

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS

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

Plaintiffs,

v.

THE UNITED STATES,

Defendant.

No. 19-859 C

Judge Ryan T. Holte

DEFENDANT'S RESPONSIVE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION
BRIEF ON INDEFINITENESS

BRIAN M. BOYNTON
Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney
General

GARY L. HAUSKEN
Director

Of Counsel:
SCOTT BOLDEN
NELSON KUAN
U.S. Department of Justice

April 29, 2022

SHAHAR HAREL
Trial Attorney
Commercial Litigation Branch
Civil Division
Department of Justice
Washington, DC 20530
shahar.harel@usdoj.gov
Telephone: (202) 305-3075
Facsimile: (202) 307-0345

COUNSEL FOR THE DEFENDANT,
THE UNITED STATES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	OVERVIEW OF CLAIM TERMS AT ISSUE	1
III.	LEGAL STANDARD.....	2
	A. Indefiniteness Based on Antecedent Basis	2
	B. Law on 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 6.....	3
IV.	ARGUMENT.....	6
	A. The ‘355 Patent.....	7
	1. ‘355 Patent, Term 6: “the step of receiving”	7
	B. The ‘816 Patent.....	9
	1. ‘816 Patent, Term 5: “the markup language”	9
	2. ‘816 Patent, Term 6: “means for receiving . . .”	11
	3. ‘816 Patent, Term 7: “means for automatically transforming. . .”.....	11
	4. ‘816 Patent, Term 8: “means for combining . . .”	17
	5. ‘816 Patent, Term 9: “means for displaying . . .”	21
	C. The ‘383 Patent.....	21
	1. ‘383 Patent, Term 13: “means for identifying . . .”	21
	2. ‘383 Patent, Term 14: “means for automatically transforming . . .”.....	26
	3. ‘383 Patent, Term 15: “means for processing . . .”.....	28
	4. ‘383 Patent, Term 16: “means for causing a display...”	29
	D. The ‘748 Patent.....	29
	1. ‘748 Patent, Term 7: “code for storing a plurality . . .”	32
	2. ‘748 Patent, Term 8: “code for processing at least . . .”	33
	3. ‘748 Patent, Term 9: “code for receiving a user selection”	35
	4. ‘748 Patent, Term 10: “code for receiving a user selection . . .”	36

5.	‘748 Patent, Term 11: “code for mapping . . .”.....	37
6.	‘748 Patent, Term 12: “code for outputting a presentation . . .”.....	38
7.	‘748 Patent, Term 14: “code for outputting a report . . .”.....	41
8.	‘748 Patent, Term 16: “code for outputting at least one . . .”.....	42
V.	CONCLUSION.....	43

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Blackboard, Inc. v. Desire2Learn, Inc.</i> , 574 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Bushnell Hawthorne, LLC v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , 813 F. App'x 522 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	2, 11, 13
<i>Cellcast Tech., LLC v. United States</i> , 150 Fed. Cl. 353 (2020).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Cypress Lake Software, Inc. v. Samsung Electronics America, Inc.</i> , 382 F. Supp. 3d 586 (E.D. Tex. 2019)	5
<i>Cypress Lake Software, Inc. v. ZTE (USA) Inc.</i> , No. 6:17-CV-00300-RWS, 2018 WL 4035968 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 23, 2018)	5
<i>Egenera, Inc. v. Cisco Systems, Inc.</i> , 972 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	4, 35
<i>Energizer Holdings, Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 435 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	3
<i>EON Corp. IP Holdings v. AT & T Mobility LLC</i> , 785 F.3d 616 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	<i>passim</i>
<i>ePlus, Inc. v. Lawson Software Inc.</i> , 700 F.3d 509 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	7, 18
<i>Ergo Licensing, LLC v. Carefusion 303, Inc.</i> , 673 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	6, 8, 28, 31
<i>Howmedica Osteonics Corp. v. Wright Med. Tech., Inc.</i> , 540 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	36
<i>In re Katz Interactive Call Processing Patent Litigation</i> , 639 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2011) 8, 28, 31	
<i>Kraft Foods, Inc. v. Int'l Trading Co.</i> , 203 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	12
<i>Laitram Corp. v. Rexnord, Inc.</i> , 939 F.2d 1533 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....	30
<i>Lockheed Martin Corp. v. Space Systems/Loral, Inc.</i> , 249 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	14
<i>Lockheed Martin Corp. v. Space Systems/Loral, Inc.</i> , 324 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Mediatek, Inc. v. Sanyo Elec. Co.</i> , 513 F. Supp. 2d 778, 788 (E.D. Tex. 2007).....	15
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.</i> , 572 U.S. 898 (2014).....	2
<i>Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	6
<i>Spa Syspatronic AG v. United States</i> , 117 Fed. Cl. 375 (2014).....	22, 28, 31
<i>Williamson v. Citrix Online, LLC</i> , 792 F.3d 1339 (Fed Cir. 2015)	<i>passim</i>

Zeroclick, LLC, v. Apple Inc., 891 F.3d 1003 (Fed. Cir. 2018)..... *passim*

STATUTES

§ 112, ¶ 2..... 11, 13

35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 6..... *passim*

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.