

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

2016-1059

SMARTFLASH LLC, SMARTFLASH TECHNOLOGIES LIMITED,

Plaintiffs-Appellees,

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas
in Case No. 6:13-cv-00447-JRG, Judge J. Rodney Gilstrap

**BRIEF FOR PLAINTIFFS-APPELLEES SMARTFLASH LLC
AND SMARTFLASH TECHNOLOGIES LIMITED**

Bradley W. Caldwell
Jason D. Cassady
John Austin Curry
Hamad M. Hamad
John F. Summers
CALDWELL CASSADY & CURRY
2101 Cedar Springs Road
Suite 1000
Dallas, Texas 75201
(214) 888-4848

Aaron M. Panner
Nicholas O. Hunter
KELLOGG, HUBER, HANSEN, TODD,
EVANS & FIGEL, P.L.L.C.
1615 M Street, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 326-7900

*Counsel for Plaintiffs-Appellees Smartflash LLC
and Smartflash Technologies Limited*

March 21, 2016

CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST

Counsel for Plaintiffs-Appellees Smartflash LLC and Smartflash

Technologies Limited certifies the following:

1. The full name of every party or *amicus* represented by me is:
Smartflash LLC and Smartflash Technologies Limited.

2. The name of the real party in interest represented by me is:
None.

3. All parent corporations and any publicly held companies that own
10% or more of the stock of the party or *amicus curiae* represented by me are:

Smartflash LLC is a wholly owned subsidiary of Smartflash Technologies
Limited. The following entities own 10% or more of the shares of Smartflash
Technologies Limited: Latitude Investments Limited, Celtic Trust Company
Limited, and Eastbrook Business Inc.

4. The names of all law firms and the partners or associates that
appeared for the party or *amicus* now represented by me in the trial court or agency
or are expected to appear in this Court are:

Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd, Evans & Figel, P.L.L.C. – Aaron M. Panner,
Nicholas O. Hunter.

Law Office of Aaron M. Panner, PLLC – Aaron M. Panner (no longer with
firm).

Caldwell Cassady & Curry – Bradley W. Caldwell, Jason D. Cassady, John Austin Curry, Daniel R. Pearson, Hamad M. Hamad, Justin T. Nemunaitis, Christopher S. Stewart, John F. Summers, Jason S. McManis, Warren J. McCarthy, III.

Ward, Smith & Hill, PLLC (formerly Ward & Smith Law Firm) – T. John Ward, T. John Ward, Jr., Claire A. Henry.

March 21, 2016

/s/ Aaron M. Panner
Aaron M. Panner
KELLOGG, HUBER, HANSEN, TODD,
EVANS & FIGEL, P.L.L.C.
1615 M Street, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 326-7900

Counsel for Plaintiffs-Appellees

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	v
STATEMENT OF RELATED CASES	xi
COUNTERSTATEMENT OF JURISDICTION	1
COUNTERSTATEMENT OF THE ISSUES.....	4
COUNTERSTATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	5
A. The Invention	7
B. Patent Eligibility, Claim Construction, and Indefiniteness Rulings	13
C. Apple’s Knowing Infringement	16
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	19
STANDARD OF REVIEW	21
ARGUMENT	22
I. THE CLAIMS ARE PATENT ELIGIBLE BECAUSE THEY CLAIM SPECIFIC DEVICES THAT SOLVE NOVEL PROBLEMS PRESENTED BY DIGITAL COMMERCE	22
A. The Claims Are Not Directed to an Abstract Idea	22
B. The Claims Contain Inventive Concepts and Are Not Limited to Generic Computer Implementation	28
II. THE ASSERTED CLAIMS DO NOT CONTAIN MEANS- PLUS-FUNCTION LIMITATIONS	35
A. The “Processor” Running “Code” Connotes Structure.....	36

B.	Apple’s Assertion That a “Processor” Carrying Out Specific Functions Is Non-Structural Is Incorrect.....	41
C.	If Any Claim Is Governed by § 112(f), a New Trial Is Required	48
III.	APPLE’S CHALLENGES TO THE DISTRICT COURT’S CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS FAIL.....	50
A.	The District Court Correctly Rejected Apple’s Effort To Import Negative Limitations into the Term “Payment Data”	50
1.	The Language of the Claims and the Specification Support the District Court’s Construction	50
2.	Apple’s Challenge Is Without Merit and Waived in Part	51
B.	Validation of Payment Data Does Not Necessarily Entail Payment Authorization.....	55
1.	Apple’s Argument Is Waived	55
2.	Apple’s Challenge Fails on the Merits	55
C.	A New Trial Would Be Required.....	57
IV.	APPLE FAILS TO SHOW THAT THE DISTRICT COURT’S REFUSAL TO GIVE ITS INCOMPLETE <i>i4i</i> INSTRUCTION WAS EITHER ERRONEOUS OR PREJUDICIAL.....	58
	CONCLUSION.....	62
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	
	CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE	

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.