

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS

E-NUMERATE SOLUTIONS, INC. and
E-NUMERATE, LLC,

Plaintiffs,

v.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendant.

C.A. No. 19-859-RTH

PLAINTIFFS' SUPPLEMENTAL CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF

Dated: November 22, 2022

Sean T. O'Kelly
Gerard M. O'Rourke
O'KELLY & O'ROURKE, LLC
824 N. Market Street, Suite 1001A
Wilmington, DE 19801
302-778-4000
sokelly@okorlaw.com
gorourke@okorlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Table of Contents

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	ARGUMENT.....	1
A.	Terms 15A, B and C.....	1
B.	Term 2.....	4
III.	CONCLUSION.....	5

Table of Authorities

Cases

Funai Elec. Co. v. Daewoo Elecs. Corp., 616 F.3d 1357, 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2010) 3

In re Katz Interactive Call Processing Patent Litig., 639 F.3d 1303, 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2011)..... 3

Invitrogen Corp. v. Biocrest Mfg., L.P., 327 F.3d 1364, 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2003) 3

Nobel Biocare Servs. AG v. Instradent USA, Inc., 903 F.3d 1365, 1382 (Fed. Cir. 2018)..... 3

North Am. Container, Inc. v. Plastipak Packaging, Inc., 415 F.3d 1335, 1345-46 (Fed. Cir. 2005)
..... 3

Oatey Co. v. IPS Corp., 514 F.3d 1271, 1276-77 (Fed. Cir. 2008) 3

SciMed Life Systems, Inc. v. Advanced Cardiovascular Systems, Inc., 242 F.3d 1337, 1344 (Fed.
Cir. 2001) 3

Verizon Servs. Corp. v. Vonage Holdings Corp., 503 F.3d 1295, 1305 (Fed. Cir. 2007) 3

Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronics, Inc., 90 F.3d 1576, 1583 (Fed. Cir. 1996) 3

..

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiffs e-Numerate Solutions, Inc., and e-Numerate, LLC (collectively “e-Numerate” or “Plaintiffs”) submit this Supplemental Claim Construction Brief pursuant to the Court’s Order of November 21, 2022. ECF 104.

e-Numerate’s proposed constructions of terms 15A, B and C (the “multiple hierarchical relationships” limitations) and e-Numerate’s proposed construction of term 2 (the “report” limitation) embrace the preferred embodiments in the asserted patents. As a result, e-Numerate’s proposed constructions are fully in accord with long-standing Federal Circuit precedent that embodiments should be encompassed within claim interpretations absent a compelling reason not to include them. In contrast, the Government’s proposed constructions excludes these embodiments and is in direct contravention of this precedent.

II. ARGUMENT

Each of the proposed constructions is addressed in turn.

A. Terms 15A, B and C

The Court’s proposed preliminary definitions were as follows:

Term Number	Term	Court’s Proposed Definition
15A	“multiple hierarchical relationships between two line items”	A line item with more than one type of hierarchical relationship with another line item, conveying information such as dependency on other line items and relation of different line items to their parents, peers, and children. Examples of relationships between two line items include parent-child, siblings, and grandparent-grandchild.
15B	“multiple hierarchical relationships between two line	A line item with more than one type of hierarchical relationship with another line item, conveying information such as dependency on other line items and relation of different line items to their parents, peers,

	items of corresponding numerical values”	and children. Examples of relationships between two line items include parent-child, siblings, and grandparent-grandchild.
15C	“multiple hierarchical relationships between two of the plurality of line items”	A line item of the two or more line items with more than one type of hierarchical relationship with another line item of the two or more line items, conveying information such as dependency on other line items and relation of different line items to their parents, peers, and children. Examples of relationships between two-line items include parent-child, siblings, and grandparent-grandchild.

During the claim construction hearing, there was argument from both sides related to these claim terms and the extent to which any construction may or must include the figures in the respective patents. The parties disagreed on this issue. e-Numerate made clear in its presentation that these terms must be construed to encompass Figure 14A in the ‘383 and ‘748 patents and Figure 15 in the ‘842 patent. These figures are the only embodiments of financial reports contained in the specifications of the patents-in-suit. The patents-in-suit explicitly teach the applicability of the claimed inventions to financial reports. *See, e.g.*, ‘355 Patent at col. 49, lines 51 – 57 (“RDML permits records to be arranged *hierarchically within a table*. Although not a standard approach for relational tables, this permits *multiple levels of information* to be placed in a single two-dimensional table. Users desire this, for example, when viewing *financial statements*, where a single line item 55 (e.g., "Equipment leasing") may have several sub-components ("Autos," "Trucks," "Office Equipment.")(emphasis supplied)); *see also* ‘355 Patent at col. 9, lines 44 – 52; col. 11, lines 38 – 48; col. 23, lines 33 – 50; col. 27, line 67 – col. 28, line 6.

The Federal Circuit has repeatedly emphasized that claims should be construed to cover the examples and embodiments disclosed in the specification absent compelling reasons not to

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.