

1 George C. Lombardi (*pro hac vice*)
glombardi@winston.com
2 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
35 West Wacker Drive
3 Chicago, IL 60601-9703
Telephone: (312) 558-5600
4 Facsimile: (312) 558-5700

Dustin J. Edwards (*pro hac vice*)
dedwards@winston.com
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
800 Capitol St., Suite 2400
Houston, TX 77002-2925
Telephone: (713) 651-2600
Facsimile: (713) 651-2700

5 E. Danielle T. Williams (*pro hac vice*)
dwilliams@winston.com
6 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
300 South Tryon Street, 16th Floor
7 Charlotte, NC 28202
Telephone: (704) 350-7700
8 Facsimile: (704) 350-7800

Diana Hughes Leiden (SBN: 267606)
dhleiden@winston.com
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
333 S. Grand Avenue, 38th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071-1543
Telephone: (213) 615-1700
Facsimile: (213) 615-1750

9 Michael S. Elkin (*pro hac vice*)
melkin@winston.com
10 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
200 Park Avenue
11 New York, NY 10166
Telephone: (212) 294-6700
12 Facsimile: (212) 294-4700

13 *Attorneys for Defendants*
BANK OF AMERICA CORPORATION
14 and BANK OF AMERICA, N.A.

15 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
16 **FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

17 NANTWORKS, LLC, a Delaware
limited liability company, and
18 NANT HOLDINGS IP, LLC, a
Delaware limited liability company,

19 Plaintiffs,

20 vs.

21 BANK OF AMERICA
22 CORPORATION, a Delaware
corporation, and BANK OF
23 AMERICA, N.A., a national banking
association,

24 Defendants.
25
26
27
28

Case No. 2:20-cv-07872-GW-PVC

**DEFENDANTS BANK OF AMERICA
CORPORATION AND BANK OF
AMERICA, N.A.'S OPENING CLAIM
CONSTRUCTION BRIEF FOR THE
SECOND ROUND OF CLAIM
CONSTRUCTION**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

II. BACKGROUND 1

III. LEGAL STANDARD 4

IV. ARGUMENT 5

 1. “decoding the recognizable symbols to extract symbol information by analyzing the recognizable symbols according to type” (’252 patent, Claim 18)..... 5

 2. Characteristics Terms: “data characteristics” (’529 patent, claim 1), “characteristic” (’004 patent, claim 1), “parameters” (’036 patent, claim 1), “features” (’897 patent, claim 25) 7

 a) The Court previously construed the Recognize Terms based on unequivocal statements in the asserted patents’ specifications. 9

 b) The Court should construe the Characteristics Terms based on the same rationale it used for the Recognize Terms..... 11

 3. “determining a validity of the document based at least in part on the image . . .”/“recognizing the document as a first target object based at least in part on the image, . . .” (’278 patent, Claim 1)..... 16

V. CONCLUSION 22

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

Aylus Networks, Inc. v. Apple Inc.,
856 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2017) 5, 6, 21

Bd. of Regents of the Univ. of Tex. Sys. v. BENQ Am. Corp.,
533 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2008) 17

GPNE Corp. v. Apple Inc.,
830 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 4, 20

Markman v. Westview Instruments Inc.,
517 U.S. 370 (1996)..... 4

Phillips v. AWH Corp.,
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) 13

Poly-America, L.P. v. API Indus., Inc.,
839 F.3d 1131 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 12, 15, 20

Renishaw PLC v. Marposs Societa'
per Azioni, 158 F.3d 1243 (Fed. Cir. 1998)..... 4

Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Elm 3DS Innovations, LLC,
925 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2019) 12

Seabed Geosolutions (US) Inc. v. Magseis FF LLC,
8 F.4th 1285 (Fed. Cir. 2021) 4

SIPCO, LLC v. Emerson Elec. Co.,
794 F. App'x 946 (Fed. Cir. 2019)..... 17

Standard Oil v. Am. Cyanamid Co.,
774 F.2d 448 (Fed. Cir. 1985) 4

Verizon Servs. Corp. v. Vonage Holdings Corp.,
503 F.3d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 2007) 15

I. INTRODUCTION

As this Court previously recognized, the asserted patents claim a particular and allegedly novel way of identifying an object in an image solely by using its visual appearance (e.g., color or shape). Dkt. 145 at 1–2, 16–17. However, in its recent filings and discovery responses, NantWorks continues to expand the scope of the asserted claims far beyond the alleged novelty identified as the “present invention” in the patents’ specification. All this despite making statements in *inter partes* review (“IPR”) proceedings that amount to clear prosecution disclaimers.

