



Pursuant to the Order Setting Rule 26(f) Scheduling Conference<sup>1</sup>, the Court's Order Continuing Claim Construction Deadlines<sup>2</sup>, and Northern District of California's Patent L.R. 4-3, Plaintiff Document Security Systems, Inc. ("DSS") and Defendants Seoul Semiconductor Co., Ltd., Seoul Semiconductor, Inc., Cree, Inc., Everlight Electronics Co., Everlight Americas, Inc., Lite-On, Inc., Lite-On Technology Corporation (collectively, "Defendants") (DSS and Defendants are referred to collectively as the "Parties") hereby provide their First Amended Joint Claim Construction Chart and Prehearing Statement.

## I. AGREED CONSTRUCTIONS.

The Parties anticipate continuing to meet and confer to narrow the issues for claim construction. At this time, the Parties have agreed to the following construction:

U.S. Patent 7,524,087

Claims 1, 6, 7, 8-10, 13, 15, 17, and 18.

# "pocket" / "cavity"

"a hollow space <u>surrounded by the peripheral sidewall</u> that is more than a minor depression left over <u>from the manufacturing process</u>"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Dkt. No. 74 (Case No. 8:17-cv-00981-JVS-JCG); Dkt. No. 60 (Case No. 2:17-cv-4263-JVS-JEMx); Dkt. No. 58 (Case No. 2:17-cv-06050-JVS-JEMx); Dkt. No. 69 (Case No. 2:17-cv-04273\_IVS\_IEMx)



Dkt. No. 11 (Case No. 8:17-cv-00981-JVS-JEMx); Dkt. No. 14 (Case No. 2:17-cv-4263-JVS-JEMx); Dkt. No. 14 (Case No. 2:17-cv-06050-JVS-JEMx); Dkt. No. 29 (Case No. 2:17-cv-04273-JVS-JEMx).

# RUSS, AUGUST & KABAT

# II. DISPUTED CONSTRUCTIONS.

# A. U.S. Patent 6,949,771.

| A. U.S. Patent 6,949,771. |                              |   |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Term                      | DSS's Proposal               | Defendants' Proposal                    |  |  |  |  |
| 1. "nlatform"             | "the horizontal flat         | Plain and ordinary                      |  |  |  |  |
| "platform"                | portion of a single          | meaning                                 |  |  |  |  |
|                           | structure providing          | (i.e., horizontal flat                  |  |  |  |  |
| Claims 1-                 | support to the LED die"      | surface)                                |  |  |  |  |
| 4, 6, and 7.              |                              |   |  |  |  |  |
|                           | <b>Intrinsic Evidence</b>    | Disclaimer: The term                    |  |  |  |  |
|                           | '771 patent specification    | "platform" cannot be a                  |  |  |  |  |
|                           | including at Figs. 2, 8, 15, | lead frame because DSS                  |  |  |  |  |
|                           | and 19 (and associated       | clearly and unmistakably                |  |  |  |  |
|                           | discussion in the written    | disclaimed a lead frame                 |  |  |  |  |
|                           | description); 2:1-23;        | as being "a different form              |  |  |  |  |
|                           | 2:31-44; 2:49-62; 3:56-      | of the contacts [from a                 |  |  |  |  |
|                           | 4:12; 4:20-33; 6:1-11;       | platform] taught in the                 |  |  |  |  |
|                           | 6:45-57; and claim           | present invention" in its               |  |  |  |  |
|                           | language.                    | Nov. 17, 2003, response                 |  |  |  |  |
|                           |                              | to an office action.                    |  |  |  |  |
|                           | '771 patent file history     |   |  |  |  |  |
|                           | including 08/23/2004         |   |  |  |  |  |
|                           | Amendment.                   | '771 patent, Figs. 2, 8, 17,            |  |  |  |  |
|                           |                              | 23.                                     |  |  |  |  |
|                           | <b>Extrinsic Evidence</b>    | '771 patent specification:              |  |  |  |  |
|                           | Declaration and/or           | , |  |  |  |  |
|                           | testimony of R. Jacob        | 2:10-21, 2:24-30, 2:35-                 |  |  |  |  |
|                           | Baker                        | 44, 2:49-59, 3:29-38,                   |  |  |  |  |
|                           |                              | 3:56-4:11, 4:7-9, 4:25-29,              |  |  |  |  |
|                           | Intrinsic and extrinsic      | 4:66-5:8,                               |  |  |  |  |
|                           | evidence cited by            | 5:13-41.                                |  |  |  |  |
|                           | Defendants.                  |   |  |  |  |  |
|                           | 5.00                         | Prosecution History:                    |  |  |  |  |
|                           | DSS objects to               | Office Action Response,                 |  |  |  |  |
|                           | Defendants adding a          | 1 ' '                                   |  |  |  |  |
|                           | purported disclaimer         | <u> </u>                                |  |  |  |  |
|                           | argument to their            | p. 8 (Aug. 23, 2004).                   |  |  |  |  |
|                           | proposed construction in     | IDD 2010 002 57 B                       |  |  |  |  |
|                           | this First Amended chart.    | · ·                                     |  |  |  |  |
|                           | Defendants did not meet      | 1                                       |  |  |  |  |
|                           | and confer concerning        | Response at 1, 3, 6, 13,                |  |  |  |  |



