

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Valeo Schalter und Sensoren GmbH v. NVIDIA Corporation

Case No. 23-cv-05721-NW (VKD) (N.D. Cal. July 31, 2025) · No. 23-cv-05721-NW (VKD) · Decided July 31, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California denies NVIDIA Corporation’s motion to strike portions of Valeo Schalter und Sensoren GmbH’s expert report as untimely. The court concludes that Valeo adequately disclosed its theory concerning NVIDIA’s alleged use of Trade Secrets Nos. 4 and 10 during discovery and that any deficiency in its response to Interrogatory No. 7 was harmless.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Virginia K. DeMarchi
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	July 31, 2025
DOCKET	23-cv-05721-NW (VKD)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant NVIDIA Corporation moved to strike portions of plaintiff Valeo Schalter und Sensoren GmbH's technical expert report as untimely and sought sanctions under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 37(c) and 37(b). The court denied the motion.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order
PARTIES	NVIDIA Corporation v. Valeo Schalter und Sensoren GmbH

TOPICS

- sanctions
- discovery dispute
- trade secrets
- misappropriation of trade secrets
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- trade secrets
- commercial litigation
- intellectual property

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether NVIDIA's motion to strike was untimely under Civil Local Rule 7-8(c).
2. Whether Valeo failed to supplement its discovery responses as required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(e), warranting sanctions under Rule 37(c)(1).
3. Whether Valeo violated the court's October 18, 2024 discovery order, warranting sanctions under Rule 37(b).
4. Whether striking portions of Valeo's expert report was an appropriate remedy.

HOLDINGS

1. NVIDIA did not move promptly to seek the requested relief, but the court declined to deny the motion solely on timeliness grounds and considered its merits because NVIDIA claimed that the alleged prejudice could not have been cured without reopening fact discovery.
2. Valeo did not fail to provide information required to be disclosed regarding NVIDIA's alleged use of Trade Secrets Nos. 4 and 10; alternatively, any deficiency in Valeo's particular response to Interrogatory No. 7 was harmless. Striking the disputed expert-report portions was therefore unwarranted.
3. Valeo did not violate a distinct obligation imposed by the October 18, 2024 discovery order, because that order did not specifically direct Valeo to supplement its response to Interrogatory No. 7 or impose the requested preclusion requirement.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“On the record presented, the Court finds that NVIDIA did not move promptly to seek the relief that it now requests.” (at 2)

“For these reasons, the Court concludes that Valeo did not fail to provide information required to be disclosed in discovery regarding NVIDIA’s alleged use of Trade Secrets Nos. 4 and 10, and that any deficiency in its particular response to Interrogatory No. 7 was harmless.” (at 6)

“In view of the discussion above with respect to Rule 37(c), the Court finds that Valeo adequately disclosed during discovery its theory of misappropriation, including use by NVIDIA, of Trade Secrets Nos. 4 and 10, and that the October 18, 2024 order did not impose a distinct obligation that Valeo failed to obey.” (at 8)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Valeo alleged that NVIDIA misappropriated trade secrets involving testing, data collection, and parking-assistance technology. Valeo's technical expert disclosed opinions that NVIDIA obtained benefits, saved development time and costs, and gained competitive advantages from the alleged misappropriation of Trade Secrets Nos. 4 and 10. NVIDIA contended that Valeo had not timely disclosed its use theories in response to Interrogatory No. 7 and sought to strike the corresponding portions of the expert report.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Valeo served the expert report of Dr. Matthew Johnson-Roberson on January 24, 2025. NVIDIA filed its motion to strike on April 7, 2025, arguing that the report disclosed untimely theories concerning NVIDIA's alleged use

of Trade Secrets Nos. 4 and 10. After briefing and a hearing, the court concluded that Valeo had disclosed the relevant theory during fact discovery and that any deficiency in its response to Interrogatory No. 7 was harmless.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Yeti by Molly, Ltd. v. Deckers Outdoor Corp., 259 F.3d 1101, 1106 (9th Cir. 2001)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-northern-district-of-ca/2025/valeo-schalter-und-sensoren-gmbh-v-nvidia-corporation-3f4wtupp>