

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND..... 1

III. PRINCIPLES OF CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 3

IV. DISPUTED CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS 6

A. The “Pre-Processing” Term 6

1. Summit 6’s Construction Defines Pre-Processing Consistent with the Specification and Prosecution History..... 6

a) The Intrinsic Evidence Shows that Digital Content Data, Rather Than Data Merely Associated with the Digital Content Data, is Pre-Processed..... 7

b) The Intrinsic Evidence Shows that Pre-Processing Occurs at the Client or Local Device..... 8

c) The Intrinsic Evidence Shows that the Digital Content is Pre-Processed in Preparation for Sending to a Remote Device. 9

2. Defendants’ Proposal is Not Supported by the Intrinsic Record. 10

a) Defendants’ Proposal Improperly Excludes a Claimed Embodiment. 10

b) Summit 6 Did Not Disclaim or Define Pre-Processing Such That It Requires “Further Processing” 12

c) Defendants’ Construction Injects an Ambiguous Limitation. 12

B. The “Server,” “Separate” Device, and “Distributing Party” Terms 13

1. The First Three Plain, Ordinary Terms Need Not be Construed. 14

2. Summit 6’s Proposal for the Remaining Two Terms is Not Disputed. 15

3. Defendants Improperly Require All Claims to Use the Same Server or Same Device 15

a) Defendants’ Same Server/Device Requirement Contradicts the Claims..... 15

b) Defendants’ Proposal Ignores the Doctrine of Claim Differentiation. 17

c) The Intrinsic Record Contradicts Defendants’ Proposal. 18

4. The Claims are Not Invalid if Given Their Plain Meaning. 20

C. The Pre-Processing Parameters “Received From” and “Provided To” Terms 21

1. The Plain Meaning and/or Summit 6’s Constructions Should Be Adopted Because They Provide Meaning to the Terms at Issue. 22

2. Defendants’ Proposal Violates the Doctrine of Claim Differentiation. 23

3. Summit 6 Did Not Limit its Claim to Defendants’ Narrow Proposal..... 24

D. The Preambles of the ’482 and ’515 Patents 24

E. The “Distributing” and “Distribution” Terms..... 26

1. These Terms are Not Confusing and Need Not be Construed..... 26

2. Defendants Ignore that Different Claim Terms are Presumed to Have Different Meaning and Scope..... 26

F. The Terms that Defendants Allege are Indefinite..... 27

1.	These Terms are Not Indefinite.	28
2.	“Said Identification”	29
3.	“Said Client Device”	30
a)	Summit 6’s Construction is Supported by the Intrinsic Record.	31
b)	If Necessary, the Court Can Correct This Typographical Error.	32
4.	“Media Object Identifier”	33
5.	The “Code Means” Term	35
V.	CONCLUSION.....	36

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>2-way Computing Inc. v. Sprint Nextel Corp.</i> , 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 71142 (D. Nev. May 17, 2013).....	32
<i>Acumed LLC v. Stryker Corp.</i> , 483 F.3d 800 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	17, 24
<i>Ariad Pharms, Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	20
<i>Ariba, Inc. v. Emptoris, Inc.</i> , 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 59862 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 7, 2008)	35, 36
<i>Bd. of Regents of the Univ. of Tex. Sys. v. A123 Sys.</i> , 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 32886 (N.D. Tex. Mar. 29, 2011).....	28
<i>Bell Commc’ns Research, Inc. v. Vitalink Commc’ns Corp.</i> , 55 F.3d 615 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	3
<i>Biovail Corp. v. Andrx Pharms., Inc.</i> , 239 F.3d 1297 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	5
<i>Comark Commc’ns v. Harris Corp.</i> , 156 F.3d 1182 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	16, 27
<i>Cree, Inc. v. SemiLEDs Corp.</i> , 2012 U.S. Dist LEXIS 39582 (D. Del. Mar. 21, 2012)	32
<i>DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.</i> , 2014 U.S. App. LEXIS 22902 (Fed. Cir. Dec. 5, 2014).....	20
<i>Embrex, Inc. v. Serv. Eng’g Corp.</i> , 216 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	6, 13
<i>ERBE Elektromedizin GmbH v. Canady Tech. LLC</i> , 629 F.3d 1278 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	8
<i>Genentech, Inc. v. Chiron Corp.</i> , 112 F.3d 495 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	12
<i>Golight, Inc. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</i> , 355 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	12

Group One, Ltd. v. Hallmark Cards, Inc.,
407 F.3d 1297 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....32

Hill-Rom Servs. v. Stryker Corp.,
755 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....6

Hoffer v. Microsoft Corp.,
405 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....32

i4i Ltd. P’ship v. Microsoft Corp.,
598 F.3d 831 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....10, 11, 12

Intermec Techs. Corp. v. Palm Inc.,
811 F. Supp. 2d 973 (D. Del. 2011).....32

Interval Licensing LLC v. AOL, Inc.,
766 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....20, 21

Intirtool, Ltd. v. Texar Corp.,
369 F.3d 1289 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....25

Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.,
358 F.3d 898 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....17, 18, 23, 24

Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.,
52 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (en banc), *aff’d*, 517 U.S. 370 (1996).....3

Med. Instrumentation & Diagnostics Corp. v. Elekta AB,
344 F.3d 1205 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....35

Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.,
134 S. Ct. 2120, 189 L. Ed. 2d 37 (2014)..... passim

Nazomi Commc’ns, Inc. v. Arm Holdings, PLC,
403 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....4

Nichia Corp. v. Everlight Elecs. Co.,
2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 172024 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 12, 2014).....28

Noah Sys. Inc. v. Intuit Inc.,
675 F.3d 1302 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....35

O2 Micro Int’l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co., Ltd.,
521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....4, 14, 15, 26

Phillips v. AWH Corp.,
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... passim

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.