	Case5:14-cv-03928-PSG Documen	t79	Filed06/04	1/15	Page1 of 7			
1	John C. Carey (pro hac vice)							
2	<i>jcarey@careyrodriguez.com</i> Ernesto M. Rubi (<i>pro hac vice</i>)							
3	<i>erubi@careyrodriguez.com</i> Frank S. Hedin (CA SBN 291289)							
4	fhedin@careyrodriguez.com							
5	CAREY RODRIGUEZ O'KEEFE MILIAN GONYA, LLP							
6	1395 Brickell Avenue, Suite 700 Miami, FL 33131							
7	Telephone: 305-372-7474							
8	Facsimile: 305-372-7475							
9	Mark Punzalan (CA SBN 247599) markp@punzalanlaw.com							
10	Herbert T. Patty (CA SBN 255502)							
11	herbertp@punzalanlaw.com PUNZALAN LAW, P.C. 600 Allerton Street, Suite 201 Redwood City, CA 94063							
12								
13	Telephone: 650-362-4150							
13	Facsimile: 650-362-4151							
15	Attorneys for Plaintiff / Counter-Defendant Rothschild Digital Media Innovations LLC.							
15								
	[see next page for a listing of Defendant's c	ounse	; 1]					
17 18	UNITED STAT	ES D	ISTRICT	COU	RT			
19	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA							
20	(San Jose Division)							
20		50501	, in the second s					
22	ROTHSCHILD DIGITAL MEDIA INNOVATIONS LLC,	Case	e No. 5:14-0	ev-03	928-PSG			
23	Plaintiff / Counter - Defendant				ONSTRUCTION AND			
24	v.				Pate: Sept. 2, 2015			
25	SONY COMPUTER ENTERTAINMENT	Time	e: 10:00 Al	Ň	- ·			
26	AMERICA LLC,		Courtroom: Courtroom 5, 4 th Floor Judge: Hon. Paul. S. Grewal					
27	Defendant / Counter – Plaintiff.							
28]						

DOCKET A L A R M Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

	Case5:14-cv-03928-PSG Document79 Filed06/04/15 Page2 of 7
1	Attorneys for Defendant/Counter - Plaintiff Sony Computer Entertainment America LLC:
2	Michael J. Curley (CA Bar 230343)
3	Michael.Curley@quarles.com Nikia L. Gray (<i>pro hac vice</i>)
4	Nikia.Gray@quarles.com QUARLES & BRADY, LLP
5	One South Church Avenue, Suite 1700
6	Tucson, AZ 85701 Phone: (520) 770-8700
7	David R. Cross (pro hac vice)
8	David.Cross@quarles.com
9	QUARLES & BRADY, LLP 411 East Wisconsin Avenue
10	Milwaukee, WI 53202 Phone: (414) 277-5669
11	
12	Gregory P. Sitrick (<i>pro hac vice</i>) Gregory.Sitrick@quarles.com
13	QUARLES & BRADY, LLP One Renaissance Square
13	Two North Central Avenue
	Phoenix, AZ 85004 Phone: (602) 229-5200
15	Christopher J. Fahy (pro hac vice)
16	Christopher.Fahy@quarles.com
17	QUARLES & BRADY, LLP 300 North LaSalle Street
18	Suite 4000
19	Chicago, IL 60654 Phone: (312) 715-5000
20	Krista Celentano (CA SBN 279526)
21	Krista.Celentano@dlapiper.com
22	DLA Piper LLP (US) 2000 University Avenue
23	East Palo Alto, CA 94530 Phone: (650) 833-2000
24	
25	Jeremy T. Elman (CA SBN 223696) Jeremy.Elman@dlapiper.com
26	DLA Piper LLP (US) 200 South Biscayne Blvd., Suite 2500
27	Miami, FL 33131
28	Phone: (305) 423-8500
	2

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

Case5:14-cv-03928-PSG Document79 Filed06/04/15 Page3 of 7

1	Pursua	Pursuant to Northern District of California Patent Local Rule 4-3, Plaintiff Rothschild Digital			
2	Media Innov	ations, LLC ("RDMI") and Defendant Sony Computer Entertainment America LLC			
3	("SCEA") jo	intly submit this Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement.			
4 5	I. PRO	POSED CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE			
	A.	Patent L.R. 4-2(c): Meet and Confer			
6	Pursu	ant to Patent L.R. 4-2(c), the parties have met and conferred regarding the submission			
7	of this Joint	Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement with regards to U.S. Pat. No. 6,101,534			
8	("the '534 pa	atent").			
9	B.	Patent L.R. 4-3(a): Agreed Constructions			
10	Pursu	ant to Patent L.R. 4-3(a), the parties agree that the term "local processor assembly"			
11	should be con	nstrued to mean "a computer at the user's location." This term appears in claims 1, 22,			
12	23, and 24.				
13	C.	Patent L.R. 4-3(b): Proposed Constructions of Disputed Terms			
14	Pursu	ant to Patent L.R. 4-3(b) the parties' disputed terms and proposed constructions			
15 16	thereof are identified in Exhibit "A" hereto. Exhibit "A" likewise includes the parties'				
16 17	identification	n of intrinsic and extrinsic evidence in support of the parties' respective proposed			
17	constructions. Each party reserves the right to supplement or amend its supporting evidence (both				
10	intrinsic and extrinsic) based on newly identified evidence, including but not limited to documents				
20	requested but not yet received from the other party or the presentation of rebuttal declarations or				
21	testimony. In	n addition, each party reserves the right to rely on any intrinsic or extrinsic evidence			
22	identified by	the other party in support of its proposed constructions.			
22	D.	Patent L.R. 4-3(c): Most Significant Disputed Claim Terms for Construction			
23	Pursu	ant to Patent Local Rule 4-3(c), the parties jointly identify the following terms of the			
25	534 patent a	as most significant to resolution of the case:			
23 26	1.	"primary site data"			
20	2.	"primary site address"			
28	3.	"auxiliary site data"			
		3			

