

**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 SUR-REPLY CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

BRIAN M. BOYNTON  
Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney  
General

GARY L. HAUSKEN  
Director

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

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

July 1, 2022

COUNSEL FOR THE DEFENDANT,  
THE UNITED STATES

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. ARGUMENT ..... 1

    A. The ‘355 Patent ..... 1

        1. ‘355 Patent, Term 1: “Series of numerical values having tags indicating characteristics ...” ..... 1

        2. ‘355 Patent, Term 2: “tag/tags” ..... 4

        3. ‘355 Patent, Term 3: “macro” ..... 5

        4. ‘355 Patent, Term 4: “transform the series of numerical values ...” ..... 6

        5. ‘355 Patent, Term 5: “generating at least one second title...” ..... 6

        6. ‘355 Patent, Term 6: “the step of receiving” ..... 7

        7. ‘355 Patent, Term 7: “report” ..... 7

    B. The ‘816 Patent ..... 10

        1. ‘816 Patent, Term 1: “tags reflecting characteristics...” ..... 10

        2. ‘816 Patent, Term 2: “tag/tags” ..... 10

        3. ‘816 Patent, Term 3: “wherein the characteristics indicate ... format ...” ..... 10

        4. ‘816 Patent, Term 4: “automatically transforming ... common format” ..... 11

        5. ‘816 Patent, Terms 5 -9..... 12

        6. ‘816 Patent, Term 10: “characteristic of the numerical value” ..... 12

    C. The ‘383 Patent ..... 12

        1. ‘383 Patent, Term 1: “first tags reflecting characteristics . . .” ..... 12

        2. ‘383 Patent, Term 2: “second tags reflecting characteristics ...” ..... 12

        3. ‘383 Patent, Term 3: “tag/tags” ..... 12

        4. ‘383 Patent, Term 4: “wherein the first tags . . . semantic tags . . .” ..... 12

        5. ‘383 Patent, Term 5: “semantic tag/semantic tags” ..... 12

6.	‘383 Patent, Term 6: “automatic transformation . . . common unit of measure”	13
7.	‘383 Patent, Term 7: “capable of including . . .”	13
8.	‘383 Patent, Term 8: “rule”	13
9.	‘383 Patent, Term 9: “presentation”	15
10.	‘383 Patent, Term 10: “report”	16
11.	‘383 Patent, Term 11: “multiple hierarchical relationships between two line items . . .”	16
12.	‘383 Patent, Term 12: “capable of including . . .”	17
13.	‘383 Patent, Terms 13- 16	17
D.	The ‘384 Patent	17
1.	‘384 Patent, Term 1: “values”	17
2.	‘384 Patent, Term 2: “data structure”	18
3.	‘384 Patent, Term 3: “identify one or more indications . . . tagging . . . semantic tags”	19
4.	‘384 Patent, Term 4: “one or more computer-readable semantic tags”	19
5.	‘384 Patent, Term 5: “semantic tags”	19
6.	‘384 Patent, Term 6: “presentation”	19
7.	‘384 Patent, Term 7: “report”	19
E.	The ‘748 Patent	19
F.	The ‘842 Patent	19
G.	The ‘337 Patent	19
1.	‘337 Patent, Term 1: “data values”	19
2.	‘337 Patent, Term 2: “computer readable semantic tags . . .”	19
3.	‘337 Patent, Term 3: “semantic tags”	19
4.	‘337 Patent, Term 4: “presentation”	19

5.	'337 Patent, Term 5: "report" .....	20
6.	'337 Patent, Term 6: "markup language" .....	20
H.	The '708 Patent .....	20
III.	CONCLUSION.....	20

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### CASES

<i>Advanced Aerospace Techs., Inc. v. United States</i> , 122 Fed. Cl. 445 (2015).....	18
<i>Advanced Fiber Techs. (AFT) Tr. v. J &amp; L Fiber Servs., Inc.</i> , 674 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	5
<i>Apple Inc. v. MPH Techs. Oy</i> , 28 F.4th 254, 261 (Fed. Cir. 2022).....	2
<i>Arista Networks, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , 908 F.3d 792 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....	9, 14
<i>Bell Atl. Network Servs. v. Covad Communs. Group</i> , 262 F.3d 1258 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	8, 9, 14
<i>CAE Screenplates, Inc. v. Heinrich Fiedler GmbH &amp; Co. KG</i> , 224 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	15
<i>EON Corp. IP Holdings, LLC v. Sensus USA Inc.</i> , 741 F.Supp.2d 783 (E.D. Tex. 2010).....	18
<i>Hilgraeve Corp. v. Symantec Corp.</i> , 265 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	13
<i>Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 898, 913 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	8
<i>Lydall Thermal/Acoustical, Inc. v. Federal-Mogul Corp.</i> , 344 Fed. Appx. 607 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	9, 14
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	20
<i>SanDisk Corp. v. Memorex Prod., Inc.</i> , 415 F.3d 1278 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	5
<i>SciMed Life Sys., Inc. v. Advanced Cardiovascular Sys., Inc.</i> , 242 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....	9
<i>Secure Web Conference Corp. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 640 Fed. Appx. 910 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	9, 14
<i>See Innova/Pure Water, Inc. v. Safari Water Filtration Systems, Inc.</i> , 381 F.3d 1111 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	3

### STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 101.....	4,5
----------------------	-----

# 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.