

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

ARENDI S.A.R.L.,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	C.A. No. 13-919-JLH
	)	
v.	)	<b>Original Version Filed: February 2, 2023</b>
	)	
GOOGLE LLC,	)	<b>Public Version Filed: February 9, 2023</b>
	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

**PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR  
CLARIFICATION OF CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AND MOTION TO STRIKE**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
Background.....	2
Argument .....	6
1. Defendants Violated the Court’s Rules.....	6
A. Defendants motion violates Local Rule 7.1.5(a) .....	6
B. Defendants motion violates the Court’s scheduling order and Rule 16 .....	9
C. <i>O2 Micro</i> does not require repeated construction of the same term.....	11
2. Defendants’ proposed construction <u>still</u> fails on the merits.....	12
Conclusion .....	19

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Becton Dickinson &amp; Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Grp. LP</i> , No. CIV.A. 02-1694-GMS, 2006 WL 890995 (D. Del. Mar. 31, 2006).....	7
<i>Boyer v. Taylor</i> , No. CIV.A. 06-694-GMS, 2013 WL 1336221 (D. Del. Mar. 29, 2013) .....	10
<i>Cronos Techs., LLC v. Expedia, Inc.</i> , No. CV 13-1538-LPS, 2015 WL 5234040 (D. Del. Sept. 8, 2015).....	13
<i>DoseLogix, LLC v. Reflex Med. Corp.</i> , No. 21-cv-1275, 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 205131 (D. Minn. Nov. 10, 2022).....	10
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Secure Computing Corp.</i> , 626 F.3d 1197 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	11, 12
<i>Flash Seats, LLC v. Paciolan, Inc.</i> , No. CIV. 07-575-LPS, 2011 WL 4501320 (D. Del. Sept. 28, 2011).....	7
<i>Hill-Rom Servs., Inc. v. Stryker Corp.</i> , 755 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	16
<i>IPPV Enters., LLC v. EchoStar Commc 'ns Corp.</i> , No. CIV.A.99-577-KAJ, 2003 WL 723260 (D. Del. Feb. 27, 2003) .....	7
<i>Loughlin v. Harada</i> , No. CV 20-1055-LPS, 2022 WL 610672 (D. Del. Feb. 28, 2022).....	7
<i>McDerby v. Daniels</i> , No. C.A.08-882-GMS, 2010 WL 2403033 (D. Del. June 16, 2010).....	9
<i>Mylan Pharms., Inc. v. Kremers Urb. Dev. Co.</i> , No. C.A. 02-1628-GMS, 2004 WL 57218 (D. Del. Jan. 13, 2004).....	7
<i>O2 Micro Int'l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co.</i> , 521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	1, 7, 11, 12
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	16
<i>Skedco, Inc. v. Strategic Operations, Inc.</i> , 685 F. App'x 956 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	16

..

*Summit 6, LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*,  
802 F.3d 1283 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....11, 12, 14, 15

**Rules**

Fed. R. Civ. P. 16.....9, 10

Local Rule 7.1.5.....1, 6, 7

...

Defendants take a persistent approach to claim construction. If at first they don't succeed, they try, try (wait for a new judge), and try again. The Court construed the disputed limitation in August 2019; and the Court confirmed the plain and ordinary meaning of its construction in March 2022, when ruling on both summary judgment and *Daubert* motions. Those latter motions briefed the exact issue Defendants rehash now, and the Court settled that issue decisively:

While the eligible “predefined categories” of information must be categories “that can be searched for in an information source external to the document,” the Court’s construction does not require that the searchability determination of the first information must be made by the accused infringing products while performing this step of the claimed process. The contrary interpretation of the term would effectively read the word “predefined” out of the Court’s construction. ***In other words, “the phrase ‘that can be searched for’ modifies the allowable ‘predefined categories’ and does not specify a distinct determination to be made.”***

Dkt. 400 at 6-7 (emphasis added). As a result, the Court denied Defendants’ motion for summary judgment, and the Court ordered Defendants’ technical expert be “***precluded from testifying that the Accused Devices or Accused Apps do not satisfy the claim limitation because they do not determine the searchability of the first information.***” *Id.* at 7 (emphasis added).<sup>1</sup>

Defendants ignore the procedural rules and substantive rulings of this Court. They filed their motion, without seeking leave, in violation of the Court’s scheduling order, which required claim construction briefing to conclude by summer 2019. Their motion also violates Local Rule 7.1.5(a), which limits motions for reargument to 10 pages filed within 14 days of the Court’s challenged order, whether viewed vis-à-vis the Court’s August 2019 claim construction order or its March 2022 summary judgment and *Daubert* orders. And, in a baseless attempt to invoke *O2 Micro*, they pretend the Court has addressed determining searchability *only* “while the document

---

<sup>1</sup> This brief and Exhibit 1 contain materially the same argument and evidence as those filed in opposition to the same motion in *Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Motorola Mobility LLC*, C.A. No. 12-1601-JLH. Arendi has filed separate versions in the two cases because each version incorporates material from sealed filings in its respective case.

# 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.