

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
TYLER DIVISION**

**CHRIMAR SYSTEMS, INC. d/b/a  
CMS TECHNOLOGIES AND  
CHRIMAR HOLDING COMPANY,  
LLC,**

**vs.**

**ALCATEL-LUCENT, INC. et al.,**

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

**Civil No. 6:13-cv-880-JDL**

---

**CHRIMAR SYSTEMS, INC. d/b/a  
CMS TECHNOLOGIES AND  
CHRIMAR HOLDING COMPANY,  
LLC,**

**vs.**

**AMX, LLC,**

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

**Civil No. 6:13-cv-881-JDL**

---

**CHRIMAR SYSTEMS, INC. d/b/a  
CMS TECHNOLOGIES AND  
CHRIMAR HOLDING COMPANY,  
LLC,**

**vs.**

**GRANDSTREAM NETWORKS, INC.,**

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

**Civil No. 6:13-cv-882-JDL**

---

**CHRIMAR SYSTEMS, INC. d/b/a  
CMS TECHNOLOGIES AND  
CHRIMAR HOLDING COMPANY,  
LLC,**

**vs.**

**SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,  
et al.**

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

**Civil No. 6:13-cv-883-JDL**

---

## MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Before the Court are Defendants’<sup>1</sup> Combined Motions for Summary Judgment and Claim Construction (No. 6:13-cv-880, Doc. No. 71; No. 6:13-cv-881, Doc. No. 73; No. 6:13-cv-882, Doc. No. 67; and No. 6:13-cv-883, Doc. No. 68)<sup>2</sup> (“Mot.”). Plaintiff ChriMar Systems, Inc. d/b/a CMS Technologies and Chrimar Holding Company LLC filed a Response (Doc. No. 74)(“Resp.”) and Defendants filed a Reply (Doc. No. 76) (“Reply”). The Court held a hearing on September 3, 2014. For the reasons set forth herein, the Court adopts the constructions set forth below, and **DENIES** Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment.

### BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleges Defendants infringe Claims 31 and 67 of U.S. Patent No. 8,115,012 (“the ‘012 Patent”).<sup>3</sup> The ‘012 Patent is titled “System and Method for Adapting a Piece of Terminal Equipment,” and relates to tracking of devices that are connected to a wired network. More specifically, the ‘012 patent describes permanently identifying an “asset,” such as a computer, “by attaching an external or internal device to the asset and communicating with that device using existing network wiring or cabling.” ‘012 Patent at 1:67–2:2. The ‘012 patent refers to that device as the “remote module.” *Id.* at 3:22–26. The asset can then be managed, tracked, or identified by using the remote module to communicate a unique identification number, port ID, or wall jack location to the network monitoring equipment, or “central module.” *Id.* at 6:7–13 and 8:66–9:4. The ‘012 patent further discloses that “asset identification” may be done in a way

---

<sup>1</sup> Defendants include Alcatel-Lucent USA, Inc., Alcatel-Lucent Holdings, Inc., AMX LLC, Grandstream Networks, Inc., Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC, and Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. Defendants Aastra Technologies, Ltd., and Aastra USA Inc have since settled. *Chrimar Systems, Inc. v. Aastra Technologies Limited*, No. 6:13-cv-879, Doc. No. 70.

<sup>2</sup> All citations hereinafter will be to the Docket in *Chrimar Systems, Inc. v. Alcatel-Lucent, Inc.*, No. 6:13-cv-880.

<sup>3</sup> Chrimar additionally asserts infringement of claims 35, 40, 42–43, 49–50, 52, 55–56, 65–66, 72–73, 77, 82, 88–90, and 106–107, each of which depends from either claim 31 or claim 67.

