

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

YYZ, LLC,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.) Civ. No. 13-136-SLR
)
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY,)
)
Defendant.)

YYZ, LLC,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.) Civ. No. 13-579-SLR
)
ADOBE SYSTEMS, INC.,)
)
Defendant.)

YYZ, LLC,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.) Civ. No. 13-581-SLR
)
PEGASYSTEMS, INC.,)
)
Defendant.)

MEMORANDUM ORDER

At Wilmington this ^{14th} day of December, 2014, having heard argument on, and having reviewed the papers submitted in connection with, the parties' proposed claim construction;

IT IS ORDERED that the disputed claim language of U.S. Patent Nos. 7,603,674

(“the ‘674 patent”) and 7,062,749 (“the ‘749 patent”) shall be construed consistent with the tenets of claim construction set forth by the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit in *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005), as follows:

1. **“Asynchronous messaging environment:”**¹ “A computer-based environment in which data is transmitted through messages (instead of large files) without prior coordination between communication end points.” The specification describes the invention as “relat[ing] to computer-based apparatus and systems for measuring, monitoring, tracking and simulating enterprise communications and processes in an asynchronous messaging environment.” (1:17-20)² To distinguish an asynchronous messaging environment from a synchronous one, the specification explains that

enterprise communications were formerly primarily synchronous, or connection oriented, in which a connection is established with prior coordination between communication end points with data then being transmitted over the connection. Enterprise communications are now increasingly asynchronous, or connectionless, transmitting data without prior coordination between communication end points, such as through “event based” communications which use messages to move data instead of large files.

(1:48-57)

2. **“Process:”**³ “Business operation.” The specification explains that “[t]he

¹Claims 1, 46, 51 and 70 of the ‘674 patent and claims 1, 22, 55, and 56 of the ‘749 patent.

²As the ‘674 and ‘749 specifications are substantively identical but have different line numbers, the court refers to the ‘674 patent throughout unless indicated otherwise.

³Claims 1, 46, 51, 55, and 76 of the ‘674 patent and claims 4, 22, 23, 28, 29, and 55 of the ‘749 patent.

activities of a business or enterprise can be grouped into processes. Processes are business operations that are separated as desired and usually occur across business units.” (1:24-26)

3. **“Sub process:”**⁴ “Step of a business operation.” The specification explains that “[t]he processes are comprised of sub-processes.” (1:28-29)

4. **“Activity:”**⁵ “Part of a step of a business operation.” The specification explains that “[e]ach sub-process may in turn be broken down into discrete activities such as providing customer number, entering that customer number, establishing pricing, determining a shipping date, etc.” (1:34-36)

5. **“Original message:”**⁶ “A message originating from a business process, sub process, or activity carrying information for the execution of a business process, sub process, or activity.” The specification explains that an original message is sent within a process, sub process, or activity. (3:11-12) The original messages are “received by the [messaging] broker.” (3:58-59) In a certain embodiment, the “original messages [pass] between the sub-processes.” (3:60-61)

6. **“Original message data:”**⁷ “Data from the original message.” The parties agree on this construction.

⁴Claims 1, 46, 51, 70, and 71 of the ‘674 patent and claims 4, 22, and 56 of the ‘749 patent. The specification also uses “sub-process.”

⁵Claims 1, 46, and 70 of the ‘674 patent and claims 1 and 4 of the ‘749 patent.

⁶Claims 1, 46, 51, and 70 of the ‘674 patent and claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 22, 55, and 56 of the ‘749 patent.

⁷Claims 1, 46, 51, 52, 56, and 70 of the ‘674 patent and claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 22, 55, and 56 of the ‘749 patent.

7. **“Part of said original message data.”**⁸ The court declines to construe this limitation, in light of the construction of “original message” and “original message data.”⁹ The specification provides examples of data, including “date, time, customer number, materials, quantity, amount, or other information” (3:15-17)

8. **“Monitoring message:”**¹⁰ “A message distinct from an original message, created by the messaging component of a messaging broker that contains at least part of the original message data, where a messaging broker is communication software that performs at least message transformation and routing based on information in the message.” The specification provides that “[f]or each original message sent within a process, sub-process or activity, the preferred embodiments of the present invention send a separate monitoring message containing data from the central message repository or database. . . . Other embodiments may add data to the monitoring message aside from that contained in the original message.”¹¹ (3:11-19, 4:19-23) The parties agree that the messaging broker performs at least “transformation” and “routing.” Defendants’ additional requirements for the messaging broker are not

⁸Claims 1, 46, and 51 of the ‘674 patent and claims 1, 55, and 56 of the ‘749 patent.

⁹Specifically, the court declines to add the limitation that the data must be “unchanged,” as proposed by defendants. Having reviewed the portion of the prosecution history cited by the parties (D.I. 85, ex. B at JA-161-63), the court concludes that the additional limitation is not warranted.

¹⁰Claims 1, 46, 51, 56, and 70 of the ‘674 patent and claims 1, 22, 55, and 56 of the ‘749 patent.

¹¹Plaintiff’s proposal that a “messaging broker” may be hardware finds no support in the specification. Plaintiff cites only to an extrinsic document from April 2008 as support.

supported by the specification, which states that “[t]his messaging broker **permits** certain sophisticated messaging uses, such as message queuing, some data translation, etc.” (3:53-54 (emphasis added))

9. **“Central message repository:”**¹² “Database for storing monitoring messages from more than one process, sub-process, or activity.” The specification states that “the terms ‘repository’ and ‘database’ are used interchangeably” (3:63-65) “The monitoring message with its data is then sent from the messaging broker to a central database repository or database” (3:61-65) Contrary to plaintiff’s proposed construction and as explained by the specification, other data “aside from that contained in the original message” may be part of the monitoring message.¹³ (3:17-19, 4:22-23)

10. **“Providing, through a monitoring message, at least part of said original message data to a central message repository:”**¹⁴ “Sending, through a messaging broker, the monitoring message, with at least part of said original message data to a central message repository.” This construction is supported by the specification which explains that the messaging broker creates a monitoring message and then sends it to

¹²Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 38, 46, 51, 55, 70, 75, and 76 of the ‘674 patent and claims 1, 22, 27, 28, 55, and 56 of the ‘749 patent.

¹³Having reviewed the declaration in the reexamination file (D.I. 85, ex. K at JA-546, 548), the court concludes that plaintiff did not “unmistakably disavow[] writing the monitoring message as records to a flat file or database during the reexamination.” (D.I. 101 at 9). Therefore, the court declines to add defendants’ proposed limitation regarding the format of the monitoring messages.

¹⁴Claims 1, 46 and 51 of the ‘674 patent and claims 1, 55, and 56 of the ‘749 patent.

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.