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

	Case5:14-cv-03928-PSG Document79 Filed06/04/15 Page4 of 7					
1						
	4. "auxiliary site addresses"*					
2	5. "overlay processor"					
3	6. "said primary site addresses including at least a portion of said primary site data"					
4	7. "said remotely accessible, auxiliary site addresses being structured to be remotely					
5	accessed by said remote server assembly"					
6	8. "said remotely accessible, auxiliary site addresses being structured to be remotely					
7	accessed by said remote server assembly so as to initiate utilization of said select portions of said					
8	quantity of auxiliary site data by said local processor assembly in conjunction with said primary					
9	site data"					
10	9. "said remote server assembly remotely accessing said auxiliary site data to initiate					
11	utilization of said select portions of said quantity of auxiliary site data by said local processor					
12	assembly"					
13	Those terms that the parties agree are most significant have been identified with a "*" in					
14	Exhibit "A."					
15	SCEA's Statement On Case Or Claim Dispositive Terms:					
16	SCEA does not infringe under any of the proposed constructions. That said, adopting					
17	SCEA's proposed construction for disputed claim term "said remotely accessible, auxiliary site					
18	addresses being structured to be remotely accessed by said remote server assembly" would provide					
19	an additional and independent ground for noninfringement of all asserted claim terms of the '534					
20	Patent as RDMI has admitted that SCEA does not infringe under that construction. <i>See</i> Plf.'s Opp.					
21	to Def.'s Mtn. for Rule 11Sanctions at 17-20 [Dkt 53]; Plf.'s Sur-Reply to Def.'s Mtn. for Rule					
22	11Sanctions at 10 [Dkt 61-1].					
23	Further, adopting SCEA's proposed construction for the disputed claim term "auxiliary site					
24	addresses" would provide an additional and independent ground for noninfringement of all asserted					
25	claim terms of the '534 Patent. Adopting SCEA's proposed construction for the disputed claim					
26	term "said remotely accessible, auxiliary site addresses being structured to be remotely accessed by					
27	said remote server assembly so as to initiate utilization of said select portions of said quantity of					
28	4					

DOCKET A L A R M Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

Case5:14-cv-03928-PSG Document79 Filed06/04/15 Page5 of 7

auxiliary site data by said local processor assembly in conjunction with said primary site data" would provide an additional and independent ground of noninfringement of claim 1.

Additionally, a finding of indefiniteness for disputed claim term "said remote server assembly remotely accessing said auxiliary site data to initiate utilization of said select portions of said quantity of auxiliary site data by said local processor assembly" above would render claims 23 and 24 invalid as impermissible "hybrid" claims that improperly combine two classes of invention.

SCEA disagrees with RDMI's characterization of SCEA's discovery concerning the accused products.

9 10

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

RDMI's Statement On Case Or Claim Dispositive Terms:

RDMI objects to SCEA's argumentative statement above as inappropriate and in violation of Patent L.R. 4-3(c). RDMI respectfully submits that each asserted claim of the '534 patent is valid and infringed, that each of SCEA's proposed claim constructions is erroneous, and that because SCEA has thus far refused to provide discovery of the products accused of infringement in this case, RDMI is not aware of any claim term that is claim or case dispositive.

II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION HEARING

The Court's November 19, 2014 Case Scheduling Order (ECF No. 52) sets the following schedule for claim construction:

- Claim Construction Discovery Deadline (including experts): July 7, 2015;
- Initial Markman Brief: July 20, 2015;
 - Opposition to Markman Brief: August 6, 2015;
- Reply re Markman Brief: August 17, 2015;
 - Markman Hearing: September 2, 2015.
- Pursuant to Patent L.R. 4-3(d), the parties anticipate the length of time necessary for the
 Claim Construction Hearing is two hours per side for a total of four hours.
 - Pursuant to Patent L.R. 4-3(e), RDMI proposes to call Robert Stevenson, Ph.D. to provide expert testimony at the Claim Construction Hearing that a person of ordinary skill in the art would interpret the claims as asserted by RDMI and may rely on Dr. Stevenson's opinion in support of its

5

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.