

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

SILVER STATE INTELLECTUAL
TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GARMIN INTERNATIONAL INC. AND
GARMIN USA, INC.,

Defendants.

2:11-CV-1578-PMP-PAL

ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiff Silver State Intellectual Technologies, Inc.’s (“Silver State”) Consolidated Opening Claim Construction Brief¹ (Doc. #53), filed September 28, 2012. Defendants Garmin International, Inc. and Garmin USA, Inc. (collectively “Garmin”) filed a Response (Doc. #54) on October 26, 2012. Silver State filed a Reply (Doc. #55) on November 9, 2012. The Court held a claim construction hearing on April 5, 2013. (Mins. of Proceedings (Doc. #74).)

I. BACKGROUND

Plaintiff Silver State owns the legal rights to United States Patent Nos. 6,525,768 (the ‘768 Patent), 6,529,824 (the ‘824 Patent), 7,702,455 (the ‘455 Patent), 7,522,992 (the ‘992 Patent), 7,593,812 (the ‘812 Patent), 7,739,039 (the ‘039 Patent), 7,650,234 (the ‘234

¹ The Court granted the parties’ request that the claim construction in this case be coordinated with a related case, Silver State Intellectual Technologies, Inc. v. Tom Tom, Inc., Case No. 2:11-CV-01581-PMP-PAL (D. Nev.). (Order Granting Joint Mot. & Stip. to Transfer & Consolidate Related Cases (Doc. #46).) On March 19, 2013, pursuant to Silver State and Tom Tom, Inc.’s stipulation, the Court dismissed with prejudice Silver State’s case against Tom Tom, Inc. (Order Granting Stip. to Dismiss with Prejudice (Doc. #82 in 2:11-CV-01581-PMP-PAL).) Therefore, this Order addresses only the claim construction issues pertinent to Silver State’s patent infringement suit against Defendants Garmin International, Inc. and Garmin USA, Inc.

1 Patent), 7,343,165 (the ‘165 Patent), and 6,542,812 (‘2812 Patent). Silver State’s patents
2 generally cover various navigation processes and devices.

3 The ‘824 Patent is the parent patent to the ‘455 Patent, and this patent family
4 “comprises Personal Communications Devices (PCDs), and traditional computer systems
5 with GPS engines, routers, and other application programs to request, process, and transmit
6 tagged, GPS encoded information.” (Decl. of Phillip Bennett in Support of Silver State’s
7 Consolidated Opening Claim Constr. Br. (Doc. #53-1) [“Bennett Decl.”], Ex. A1 at col. 2,
8 ll. 19-23.) The ‘768 Patent is part of another patent family that covers a PCD with a digital
9 camera that transmits images and GPS information. (Id., Ex. A4 at col. 29-30.) The ‘992
10 Patent, the ‘812 Patent, the ‘234 Patent, and the ‘039 Patent are part of another patent
11 family and generally cover navigation PCDs that store user preference information and
12 suggest goods or service providers based on the user preference information. (Id., Ex. A6 at
13 col. 13-16.)

14 Silver State filed a Complaint against Garmin, alleging Garmin sells navigation
15 devices that infringe Silver State’s patents. (Compl. for Patent Infringement (Doc. #1).)
16 Garmin filed an Answer, asserting that it does not directly or indirectly infringe Silver
17 State’s Patents, as well as various other defenses. (Garmin’s Answer to Silver State’s
18 Compl. for Patent Infringement and Countercl. (Doc. #21).) Garmin also asserted
19 counterclaims seeking declarations that the asserted patent claims are invalid and that
20 Garmin does not infringe any valid asserted patent claim. (Id.) Silver State filed an Answer
21 to Garmin’s counterclaims, denying that Garmin is entitled to a declaration of invalidity or
22 non-infringement. (Pl.’s Reply to Countercls. of Garmin (Doc. #25).)

23 As required under Local Rule 16.1-15, the parties filed a Joint Claim
24 Construction Chart providing the parties’ agreed upon construction of some claim terms and
25 each party’s proposed construction of the disputed claim terms. (Jt. Claim Construction and
26 Prehearing Statement Pursuant to LR 16.1-15 (Doc. #47), Ex. A.) Later, the Court granted

1 the parties' stipulation to dismiss all claims and counterclaims related to the '165 Patent.
2 (Order Granting Stip. (Doc. #49).) The parties filed an Amended Joint Claim Construction
3 Chart reflecting the dismissal and further compromise as to certain claim construction
4 disputes. (Not. of Am. Jt. Claim Construction Chart (Doc. #52).) After the parties had
5 briefed the disputed claim constructions that remained, the Court granted the parties'
6 stipulation to dismiss all claims and counterclaims related to '2812 Patent. (Order Granting
7 Stip. (Doc. #58).) The seven Silver State patents that remain in this case are the '768
8 Patent, the '824 Patent, the '455 Patent, the '992 Patent, the '812 Patent, the '039 Patent,
9 and the '234 Patent. The claim terms disputed by the parties are reflected in the parties'
10 Amended Disputed Claim Terms Summary Sheet. (Am. Disputed Claim Terms Summary
11 Sheet (Doc. #73-1).)

