

1 Robert F. McCauley (SBN 162056)
robert.mccauley@finnegan.com
2 Jacob A. Schroeder (SBN 264717)
jacob.schroeder@finnegan.com
3 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP
4 3300 Hillview Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1203
5 Telephone: (650) 849-6600
Facsimile: (650) 849-6666

6 Gerald F. Ivey (*pro hac vice*)
7 Smith R. Brittingham IV (*pro hac vice*)
Elizabeth A. Niemeyer (*pro hac vice*)
8 John M. Williamson (*pro hac vice*)
Rajeev Gupta (*pro hac vice*)
9 Aidan C. Skoyles (*pro hac vice*)
Cecilia Sanabria (*pro hac vice*)
10 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP
11 901 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20001-4413
12 Telephone: (202) 408-4000
Facsimile: (202) 408-4400

13 Stephen E. Kabakoff (*pro hac vice*)
14 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP
15 3500 SunTrust Plaza
303 Peachtree Street, N.E.
16 Atlanta, GA 30308-3263
Telephone: (404) 653- 6400
17 Facsimile: (404) 653-6444

18 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*
OpenTV, Inc., Nagravision S.A., and Nagra France S.A.S.

19 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
20 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
21 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

22 OPENTV, INC., NAGRAVISION S.A., and
NAGRA FRANCE S.A.S.

23 Plaintiffs,

24 v.

25 APPLE INC.,

26 Defendant.

CASE NO. 5:15-cv-02008-EJD (NMC)

**PLAINTIFFS' OPENING CLAIM
CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

Date: May 12, 2016

Time: 1:30 p.m.

Judge: Honorable Edward J. Davila

Courtroom: 4, 5th Floor

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. LEGAL PRINCIPLES 1

III. THE '736 PATENT 2

 A. “automatic and direct access” [Claims 1, 8, 9] 3

 B. “indicating” [Claims 1, 7-9] 5

 C. “means for extracting . . .” [Claim 9] 6

 1. The “Address Extractor” Stands as Sufficient Structure for “Means for Extracting” 7

 2. The “Modem 54” Stands as Sufficient Structure for “Means for . . . Automatically Establishing” 8

IV. THE '169 PATENT 9

 A. “directive . . .” [Claims 1, 2, 22, 23] 10

 B. “prerequisite directive” [Claims 1, 2, 22, 23] 12

 C. “subset of said set of resources” [Claims 1, 22, 23] 13

 D. “wherein said prohibiting . . .” [Claim 12] 16

 E. “a processing unit . . .” [Claim 22] 17

 F. Whether the preamble of claim 22 is limiting. [Claim 22] 21

V. THE '740 PATENT 23

 A. “imprint of data” [Claim 1] 24

VI. CONCLUSION 25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Federal Cases	
<i>Allen Eng'g Corp. v. Bartell Indus., Inc.</i> , 299 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	22
<i>Am. Med. Sys., Inc. v. Biolitec, Inc.</i> , 618 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	21, 22
<i>Apex Inc. v. Raritan Computer, Inc.</i> , 325 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	19
<i>CardioNet, Inc. v. Mednet Healthcare Techs., Inc.</i> , No. CIV.A. 12-2517, 2013 WL 6047565 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 15, 2013)	15
<i>CardioNet, Inc. v. ScottCare Corp.</i> , No. 2:12-CV-2516, 2014 WL 5090029 (E.D. Pa. Oct. 9, 2014)	15
<i>ePlus, Inc. v. Lawson Software, Inc.</i> , No. 3:09-CV-620, 2010 WL 1779973 (E.D. Va. Apr. 30, 2010)	15
<i>JVW Enters., Inc. v. Interact Accessories, Inc.</i> , 424 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	2
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2120 (2014).....	2, 4, 13, 17
<i>Network Appliance, Inc. v. Bluearc Corp.</i> , No. C03-5665MHP, 2004 WL 5651036 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 30, 2004).....	18
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc).....	1, 2, 11, 12
<i>Pitney Bowes, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , 182 F.3d 1298 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	22
<i>Power Integrations, Inc. v. Fairchild Semiconductor Int'l, Inc.</i> , 711 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	18
<i>Rambus Inc. v. Infineon Techs. AG.</i> , 318 F.3d 1081 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	2
<i>Rowe v. Dror</i> , 112 F.3d 473 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	22
<i>Schumer v. Lab. Comput. Sys., Inc.</i> , 308 F.3d 1304 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	22

1 *Spectra-Physics, Inc. v. Coherent, Inc.*,
827 F.2d 1524 (Fed. Cir. 1987).....9

2 *Stumbo v. Eastman Outdoors, Inc.*,
3 508 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....25

4 *Summit 6, LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*,
5 802 F.3d 1283 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....16

6 *Superguide Corp. v. DirecTV Enters., Inc.*,
358 F.3d 870 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....25

7 *Syncpoint Imaging, LLC v. Nintendo of Am. Inc.*,
8 No. 2:15-CV-00247-JRG-RSP, 2016 WL 55118 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 5, 2016).....18

9 *Teleflex, Inc. v. Ficosa N. Am. Corp.*,
10 299 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....2

11 *Teva Pharms. USA, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.*,
135 S. Ct. 831 (2015).....1

12 *Thorner v. Sony Comput. Entm’t Am., LLC*,
13 669 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....1, 2

14 *In re Townshend Patent Litig.*,
15 No. C 02-04833 JF, 2004 WL 1920049 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 26, 2004).....15

16 *Verizon Cal. Inc. v. Ronald A. Katz Tech. Licensing, P.A.*,
326 F. Supp. 2d 1060 (C.D. Cal. 2003)18

17 *Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.*,
18 90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....2

19 *Williamson v. Citrix Online, LLC*,
792 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....18

20 **Federal Statutes**

21 35 U.S.C. § 112 *passim*

22 **Administrative Decisions**

23 *InfoBionic, Inc. v. Braemar Mfg., LLC*,
24 IPR2015-01704, Paper No. 11 (PTAB Feb. 16, 2016).....15

25 *Netflix, Inc. v. OpenTV, Inc.*,
26 IPR2014-00269, 2014 WL 2889586 (PTAB Jun. 24, 2014)4

27 *Travelers Lloyds of Tex. Ins. Co. v. Integrated Claims Sys., LLC*,
28 CBM2014-00187, 2015 WL 1519058 (PTAB Mar. 31, 2015)15

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

Rules

Patent L.R. 4-3 1

Other Authorities

American Heritage College Dictionary (1997) 13
American Heritage College Dictionary (3d ed. 2000)..... 13
Compact Oxford English Dictionary (2d ed. 1987)..... 13
IEEE 100: The Authoritative Dictionary of IEEE Standards Terms (7th ed. 2000)..... 23, 24
Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary (10th ed. 2001) 13
Random House Dictionary of the English Language (2d ed. Unabridged 1987) 13
Random House Webster’s College Dictionary (2000)..... 13, 14

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.