IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON DIVISION

WESTERNGECO L.L.C.,)))
Plaintiff,) Civil Action No. 4:09-CV-01827
v.) Jury Trial Demanded
ION GEOPHYSICAL CORPORATION,)))
Defendant.)

WESTERNGECO'S REPLY CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF

Lee L. Kaplan lkaplan@skv.com SMYSER KAPLAN & VESELKA, L.L.P. Bank of America Center 700 Louisiana, Suite 2300 Houston, TX 77002 Tel: (713) 221-2323 Fax: (713) 221-2320

Attorneys for Plaintiff/ Counterclaim Defendant WesternGeco L.L.C.

Of Counsel:

John M. Desmarais, P.C. john.desmarais@kirkland.com Timothy K. Gilman timothy.gilman@kirkland.com Tamir Packin tamir.packin@kirkland.com Xiaoyan Zhang xiaoyan.zhang@kirkland.com Ameet Modi ameet.modi@kirkland.com KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP 601 Lexington Avenue New York, New York 10022

Tel.: (212) 446-4800 Fax: (212) 446-4900

Dated: March 12, 2010



TABLE OF CONTENTS

				Page
SU	MMARY	OF ARC	JUMENT	1
AR	GUMEN	Т		2
	I.		Terms Are Properly Construed Based on Their Ordinary Meaning	
		in Ligh	nt of the Patent's Specification	2
	II.	Propos	osed Constructions for the Bittleston Patents	
		(a)	"streamer positioning device(s)"	3
		(b)	"global control system"	
		(c)	"local control system"	
		(d)	"location information"	9
		(e)	"on or in-line with"	9
		(f)	"feather angle mode"	
		(g)	"turn control mode"	
		(h)	"streamer separation mode"	11
		(i)	"means for obtaining a predicted position of the streamer	
			positioning devices"	11
		(j)	"means for obtaining an estimated velocity of the streamer	
			positioning devices"	12
		(k)	"means for calculating desired changes in the orientations of the	
			respective wings of at least some of the streamer positioning	
			devices using said predicted position and said estimated velocity"	12
		(l)	"means for actuating the wing motors to produce said desired	
			changes in wing orientation"	13
	III.	Propos	ed Constructions for the Zajac '038 Patent	13
		(a)	"active streamer positioning device (ASPD)"	13
		(b)	"a master controller"	
		(c)	"the master controller"	
		(d)	"positioning commands"	
		(e)	"maintaining a specified array geometry"	17
		(f)	"a streamer behavior prediction processor which predicts array	
		()	behavior"	18
		(g)	"environmental factors/influences/measurements"	
		(h)	"maneuverability influences/factor(s)"	
CO	NCI LISI		• ()	10



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases Pa	age
Andersen Corp. v. Fiber Composites, Inc., 474 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	18
Asyst Techs., Inc. v. Empak, Inc., 268 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	11
Callicrate v. Wadsworth Mfg., Inc., 427 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	13
Chimie v. PPG Indus., Inc., 402 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	19
CIAS, Inc. v. Alliance Gaming Corp., 504 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	15
Colorquick, LLC v. Eastman Kodak Co., No. 6:06-CV-390, 2008 WL 5771324 (E.D. Tex. June 25, 2008)	15
DSW, Inc. v. Shoe Pavilion, Inc., 537 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	14
Halliburton Energy Svcs., Inc. v. M-I LLC, 514 F.3d 1244 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	14
Honeywell Int'l, Inc. v. ITT Indus., Inc., 452 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2006)passi	im
Inverness Med. v. Princeton Biomeditech Corp., 309 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	15
Merck & Co., Inc. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc., 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	16
Netcraft Corp. v. eBay, Inc., 549 F.3d 1394 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	2
Phillips v. AWH Corp., 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc)passi	im
Plasmart Inc. v. Wincell Int'l. Inc., No. 05-10745, 2007 WL 3355509 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 8, 2007)	15
Praxair, Inc. v. ATMI, Inc., 543 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	, 7



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (continued)

	Page
Process Control Corp. v. HydReclaim Corp., 190 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	16
Rambus, Inc. v. Infineon Techs. AG,	
318 F.3d 1081 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	2, 7
Scanner Techs. Corp. v. ICOS Vision Sys. Corp.,	
365 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	14
Stumbo v. Eastman Outdoors, Inc.,	
508 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	4, 10
Teleflex, Inc. v. Ficosa N. Am. Corp.,	
299 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	
Verizon Servs. Corp. v. Vonage Holdings Corp.,	
503 F.3d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	passim
Watts v. XL Sys., Inc.,	
232 F.3d 877 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	2

Plaintiff WesternGeco L.L.C. ("WesternGeco") respectfully submits its Reply Claim Construction Brief in further support of WesternGeco's proposed constructions set forth in the parties' Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement (D.I. 39).

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

WesternGeco filed its Complaint on June 12, 2009 to halt ION Geophysical Corp.'s ("ION's") willful infringement of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,932,017 ("the '017 patent"); 7,080,607 ("the '607 patent"); 7,162,967 ("the '967 patent") and 7,293,520 ("the '520 patent") (collectively, "the Bittleston patents"); and 6,691,038 ("the Zajac '038 patent"). (D.I. 1) ION filed a counterclaim for alleged infringement of one ION patent. (D.I. 6) This Reply addresses the parties' proposed constructions for the five WesternGeco patents.

The Federal Circuit's 2005 *en banc* decision in *Phillips* sets forth the proper framework for claim construction. It holds that disputed claim terms are properly construed based on their ordinary meanings in the context of the patent. As set forth in WesternGeco's Opening Brief ("WGOB"), WesternGeco's proposed constructions for the Bittleston and Zajac patents are based on this intrinsic record. They are properly adopted by the Court.

As also set forth in WesternGeco's Opening Brief, however, ION's proposed constructions commit the "cardinal sin of claim construction" by improperly limiting WesternGeco's patents to their preferred embodiments. They violate the requirements of *Phillips* by: (1) reading limitations into the claims; (2) ignoring the ordinary meaning of the claim terms; (3) relying heavily on extrinsic evidence; (4) excluding disclosed embodiments; (5) rendering claim terms superfluous; and (6) rendering claims duplicative. As discussed below, any of these flaws would be improper. Many of ION's proposed constructions suffer them all.

ION's Response Brief ("IRB") concedes that many of its proposed constructions were improper. For some, ION now agrees with WesternGeco's proposed constructions. For others,



DOCKET

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.

