

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

SOLOCRON MEDIA, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

VERIZON COMMUNICATIONS INC., et al.

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 2:13-cv-1059-JRG-RSP

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

SOLOCRON MEDIA, LLC'S OPENING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW OF THE TECHNOLOGY	1
III. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	2
IV. RELEVANT CLAIM CONSTRUCTION PRINCIPLES	2
A. A Claim Term Should Generally Be Given Its Ordinary Meaning.....	2
B. It Is Generally Improper To Import Limitations From Exemplary Embodiments Into Broader Claim Language	3
C. A Term Should Not Be Construed So As To Exclude An Embodiment.....	3
D. A Term Is Indefinite Only When It Fails To Inform With Reasonable Certainty	3
V. DISPUTED TERMS IN MULTIPLE PATENTS	4
A. “video file” / “the video file”/ “the selected video file” (651 Patent, claims 1, 10, 12, 16, 17, 21, 23, 31-33; 759 Patent, claims 53, 56, 64, 65).....	4
B. “communications link” (395 Patent, claims 14, 22, 30, 39; 866 Patent, claim 10; 651 Patent, claims 1, 12)	5
C. “polyphonic” / “polyphonic audio file” / “polyphonic sound” (395 Patent, claims 39, 40; 864 Patent, claims 11-14, 16, 17, 19; 866 Patent, claim 10)	7
D. “configured to [perform some function]” (651 Patent, claims 12, 31; 866 Patent, claim 10; 395 Patent, claims 22, 30)	8
VI. DISPUTED TERMS IN THE 759 PATENT.....	10
A. “allow a user to download the video file” (759 Patent, claim 53).....	10
B. “convert the video file to a native playback format usable by a playback device” (759 Patent, claim 53)	12
C. “the native playback format” (759 Patent, claim 56)	15
D. “native playback format” (759 Patent, claims 53, 54, 56, 65)	15
VII. DISPUTED TERMS IN THE 651 PATENT	18
A. “link that identifies the converted file” (651 Patent, claim 40).....	18
VIII. DISPUTED TERMS IN THE 692 PATENT	19

A.	“user-defined audio file” (692 Patent, claims 1, 4, 5).....	19
B.	“A method for programming a user defined audio file into a telephone” (692 Patent, claim 1).....	20
IX.	TERMS DEFENDANTS CONTEND ARE INDEFINITE.....	21
A.	“enhanced performance speaker” / “enhanced performance speaker capable of providing a substantially full range of audio sounds” (395 Patent, claims 22, 30, 39; 866 Patent, claim 10).....	21
B.	“substantially full range of audio sounds” (395 Patent, claims 22, 30, 39; 866 Patent, claim 10).....	22
C.	“allowing” / “to allow” / “that allows” (692 Patent, claim 1; 395 Patent, claims 22, 30, 39; 864 Patent, claims 11-13; 866 Patent, claim 10).....	26
D.	“enabling the user of the telephone to program at least a portion of the user-defined audio file into the telephone for use as an indicia of an incoming communication” (692 Patent, claim 1).....	28
X.	CONCLUSION.....	30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Adams Respiratory Therapeutics, Inc. v. Perrigo Co.</i> , 616 F.3d 1283 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	3
<i>Alcon Research, LTD. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 687 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	14
<i>Allen Eng’g Corp. v. Bartell Indus., Inc.</i> , 299 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	20
<i>Am. Med. Sys. v. Biolitec, Inc.</i> , 618 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	20, 21
<i>Anchor Wall Sys, Inc. v. Rockwood Retaining Walls, Inc.</i> , 340 F.3d 1298 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	23
<i>Ancora Techs. v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 744 F.3d 732 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	2
<i>Andrew Corp. v. Beverly Manuf. Co.</i> , 479 F. Supp. 2d 766 (N.D. Ill. 2006)	28
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 932 F. Supp. 2d 1076 (N.D. Cal. 2013)	22, 23, 24
<i>Aventis Pharms., Inc. v. Amino Chems. Ltd.</i> , 715 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	23
<i>Bancorp Servs., L.L.C. v. Hartford Life Ins. Co.</i> , 359 F.3d 1367 (Fed Cir. 2004).....	3
<i>Bayer Cropscience AG v. Dow Agrosciences LLC</i> , 728 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	6
<i>ChemFree Corp. v. J. Walter, Inc.</i> , 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 51677 (N.D. Ga. July 17, 2007).....	28
<i>Ciena Corp. v. Nortel Networks, Inc., et al.</i> , No. 2:05-cv-14-LED, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 97450 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 25, 2006).....	10
<i>Cordis Corp. v. Medtronic AVE, Inc.</i> , 339 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	23
<i>Diego, Inc. v. Audible, Inc.</i> , No. 2:05-cv-464, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22715 (W.D. Wash. Mar. 27, 2006).....	10

<i>Ecolab, Inc. v. Envirochem, Inc.</i> , 264 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	24
<i>Elbex Video, Ltd. v. Sensormatic Elecs Corp.</i> , 508 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	17
<i>EPOS Techs. Ltd. v. Pegasus Techs. Ltd.</i> , 766 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	3
<i>GE Lighting Solutions, LLC v. AgiLight, Inc.</i> , 750 F.3d 1304 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	2, 3, 10
<i>Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb Inc.</i> , 909 F.2d 1464 (Fed. Cir. 1990).....	8
<i>Hill-Rom Servs. v. Stryker Corp.</i> , 755 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	2, 6, 10
<i>In re Katz Interactive Call Processing Patent Litig.</i> , 639 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	3, 4, 6, 15
<i>Kernius v. International Electronics, Inc., et al.</i> , No. 1:05-cv-1927, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 24874 (D. Md. Mar. 30, 2007)	10
<i>Laryngeal Mask Co. Ltd. v. Ambu A/S</i> , 618 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	3
<i>Liquid Dynamics Corp. v. Vaughan Co.</i> , 355 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	23
<i>Mirror Worlds, LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 742 F. Supp. 2d 875 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 11, 2010)	12, 26, 30
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2120 (2014).....	3, 25
<i>Orion IP, LLC v. Staples, Inc.</i> , 406 F. Supp. 2d 717 (E.D. Tex. 2005)	30
<i>Paragon Solutions, LLC v. Timex Corp.</i> , 566 F.3d 1075 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	8
<i>Playtex Products, Inc. v. Procter & Gamble Co.</i> , 400 F.3d 901 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	23
<i>Ring Plus, Inc. v. Cingular Wireless Corp.</i> , 2010 U.S. App. LEXIS 16296 (Fed. Cir. Aug. 6, 2010).....	28
<i>Seven Networks Inc. v. Visto Corp.</i> , 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 93870 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 29, 2006).....	28

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.