

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

Washington, D.C.

In the Matter of

**CERTAIN WEARABLE ELECTRONIC
DEVICES WITH ECG FUNCTIONALITY
AND COMPONENTS THEREOF**

Inv. No. 337-TA-1266

**ORDER NO. 12: CONSTRUING THE TERMS OF THE ASSERTED CLAIMS OF
THE PATENTS AT ISSUE**

(November 4, 2021)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. IN GENERAL..... 1

III. RELEVANT LAW 2

IV. OVERVIEW OF THE ART AND THE LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL..... 6

V. THE ASSERTED PATENTS 8

 A. The 499 Patent 8

 B. The 731 Patent 10

 C. The 941 Patent 11

VI. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION..... 12

 A. Construction of the Agreed-Upon Claim Term 12

 B. Construction of the Disputed Claim Terms 13

 1. 499 Patent – Preambles 13

 2. 499 Patent – “alerting said first user to sense an electrocardiogram”/ “alert”
 15

 3. 499 Patent – “heart rate sensor” 17

 4. 499 Patent – Order of Method Steps..... 19

 5. 731 Patent – “confirm the presence of the arrhythmia based on the ECG
 data” / “confirming the presence of the arrhythmia based on the ECG data”
 20

 6. 731 Patent – Order of Method Steps..... 22

 7. 941 Patent – “to confirm a presence of the arrhythmia” / “to confirm the
 presence of the arrhythmia” 24

 8. 941 Patent – “when the activity level is resting” / “when the activity level
 value is resting” 27

 9. 941 Patent – “discordance” 30

 10. 941 Patent – Order of Method Steps..... 30

I. INTRODUCTION

This investigation was instituted by the Commission on May 20, 2021 to determine whether there is a violation of subsection (a)(1)(B) of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain wearable electronic devices with ECG functionality and components thereof by reason of infringement of one or more of claims 1-23 of U.S. Patent No. 10,638,941 (“the 941 patent”), claims 1-30 of U.S. Patent No. 10,595,731 (“the 731 patent”), and claims 1-4, 6-14, and 16-20 of U.S. Patent No. 9,572,499 (“the 499 patent”). *See* 86 Fed. Reg. 28382 (May 26, 2021). The Complainant is AliveCor, Inc. (“AliveCor”), the Respondent is Apple Inc. (“Apple”), and the Office of Unfair Import Investigations (“Staff”) is a party. *See id.*

No *Markman* hearing was held. However, the parties filed joint proposed claim construction charts setting forth a limited set of terms to be construed, and also filed claim construction briefs.¹

II. IN GENERAL

The claim terms addressed below are construed for the purposes of this investigation, and those terms not in dispute need not be construed. *See Vanderlande Indus. Nederland BV v. Int’l Trade Comm’n*, 366 F.3d 1311, 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (noting that the administrative law judge need only construe disputed claim terms). The meaning of any claim terms not presently disputed will be addressed in connection with the evidentiary hearing.

¹ For convenience, the briefs and chart submitted by the parties are referred to as:

CIMB	Complainant’s Initial Markman Brief
CRMB	Complainant’s Reply Markman Brief
RIMB	Respondent’s Initial Markman Brief
RRMB	Respondent’s Reply Markman Brief
SIMB	Staff’s Initial Markman Brief
JC	Joint Disclosure of Proposed Claim Constructions

III. RELEVANT LAW

“An infringement analysis entails two steps. The first step is determining the meaning and scope of the patent claims asserted to be infringed. The second step is comparing the properly construed claims to the device accused of infringing.” *Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.*, 52 F.3d 967, 976 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (*en banc*) (internal citations omitted), *aff'd*, 517 U.S. 370 (1996). Claim construction is a “matter of law exclusively for the court.” *Id.* at 970-71. “The construction of claims is simply a way of elaborating the normally terse claim language in order to understand and explain, but not to change, the scope of the claims.” *Embrex, Inc. v. Serv. Eng'g Corp.*, 216 F.3d 1343, 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

Claim construction focuses on the intrinsic evidence, which consists of the claims themselves, the specification, and the prosecution history. *See Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (*en banc*); *see also Markman*, 52 F.3d at 979. As the Federal Circuit in *Phillips* explained, courts must analyze each of these components to determine the “ordinary and customary meaning of a claim term” as understood by a person of ordinary skill in art at the time of the invention. 415 F.3d at 1313. “Such intrinsic evidence is the most significant source of the legally operative meaning of disputed claim language.” *Bell Atl. Network Servs., Inc. v. Covad Commc'ns Grp., Inc.*, 262 F.3d 1258, 1267 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

“It is a ‘bedrock principle’ of patent law that ‘the claims of a patent define the invention to which the patentee is entitled the right to exclude.’” *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1312 (quoting *Innova/Pure Water, Inc. v. Safari Water Filtration Sys., Inc.*, 381 F.3d 1111, 1115 (Fed. Cir. 2004)); *see Interactive Gift Express, Inc. v. Compuserve Inc.*, 256 F.3d 1323, 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2001) (“In construing claims, the analytical focus must begin and remain centered on the language of the claims themselves, for it is that language that the patentee chose to use to ‘particularly point [] out and

distinctly claim [] the subject matter which the patentee regards as his invention.”). The context in which a term is used in an asserted claim can be “highly instructive.” *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1314. Additionally, other claims in the same patent, asserted or unasserted, may also provide guidance as to the meaning of a claim term. *Id.* “Courts do not rewrite claims; instead, we give effect to the terms chosen by the patentee.” *K-2 Corp. v. Salomon S.A.*, 191 F.3d 1356, 1364 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

The specification “is always highly relevant to the claim construction analysis. Usually it is dispositive; it is the single best guide to the meaning of a disputed term.” *K-2 Corp.*, 191 F.3d at 1315 (quoting *Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.*, 90 F.3d 1576, 1582 (Fed. Cir. 1996)). “[T]he specification may reveal a special definition given to a claim term by the patentee that differs from the meaning it would otherwise possess. In such cases, the inventor’s lexicography governs.” 191 F.3d at 1316. “In other cases, the specification may reveal an intentional disclaimer, or disavowal, of claim scope by the inventor.” *Id.* As a general rule, however, the particular examples or embodiments discussed in the specification are not to be read into the claims as limitations. *Id.* at 1323. In the end, “[t]he construction that stays true to the claim language and most naturally aligns with the patent’s description of the invention will be . . . the correct construction.” *Id.* at 1316 (quoting *Renishaw PLC v. Marposs Societa' per Azioni*, 158 F.3d 1243, 1250 (Fed. Cir. 1998)).

In addition to the claims and the specification, the prosecution history should be examined, if in evidence. *Id.* at 1317; see *Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.*, 358 F.3d 898, 913 (Fed. Cir. 2004). The prosecution history can “often inform the meaning of the claim language by demonstrating how the inventor understood the invention and whether the inventor limited the invention in the course of prosecution, making the claim scope narrower than it would otherwise be.” *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1317; see *Chimie v. PPG Indus. Inc.*, 402 F.3d 1371, 1384 (Fed. Cir.

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.