IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 2 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS 3 MARSHALL DIVISION 4 CONTENTGUARD HOLDINGS, INC.) (5) (CIVIL DOCKET NO. 2:13-CV-1112-JRG 6) (7 VS.) (MARSHALL, TEXAS 8) (9 AMAZON.COM, INC., ET AL.) (FEBRUARY 6, 2015 1:00 P.M. 10) (11 CLAIM CONSTRUCTION HEARING 12 BEFORE THE HONORABLE JUDGE RODNEY GILSTRAP 13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 14 15 **APPEARANCES:** 16 FOR THE PLAINTIFF: (See sign-in sheets docketed in minutes of this hearing.) 17 18 FOR THE DEFENDANTS: (See sign-in sheets docketed in minutes of this hearing.) 19 20 COURT REPORTER: Shelly Holmes, CSR-TCRR Official Reporter 21 United States District Court Eastern District of Texas 22 Marshall Division 100 E. Houston Street 23 Marshall, Texas 75670 (903) 923-7464 24 25 (Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCK

RM

"associated." They changed the glossary definitions to get rid 1 of the statements, usage rights and fees are attached to a 2 3 digital work. They got rid of the statement a key feature of 4 the present invention is to permanently attach usage rights to 5 a digital work. They tried to broaden the scope of the claims by adding the word "associated" instead of the word "attached." 6 7 When they used the word "attached," it had its common and ordinary meaning. They recognize what that is, and that was 8 9 more limited than associated.

10 On that note, Your Honor, I -- I want to point out 11 something that's very misleading in the -- in the presentation 12 from ContentGuard.

13 In their slides, they cite to you the claims of the 14 '859 patent which talk about association. They cite to you 15 portions of the '859 patent from the summary of the invention, which is in Column 6. Those uses of the word "associated" and 16 17 that reference in Column 6 in the '859 patent was not in the 18 1994 specification that they're claiming the benefit of. That was added when the '859 patent was filed in January of 2003. 19 20 That language does not exist in the priority application that 21 they want the benefit of.

If they want the benefit of that language, then they have to take the filing date of the '859 patent as their priority date because that's when the language was added. THE COURT: All right. What else, counsel?

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

or 8:00 o'clock tonight, and that, I assure you, is not going 1 The time is yours, but we will go as far as the 2 to happen. 3 time allows us to go. I'm not going to extend this 4 indefinitely. So I suggest to you that you condense your 5 arguments to the most salient points so that we can pick up the 6 pace. 7 With that, we'll take a short recess. COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise. 8 9 (Recess.) COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise. 10 11 THE COURT: Please be seated. We'll continue with the claim construction 12 All right. 13 argument. Our next term is "manner of use," and I'll hear from 14 the Plaintiff. 15 MR. COTE: Your Honor, may I make two minor points on 16 the presentation on the permanently attached argument because 17 I've heard some things that were inconsistent completely with 18 the record, and it's troubling. 19 THE COURT: In light of my prior comments before the 20 recess, proceed. 21 MR. COTE: Thank you. 22 THE COURT: The time you use is your own. 23 MR. COTE: So we heard Defendants' counsel tell the 24 Court in very affirmative statements that the description tree 25 storage does not contain the usage rights. But I want to

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Μ

remind the Court that at Column 9, Lines 10 through 25, 1 there's -- actually it's Line -- the lines aren't there, but 2 3 you can see in this passage, it expressly says that the 4 description tree file includes a rights portion. We can see 5 that over here on the right in Figure 7. It's expressly stated, we're talking about the description tree file. And it 6 7 expressly states: Wherein that rights portion -- wherein the granted rights and status are maintained. 8

9 So there's no question in the spec that the usage 10 rights are maintained in -- in the description tree. There's 11 no question in the specification that the description tree is 12 stored in the description tree storage separate from the 13 content storage. And I wanted to bring that to the Court's 14 attention.

15 The other thing I'd like to bring to the Court's 16 attention is I heard him say emphatically that the teachings in 17 the patent of permanently attached as meaning associated with, 18 that we pointed to the Court -- pointed the Court to here on 19 Slide 38 were not in the originally filed application. That is 20 utterly false. And you will find those in the originally filed 21 application. I encourage the Court to look. The patent did 22 not just teach physical attachment. It did not teach permanent 23 attachment in its ordinary meaning. The patent taught 24 permanently attached as associated with.

And the patent makes clear, finally, Your Honor, that

25

constructions is how to capture the specification teaching that
a meta-right is something different than a usage right.

3 And ContentGuard's construction, we think, gets that 4 by using language directly from the specification about how 5 actions to content did not result from exercising a meta-right, whereas Defendants' construction seems like an attempt to 6 7 paraphrase the specification. And to us, it's ambiguous and unclear because the language of being distinct from a usage 8 9 right, that could be argued to mean different things. That could mean not a usage right or that could mean different than 10 one or more usage rights. 11

12 Our -- our construction, on the other hand, is 13 directly from the specification which says that there's a 14 difference between meta-rights and usage rights and that 15 actions to content did not result from exercising meta-rights. 16 And that's it for this one term, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Let me hear from the Defendants, please. 18 MR. PRITIKIN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. THE COURT: Good afternoon. 19 20 MR. PRITIKIN: David Pritikin. I've been waiting all 21 afternoon. 22 Now you have your chance. THE COURT: 23 Right. MR. PRITIKIN: 24 THE COURT: I'll hear from you now. I don't think there is an enormous 25 MR. PRITIKIN:

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET A L A R M



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.