

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

ARENDI S.A.R.L.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 12-1595-LPS
)	
LG ELECTRONICS, INC.,)	
LG ELECTRONICS USA, INC. and)	
LG ELECTRONICS MOBILECOMM U.S.A.,)	
INC.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
ARENDI S.A.R.L.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 12-1596-LPS
)	
APPLE INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
ARENDI S.A.R.L.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 12-1597-LPS
)	
BLACKBERRY LIMITED and)	
BLACKBERRY CORPORATION,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
ARENDI S.A.R.L.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 12-1599-LPS
)	
MICROSOFT MOBILE INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

ARENDI S.A.R.L.,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.) C.A. No. 12-1601-LPS
)
MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC)
f/k/a MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC.,)
)
Defendant.)
)
ARENDI S.A.R.L.,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.) C.A. No. 12-1602-LPS
)
SONY MOBILE COMMUNICATIONS (USA))
INC. f/k/a SONY ERICSSON MOBILE)
COMMUNICATIONS (USA) INC.,)
SONY CORPORATION and)
SONY CORPORATION OF AMERICA,)
)
Defendants.)
ARENDI S.A.R.L.,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.) C.A. No. 13-919-LPS
)
GOOGLE LLC,)
)
Defendant.)
ARENDI S.A.R.L.,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.)
OATH HOLDINGS INC., and)
OATH INC.,)
)
Defendants.)
)

**PLAINTIFF'S ANSWERING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF
ADDRESSING U.S. PATENT NUMBERS 7,917,843 AND 8,306,993**

Of Counsel:

Stephen Susman
Seth Ard
Max Straus
SUSMAN GODFREY, LLP
1301 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor
New York, New York 10019
Tel: (212) 336-8330
ssusman@susmangodfrey.com
sard@susmangodfrey.com
mstraus@susmangodfrey.com

SMITH, KATZENSTEIN & JENKINS, LLP

Neal C. Belgam (No. 2721)
Eve H. Ormerod (No. 5369)
Beth A. Swadley (No. 6331)
1000 West Street, Suite 1501
Wilmington, DE 19801
Tel: (302) 652-8400
nbelgam@skjlaw.com
eormerod@skjlaw.com
bswadley@skjlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Arendi S.A.R.L.

John Lahad
SUSMAN GODFREY, LLP
1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 5100
Houston, Texas 77002-5096
Tel: (713) 651-9366
jlahad@susmangodfrey.com

Dated: July 17, 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	DISPUTED TERMS.....	1
A.	“Document”	1
1.	“Document” Should Not Be Limited to a Word Processing or Spreadsheet File.....	1
2.	“Document” Does Not Require the User to Enter Text.....	8
3.	The “Ordinary Meaning” of Document is Not So Limited.....	9
B.	“computer program”/“first computer program”/“second computer program”	10
C.	“first information”.....	12
D.	“to determine if the first information is at least one of a plurality of types of information that can be searched for”.....	14
E.	“providing an input device configured by the first computer program” / “providing an input device configured by the document editing program”	16
F.	“wherein the computer implemented method is configured to perform each one of action (i), action (ii), and action (iii) using the first contact information previously identified as a result of the analyzing”	17
G.	“that allows a user to enter a user command to initiate an operation”	20
H.	“providing for the user an input device configured so that a single execute command from the input device is sufficient to cause the performing”	22
I.	“while it is electronically displayed”	25
III.	CONCLUSION.....	25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Akamai Techs., Inc. v. Limelight Networks, Inc.</i> , 805 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	3, 13
<i>Andersen Corp. v. Fiber Composites, LLC</i> , 474 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	4
<i>Chicago Bd. Options Exch., Inc. v. Int'l Sec. Exch., LLC</i> , 677 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	4
<i>Cronos Techs., LLC v. Expedia, Inc.</i> , No. 13-1538-LPS, 2016 WL 3982309 (D. Del. July 22, 2016).....	7
<i>GE Lighting Sols., LLC v. AgiLight, Inc.</i> , 750 F.3d 1304 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	3
<i>GPNE Corp. v. Apple, Inc.</i> 830 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	7
<i>Hill-Rom Servis., Inc. v. Stryker Corp.</i> , 755 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Honeywell Int'l, Inc. v. ITT Indus., Inc.</i> , 452 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	7
<i>Howmedica Osteonics Corp. v. Wright Med. Tech. Inc.</i> , 540 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	4
<i>In re Papst Licensing Digital Camera Patent Lit.</i> , 778 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	13
<i>Innova/Pure Water, Inc. v. Safari Water Filtration Sys.</i> , 381 F.3d 1111 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	3
<i>IPXL Holdings, LLC v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , 430 F.3d 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	18
<i>Microprocessor Enhancement Corp. v. Texas Instruments Inc.</i> , 520 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	17, 18, 19
<i>SafeTCare Mfg., Inc. v. Tele-Made, Inc.</i> , 497 F.3d 1262 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	4

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.