|                      | 1  | Term                     | DSS's Proposal                                      | Defendants' Proposal                          |
|----------------------|----|--------------------------|---|---|
|                      | 2  |                          | changing its proposed construction of this term.    |   |
|                      |    |                          | Moreover, Defendants'                               | (PTAB Mar. 13, 2018)<br>(Paper 6).            |
|                      | 3  |                          | purported disclaimer is an                          | (Tuper o).                                    |
|                      | 4  |                          | incomplete and                                      | IPR2018-00265,                                |
|                      | 5  |                          | misquoted snippet of a                              |   |
|                      | 6  |                          | passage removed from                                |   |
|                      |    |                          | context that, if at all relevant, is relevant to at | (Paper 8).                                    |
|                      | 7  |                          | most one asserted claim.                            | Extrinsic Evidence                            |
|                      | 8  |                          |   | Webster's II New College                      |
|                      | 9  |                          |   | Dictionary (2001), ISBN                       |
|                      | 10 |                          |   | 0-395-96214-5, p. 844.                        |
|                      | 11 |                          |   | Declaration and/or                            |
| BAT                  | 12 |                          |   | testimony of Dr. M.                           |
| Russ, August & Kabat | 13 |                          |   | Lebby.  |
| ST &                 |    |                          |   |   |
| JGU                  | 14 |                          |   | Intrinsic and extrinsic                       |
| , At                 | 15 |                          |   | Intrinsic and extrinsic evidence presented by |
| NSS                  | 16 |                          |   | Plaintiff.                                    |
| $\simeq$             | 17 | 2. "within the aperture" | "wholly contained in the                            | -   |
|                      | 18 | 1                        | horizontal and vertical bounds of the aperture"     | meaning                                       |
|                      | 19 | Claims 1- 4, 6, and 7.   | bounds of the aperture                              | Intrinsic Evidence                            |
|                      | 20 | Ciums 1 4, 0, and 7.     | <b>Intrinsic Evidence</b>                           | <sup>7</sup> 771 patent, Figs. 2, 8, 17,      |
|                      |    |                          | '771 patent specification                           | 23.   |
|                      | 21 |                          | including at abstract;<br>Figs. 2 and 17 (and       | '771 patent specification:                    |
|                      | 22 |                          | associated discussion in                            | Abstract, 1:39-67, 2:2-9,                     |
|                      | 23 |                          | the written description);                           | 2:10-21, 2:24- 30, 2:35-                      |
|                      | 24 |                          | 2:1-30; 2:35-62; 3:55-65;                           | 44, 2:49-59, 3:29-38,                         |
|                      | 25 |                          | 4:20-33; 5:19-43; 6:1-11; and claim language.       | 3:56-4:11, 4:7-9, 4:25-29, 4:66-5:8, 5:13-41. |
|                      | 26 |                          |   |   |
|                      |    |                          | '771 patent file history                            | •   |
|                      | 27 |                          | including appeals brief, p. 5.                      | Office Action Response, p.5 (Nov. 17, 2003);  |
|                      | 28 |                          |   | [ [ [ [ [ [ [ [ [ [ [ [ [ [ [ [ [ [ [         |



# DOCKET

# Explore Litigation Insights



Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

# **Real-Time Litigation Alerts**



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time** alerts and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

# **Advanced Docket Research**



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

# **Analytics At Your Fingertips**



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

### API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

#### **LAW FIRMS**

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

#### **FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS**

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## **E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS**

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.

