

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF VERMONT**

ARNOUSE DIGITAL DEVICES, CORP.,)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. 5:11-cv-155
)	
MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC.)	
Defendant.)	

**ARNOUSE DIGITAL DEVICES, CORP.'S *MARKMAN* BRIEF REGARDING
CONSTRUCTION OF THE DISPUTED CLAIM TERMS IN U.S. PATENT NO. 7,516,484**

I. BACKGROUND 6

II. LEGAL STANDARDS GOVERNING MARKMAN HEARINGS IN THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF VERMONT 7

 A. General 7

 B. The Public Notice Function Of Patents Mandates That Claims Be Construed Exactly As They Are Written. 8

 C. A Proper Claim Construction Must Comport With The Written Description Of The Application As Filed 9

 D. Extrinsic Evidence 11

III. PROPOSED CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 11

 A. “a reader configured to interact with a portable computer without input and output means for interacting directly therewith” 12

 i. ADD’s Construction Gives Effect To All Of The Words Of The Claim Without Unduly Limiting The Claim. 13

 ii. Defendant MMI’s Construction Neglects To Consider Each And Every Word Of The Preamble. 18

 B. “input or an output device” 19

 i. ADD’s Construction Adheres To The Meaning Expressed By The ‘484 Patent. 19

 C. “non-functioning shell” 20

 i. ADD’s Construction Of “non-functioning shell” Is Consistent With The Explicit Teachings Of The ‘484 Patent. 21

 ii. Defendant MMI’s Construction Of “non-functioning shell” Is Not Supportable 23

 D. “wherein the readers are configured so that they will not operate with a computer other than a portable computer of the system” 23

 i. ADD’s Construction Construes The Phrase As A Whole And Adheres To The Patentee’s Description Of The System. 24

 ii. Defendant’s Construction Is At Odds With The Preamble And The Intended Meaning Of The Patentee 25

 E. “at least one portable computer” 27

 i. Plaintiff’s Construction Is Consistent With The ‘484 Patent’s Specification. 28

 F. “wherein the portable computer excludes means for a user to interact directly with the portable computer” 28

 i. ADD’s Construction Gives Effect To The Phrase “interacting directly” 28

A. “wherein the reader and portable computer are configured to become a fully functioning computer when connected” 29

 i. In Contrast To Defendant MMI, ADD Gives Effect To All Of The Claim Terms In Its Construction..... 29

IV. CONCLUSION..... 30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Advanced Fiber Technologies Trust v. J & L Fiber</i> , 674 F. 3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	17
<i>Application of Lund</i> , 376 F. 2d 982 (CCPA 1967)	24
<i>Bicon, Inc. v. Straumann Co.</i> , 441 F.3d 945 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	17
<i>CCS Fitness, Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.</i> , 288 F. 3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	17
<i>Digital Biometrics, Inc. v. Identix, Inc.</i> , 149 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	10
<i>Digital-Vending Svcs. Intern. v. Univ. of Phoenix</i> , 672 F.3d 1270 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	17
<i>Johnson & Johnston Assoc. Inc. v. R.E. Serv. Co., Inc.</i> , 285 F.3d 1046 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (<i>en banc</i>)	7
<i>Laitram Corp. v. Rexnord, Inc.</i> , 939 F.2d 1533 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....	9
<i>Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 898 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	9, 11
<i>Liebscher v. Boothroyd</i> , 258 F.2d 948 (CCPA 1958).....	11
<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments Inc.</i> , 517 U.S. 370 (1996)	7
<i>Martek Biosciences v. Nutrinova</i> , 579 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	10
<i>Medrad, Inc. v. MRI Devices Corp.</i> , 401 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	8
<i>Multiform Desiccants, Inc. v. Medzam, Ltd.</i> , 133 F.3d 1473 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	8
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (<i>en banc</i>)	passim
<i>Renishaw PLC v. Marposs Societa' per Azioni</i> , 158 F.3d 1243 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	10, 11
<i>Rexnord Corp. v. Laitram Corp.</i> , 274 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	9, 20, 28
<i>SciMed Life Sys., Inc. v. Advanced Cardiovascular Sys., Inc.</i> , 242 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2001)..	11
<i>Standard Oil Co. v. Am. Cyanamid Co.</i> , 774 F.2d 448 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	10
<i>Vas-Cath v. Mahurakr</i> , 935 F.2d 1555 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	10

Vitronics, Corp. v Conceptronic, Inc., 90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996)..... 8

Watts v. XL Sys., Inc., 232 F.3d 877 (Fed. Cir. 2000)..... 11

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 112..... 9

35 U.S.C. § 271 (a) 7

Other Authorities

Merriam-Webster, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/computer> 14

ROBERT C. FABER, *Faber On Mechanics of Patent Claim Drafting*, 6th ed. (August 2010) 26

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.