



**Christopher Field, Japanese Linguist**

**Simultaneous and Consecutive Technical and General Interpreting  
Certified Written Translation**

**Wayland, MA**

**617.905.6060   cfinterpreting@gmail.com   www.christopherfield.com**

**DEPOSITIONS:** Recent representative depositions:

Gree Inc. vs. Supercell Oy. Patent dispute over video game software. Retained by Gree/Kilpatrick Townsend (via remote platform).

Toray/LG Chem vs. SKI. Patent dispute over electric vehicle battery separator films. Retained by Toray/Fish & Richardson (via remote platform).

University of California vs Amazon, Target, et al. Patent dispute over certain LEDs. Witness: Blue LED inventor Shuji Nakamura. Retained jointly by MOFO, Nixon Peabody, and others representing respective parties.

Stone Energy vs Mitsui Sumitomo Marine. Steel pipe failure in oil well involving metallurgy, materials analysis, electron micrography, etc. Retained by Sumitomo.

Broadcom vs Panasonic, Japan Radio, et al. ITC patent dispute over GPS and other electronic and firmware/software patent infringement. Retained by DLA Piper.

Harvard University/Sionyx vs. Hamamatsu Photonics. Patent dispute over design of high asperity-ratio image capture elements. Retained by Nikon.

Bartlit Beck vs Okada. Subject: Financial dispute. Retained by Bartlit law firm.

I have also interpreted at the following trials and arbitrations, among others:

**TRIALS**

2019: (April) Harvard University v Hamamatsu photonics (image sensors; jointly retained by both sides), Federal District Court, Boston; (May) USA v H. Yabe (criminal sentencing in pharmaceutical case, retained by US Court District of NJ); (June) Broadcom v Toyota, Panasonic, JRC, Denso, et al (navigation technology; jointly retained by all parties), ITC.

2018: (March) Nikon v Zeiss, ITC (image process; jointly retained by both sides); (April) Fujifilm-Hologic, ITC (mammography imaging; jointly retained by both sides); (July) Nikon v Zeiss, Fed District Court (LA) (image processing; jointly retained by both sides); (August) IV v Honda, Toyota, et al (plastic encapsulated electric motors; jointly retained by all parties); (November) Xtera v NEC, ITC (undersea cable technology; jointly retained by both sides).

2017: District of Delaware. Intellectual Ventures vs. Toshiba. NAND-flash memory technology patents. Interpreted direct and cross for two Japanese witnesses. Retained by DLA Piper/Toshiba.

2014: Central District of California (Riverside). Kaneka-SKC. Polyimide film (for semiconductors) patents. Interpreted cross-examination of 2 Japanese witnesses. Retained by Finnegan/SKC.

2013: Western District of Wisconsin (Madison). Toshiba vs. Imation. Storage media patents. Interpreted for 1 Japanese witness. Retained by Morrison & Foerster/Toshiba.

2012: Northern District of Illinois (Chicago). Fujitsu Ltd vs Tellabs. Optical amplifier patents. Interpreted for two witnesses. Retained by Orrick/Fujitsu. \*Note: Judge James Holderman presided. After a break, before the jury was resealed, Judge Holderman addressed the courtroom to commend the interpreter (myself) on the record for an exceptional job.

2012: Dallas TX Federal Court. GE vs Mitsubishi Heavy Industries. Wind turbine patents. Interpreted for 2 Japanese witnesses. Retained by Finnegan/Mitsubishi.

2010: Federal Court, District of Delaware. Shionogi v Watson et al. Pharmaceutical/ANDA case. Interpreted cross-examination of two witnesses. Retained by Knobbe Martens/Watson et al.

2009: ITC, Toyota v Solomon. Hybrid automobile patents; one of 3 hybrid cases in which I was retained at Toyota's request; in other cases a neutral interpreter was retained for the trial. Interpreted for 2 Japanese witnesses. Retained by Finnegan Henderson/Toyota.

2008 International Trade Commission (ITC). Samsung v Sharp. LCD technology. interpreted cross examination of 2 Japanese witnesses. Retained by Fish and Richardson/Samsung.

2008: San Diego Federal Court. Honda Motor Co vs Calcar. Case concerned navigation patents asserted against Honda. Interpreted for 2 or 3 Japanese witnesses. Retained by Fish and Richardson/Honda.

#### **ARBITRATIONS**

2020: Arbitration, New York, NY: Trividia Health vs Nipro Corp. Supplier agreement dispute. Interpreted examination of 6 Japanese witnesses in case pertaining to home glucose monitors. Retained by Sheppard Mullin.

2017: Arbitration, New York, NY. Toshiba vs. Samsung. Contract dispute. Interpreted for two Japanese witnesses. Retained by Latham & Watkins/Toshiba. \*Note: At the conclusion of the Japanese witness portion, the president of the arbitration panel made a statement on the record to the effect that the interpreting had contributed greatly to the panel's understanding of the case.

2016: Arbitration, New York NY. Philips Electronics vs. Nikon. Semiconductor fabrication equipment (steppers). Interpreted for 2 Japanese witnesses. Retained by Morrison Foerster/Nikon.

2016: Arbitration, San Francisco CA. Southern California Edison (utility) vs. Mitsubishi Nuclear Energy Systems. Case concerned compensation for a failed steam generator at SCE's power plant. Interpreted for approximately 5 Japanese witnesses. Retained by Irell Manella/Mitsubishi.

2011: Arbitration, Boston MA. PCMS vs. Seiko Epson. Interpreted for one witness. Retained by MOFO/Seiko Epson.

2010: International arbitration, Zurich, Switzerland. Westinghouse vs. Mitsubishi Heavy Industries. Nuclear reactor vessel technology. Interpreted for 3 Japanese witnesses. Retained by Irell Manella/Mitsubishi. \*Note: European arbitrators required simultaneous interpretation of proceedings.