

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

NETWORK-1 TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

Plaintiff,

- against -

GOOGLE, INC., and YOUTUBE, LLC,

Defendants.

14 Civ. 2396 (PGG)

NETWORK-1 TECHNOLOGIES, INC.'S OPENING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF

Table Of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. BACKGROUND 1

III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION PRINCIPLES 6

 A) Claim Interpretation Focuses On The Meaning Of Terms To Persons Of Ordinary Skill
 In The Art..... 6

 B) Claims Are Definite Unless They Fail To Inform Those Skilled In The Art Of The
 Scope Of The Invention With Reasonable Certainty..... 7

IV. AGREED CONSTRUCTIONS 8

V. DISPUTED CONSTRUCTIONS 8

 A) "neighbor" "near neighbor" 8

 (1) Network-1’s Definition Comes Directly From The Patent Specification. 9

 (2) Defendants’ Proposed Construction Excludes The Preferred Embodiment. 11

 (3) Extrinsic Evidence Also Confirms Network-1’s Construction. 12

 B) "non-exhaustive search" 13

 (1) The Intrinsic Evidence Confirms Network-1’s Construction Of "Non-Exhaustive
 Search" 15

 (2) Network-1’s Construction Conforms To The Understanding Of Those Skilled In The
 Art And The Extrinsic Evidence. 16

 (3) Google’s Assertion Of Indefiniteness Cannot Be Supported..... 18

 (4) Google’s Alternative Construction Does Not Comport With What One Skilled In The
 Art Would Understand “Non-Exhaustive Search” To Mean. 19

 C) "non-exhaustive neighbor search" 20

 D) "associating" [an action with a work] 20

 (1) “Associating” As Used In The Asserted Claims Has Definite, Clear Meaning. 20

 (2) This Claim Element Easily Meets The Standard For Definiteness 22

 E) "(f) obtaining, by the computer system, second extracted features of a second electronic
 work; (g) searching, by the computer system, for an identification of the second
 electronic work by comparing the second extracted features of the second electronic
 work with the first electronic data in the database using a non-exhaustive neighbor
 search; and (h) determining, by the computer system, that the second electronic work is
 not identified based on results of the searching step" 24

VI. CONCLUSION..... 25

..

Table Of Authorities

CASES

Anchor Wall Sys., Inc. v. Rockwood Retaining Walls, Inc.,
340 F.3d 1298 (Fed.Cir.2003)..... 11

Aventis Pharm. Inc. v. Amino Chemicals Ltd.,
715 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2013)..... 9, 20

Bancorp Services, LLC v. Hartford Life Insurance Co.,
359 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2004)..... 23

DDR Holdings v. Hotels.com,
2014 U.S. App. LEXIS 22902 (Fed. Cir. Dec. 5, 2014)..... 14

Eidos Display, LLC v. AU Optronics Corp.,
__ F.3d __, Case No. 2014-1254, slip op. at 8-10 (Fed. Cir, Mar. 10, 2015)..... 14

Epos Technologies Ltd. v. Pegasus Technologies,
766 F. 3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 11

In re: Maxim Integrated Prods., Inc.,
Misc. No. 12-244, MDL 2354, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 100448 (W.D. Pa. July 23, 2014) 23

Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.,
517 U.S. 370 (1996)..... 11

MeadWestVaco Corp. v. Rexam Beauty and Closures, Inc.,
731 F.3d 1258, 1270 n.9 (Fed. Cir. 2013)..... 23

Multiform Desiccants, Inc. v. Medzam, Ltd.,
133 F.3d 1473 (Fed. Cir. 1998)..... 7

...

Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.,
134 S. Ct. 2120, (2014)..... 8

Phillips v. AWH Corp.,
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (*en banc*) 6, 7, 12

SmithKline Beecham Corp. v. Apotex Corp.,
403 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 23

Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.,
547 U.S. _____, 135 S.Ct. 831 ____ (2015) (slip. op. at 6-7) 6

Wellman, Inc. v. Eastman Chemical Co.,
642 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2011)..... 8

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 112..... 7

I. INTRODUCTION

This case presents several terms and phrases from the claims of the patents-in-suit for the Court to construe. This requires that the Court determine the ordinary and customary meaning of those terms to a person of ordinary skill in the relevant art at the time of the effective filing date of the patent application. This understanding is informed by both the context of the particular claim(s) where the term appears as well as the patent specification.

Plaintiff Network-1 Technologies, Inc. (“Network-1”) proposes constructions that fit these basic principles and the many Federal Circuit decisions implementing and elucidating them. Defendants (collectively, “Google”) offer constructions that fail to accurately reflect the ordinary meaning of these claim terms to persons skilled in the art in an effort to advance invalidity or non-infringement positions. Additionally, for some terms, Google argues that they are indefinite. This assertion of indefiniteness is a species of patent invalidity under 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph 2. Google bears a heavy burden under the most recent decisions from the Supreme Court of showing, by clear and convincing evidence, that the claims fail to inform persons skilled in the art of the scope of the invention with reasonable certainty. Google cannot meet that burden here.

Below we present first, a brief background of the patents-in-suit and the basic concepts involved. Next, we provide an overview of some of the key legal principles of claim construction as set forth by the Federal Circuit. Finally, we address the disputed claim construction issues in turn, demonstrating that the constructions offered by Network-1 conform to the standards set by the Federal Circuit, while the constructions offered by Google do not.

II. BACKGROUND

Professor Ingemar J. Cox, a Professor in the Department of Computer Science at the University College of London and at the University of Copenhagen is the inventor of the four

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.