12 **II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION LEGAL STANDARDS**

13 "The purpose of claim construction is to determine the meaning and scope of the
14 patent claims that the plaintiff alleges have been infringed." Every Penny Counts, Inc. v.
15 Am. Express Co., 563 F.3d 1378, 1381 (Fed. Cir. 2009). "When the parties raise an actual
16 dispute regarding the proper scope of these claims, the court, not the jury, must resolve that
17 dispute." O2 Micro Int'l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co., 521 F.3d 1351, 1360 (Fed.
18 Cir. 2008); Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc., 517 U.S. 370, 372 (1996) (finding
19 patent claim construction is a question of law for the court). "To ascertain the scope and
20 meaning of the asserted claims, [courts] look to the words of the claims themselves, the
21 specification, the prosecution history, and, if necessary, any relevant extrinsic evidence."²
22 01 Communique Lab., Inc. v. LogMeIn, Inc., 687 F.3d 1292, 1295-96 (Fed. Cir. 2012)
23 (quotation omitted).

24 _____
25 ² The parties do not cite the prosecution history to support their proposed claim constructions.
26 Therefore, the Court considers only the claim language, the specification, and any pertinent extrinsic
evidence.

1 The Court must begin by examining the claim language. Acumed LLC v. Stryker
2 Corp., 483 F.3d 800, 805 (Fed. Cir. 2007); Every Penny Counts, 563 F.3d at 1381 (“The
3 construction that stays true to the claim language and most naturally aligns with the patent’s
4 description of the invention will be, in the end, the correct construction.” (quotation
5 omitted)). “The words of a claim are generally given their ordinary and customary
6 meaning, which is the meaning that the term would have to a person of ordinary skill in the
7 art in question at the time of the invention.” Function Media, L.L.C. v. Google, Inc., 708
8 F.3d 1310, 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2013) (quotation omitted). Considering how a person of
9 ordinary skill in the art would understand a claim term “is based on the well-settled
10 understanding that inventors are typically persons skilled in the field of the invention and
11 that patents are addressed to and intended to be read by others of skill in the pertinent art.”
12 Phillips v. AWH Corp., 415 F.3d 1303, 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc).

13 “While certain terms may be at the center of the claim construction debate, the
14 context of the surrounding words of the claim also must be considered in determining the
15 ordinary and customary meaning of those terms.” ACTV, Inc. v. Walt Disney Co., 346
16 F.3d 1082, 1088 (Fed. Cir. 2003); Exxon Chem. Patents, Inc. v. Lubrizol Corp., 64 F.3d
17 1553, 1557 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (stating courts “must give meaning to all the words in [the]
18 claims”). Both asserted and unasserted claims of the patent can add meaning to a disputed
19 claim term, as claim terms normally are used consistently throughout the patent. Phillips,
20 415 F.3d at 1314. Additionally, where the patents at issue “derive from the same parent
21 application and share many common terms, [the court] must interpret the claims
22 consistently across all asserted patents.” NTP, Inc. v. Research In Motion, Ltd., 418 F.3d
23 1282, 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2005). If the claim language is clear on its face, then consideration of
24 the other intrinsic evidence is limited “to determining if a deviation from the clear language
25 of the claims is specified.” Interactive Gift Exp., Inc. v. Compuserve Inc., 256 F.3d 1323,
26 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

1 Furthermore, “claims must be read in view of the specification[] of which they
2 are a part.” Phillips, 415 F.3d at 1315 (quotation omitted). The specification can offer
3 “practically incontrovertible directions about claim meaning.” Abbott Labs. v. Sandoz,
4 Inc., 566 F.3d 1282, 1288 (Fed. Cir. 2009). For example, the patentee may act as its own
5 “lexicographer” and give a specialized definition of a claim term either explicitly or
6 implicitly, in which case the specification acts as a dictionary for the patent. Id.; Phillips,
7 415 F.3d at 1321. “Likewise, inventors and applicants may intentionally disclaim, or
8 disavow, subject matter that would otherwise fall within the scope of the claim.” Abbott
9 Labs., 566 F.3d at 1288.

10 “When consulting the specification to clarify the meaning of claim terms, courts
11 must take care not to import limitations into the claims from the specification.” Id.
12 “[A]lthough the specification may well indicate that certain embodiments are preferred,
13 particular embodiments appearing in the specification will not be read into claims when the
14 claim language is broader than such embodiments.” Tate Access Floors, Inc. v. Maxcess
15 Techs., Inc., 222 F.3d 958, 966 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (quotation omitted). “By the same token,
16 the claims cannot enlarge what is patented beyond what the inventor has described as the
17 invention.” Abbott Labs., 566 F.3d at 1288 (quotation omitted).

18 If the claim language is not clear after reviewing all intrinsic evidence, then the
19 Court may refer to extrinsic evidence such as expert testimony, inventor testimony,
20 dictionaries, learned treatises, and prior art not cited in the prosecution history. Zodiac Pool
21 Care, Inc. v. Hoffinger Indus., Inc., 206 F.3d 1408, 1414 (Fed. Cir. 2000). “Relying on
22 extrinsic evidence to construe a claim is proper only when the claim language remains
23 genuinely ambiguous after consideration of the intrinsic evidence. Such instances will
24 rarely, if ever, occur.” Interactive Gift Exp., 256 F.3d at 1332 (internal quotation omitted).

25 ///

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.