Claim construction is appropriate in such situation. The Court should reject NantWorks’s proposed “plain and ordinary meaning” constructions—constructions NantWorks seeks to use to improperly capture claim scope that it either disclaimed during prosecution or never claimed in the first place—and instead, adopt Bank of America’s proposed claim constructions, which (1) have clear and consistent support in the entire intrinsic record and (2) align with the Court’s findings and conclusions in the first round of claim construction. Thus, Bank of America submits its opening brief for a second round of claim construction to hold the scope of the asserted claims to this unequivocal intrinsic evidence as the Court did in its previous rulings.

II. BACKGROUND

In November 2020, NantWorks filed a Complaint against Bank of America, in relevant part, for infringement of eight patents. *See* Dkts. 1, 40. Bank of America petitioned for IPR proceedings challenging the validity of each of the asserted patents. *See* Dkt. 174 at 3; 174-4 (Ex. 4). The Court conducted one round of claim construction, which culminated in claim construction orders at the end of 2021. Dkts. 145, 153. In February 2022, NantWorks dismissed its claims regarding the ’030 and ’038 patents with prejudice. Dkts. 166, 171. In early 2022, the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“PTAB”) declined to institute IPR proceedings as to the ’897 and ’278 patents, but instituted proceedings as to the ’529, ’004, ’036, and ’252 patents. Ex. A (IPR2021-01388, Paper 11 (Decision Denying Institution)); Ex. B (IPR2021-01389, Paper 10

1 (Decision Denying Institution)); Ex. C (IPR2021-01081, Paper 15 (Decision Granting
2 Institution)); Ex. D (IPR2021-01332, Paper 9 (Decision Granting Institution)); Ex. E
3 (IPR2021-01304, Paper 10 (Decision Granting Institution)); Ex. F (IPR2021-01333,
4 Paper 9 (Decision Granting Institution)). In early 2023, the PTAB issued its final written
5 decisions regarding those four patents, upholding the validity of the challenged claims.
6 Dkts. 182-1 (IPR2021-01081, Paper 46 (Final Written Decision)), 182-2 (IPR2021-
7 01333, Paper 40 (Final Written Decision)), 187-1 (IPR2021-01304, Paper 42 (Final
8 Written Decision)), 187-2 (IPR2021-01333, Paper 35 (Final Written Decision)). Bank
9 of America has appealed those decisions. Therefore, six patents remain in the case
10 pending appeal.¹

11 NantWorks accuses the mobile check deposit functionality of Bank of America’s
12 mobile app of infringing the six patents. The asserted patents, however, do not describe
13 or even mention banking and mobile check deposit. Rather, they claim a particular way
14 of identifying an object in an image solely by using its visual appearance (e.g., color or
15 shape). *See, e.g.*, Dkt. 111-4 (’532 patent), Abstract, 1:63–2:5. This involves using a
16 mobile device to take a picture of the object of interest, comparing the visual
17 characteristics (which the patents also refer to as “parameters” or “features”)
18 decomposed from that object image with those of known objects in a database to
19 recognize the object, and then providing information about the recognized object to the
20 user. *Id.*, e.g., at Abstract, 1:63–2:5, 2:33–60, 4:37–48, 10:6–15. As the Court noted in
21 its initial claim construction order, the ’529 patent, which is illustrative as to all the
22 asserted patents, “uses data characteristics to identify an object from a plurality of
23 objects in a database” such that the “object can be identified solely by its visual
24 appearance[,]” as opposed to “[t]raditional methods for linking objects to digital

25
26
27
28

¹ All of the asserted patents claim priority to and incorporate U.S. Patent No. 7,016,532 (“the ’532 patent”) and its Application No. 09/992,942 (“the ’942 application”). *See* Dkt. 40-1 (’529 patent), 1:4–21; Dkt. 40-2 (’252 patent), 1:4–22; Dkt. 40-5 (’036 patent), 1:4–17; Dkt. 40-6 (’897 patent), 1:4–28; Dkt. 40-7 (’278 patent), 1:4–25; Dkt. 40-8 (’004 patent), 1:4–25.

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.