“that does not use existing network bandwidth.” *Id.* at 3:10–12. These concepts are reflected in the patents’ asserted claims, including independent Claims 31 and 67 as set forth below:

31. An adapted piece of Ethernet data terminal equipment comprising:  
an Ethernet connector comprising a plurality of contacts;  
and  
at least one path coupled across selected contacts, the selected contacts comprising at least one of the plurality of contacts of the Ethernet connector and at least another one of the plurality of contacts of the Ethernet connector,  
wherein *distinguishing information about the piece of Ethernet data terminal equipment* is associated to impedance within the at least one path.
67. A method for adapting a piece of terminal equipment, the piece of terminal equipment having an Ethernet connector, the method comprising:  
coupling at least one path across specific contacts of the Ethernet connector, the at least one path permits use of the specific contacts for Ethernet communication, the Ethernet connector comprising the contact 1 through the contact 8, the specific contacts of the Ethernet connector comprising at least one of the contacts of the Ethernet connector and at least another one of the contacts of the Ethernet connector; and  
arranging impedance within the at least one path to *distinguish the piece of terminal equipment*.

’012 patent, claims 31 and 67.

In its motion, Defendants present variations on the term “distinguishing”<sup>4</sup> for construction, and argue that summary judgment of non-infringement is warranted if the Court adopts its construction. Doc. No. 71. Plaintiff presented its proposed construction, as well as its position on infringement in its responsive brief. Doc. No. 74. The Court heard argument on September 3, 2014. A full claim construction hearing is set for October 30, 2014, and trial is set for September 2015.

---

<sup>4</sup> Defendants’ letter brief originally requested, and the Court permitted, an early *Markman* on two disputed terms: (1) “distinguishing information about the piece of Ethernet data terminal equipment” / “to distinguish the piece of terminal equipment”; and (2) “impedance.” Defendants’ Motion, however, addresses only the “distinguish[ing]” terms. Defendants decided to reserve the “impedance” term for the full claim construction hearing if the case is not resolved by the Court’s ruling on their Motion. See MOT. at 1 n.2; Doc. No. 61.

### CLAIM CONSTRUCTION PRINCIPLES

“It is a ‘bedrock principle’ of patent law that ‘the claims of a patent define the invention to which the patentee is entitled the right to exclude.’ *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (quoting *Innova/Pure Water, Inc. v. Safari Water Filtration Sys., Inc.*, 381 F.3d 1111, 1115 (Fed. Cir. 2004)). The Court examines a patent’s intrinsic evidence to define the patented invention’s scope. *Id.* at 1313-1314; *Bell Atl. Network Servs., Inc. v. Covad Commc’ns Group, Inc.*, 262 F.3d 1258, 1267 (Fed. Cir. 2001). Intrinsic evidence includes the claims, the rest of the specification and the prosecution history. *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1312-13; *Bell Atl. Network Servs.*, 262 F.3d at 1267. The Court gives claim terms their ordinary and customary meaning as understood by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1312-13; *Alloc, Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n*, 342 F.3d 1361, 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2003). Claim language guides the Court’s construction of claim terms. *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1314. “[T]he context in which a term is used in the asserted claim can be highly instructive.” *Id.* Other claims, asserted and unasserted, can provide additional instruction because “terms are normally used consistently throughout the patent.” *Id.* Differences among claims, such as additional limitations in dependent claims, can provide further guidance. *Id.*

“[C]laims ‘must be read in view of the specification, of which they are a part.’” *Id.* (quoting *Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.*, 52 F.3d 967, 979 (Fed. Cir. 1995)). “[T]he specification ‘is always highly relevant to the claim construction analysis. Usually, it is dispositive; it is the single best guide to the meaning of a disputed term.’” *Id.* (quoting *Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.*, 90 F.3d 1576, 1582 (Fed. Cir. 1996)); *Teleflex, Inc. v. Ficoso N. Am. Corp.*, 299 F.3d 1313, 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2002). In the specification, a patentee may define his own terms, give a claim term a different meaning than it would otherwise possess, or

disclaim or disavow some claim scope. *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1316. Although the Court generally presumes terms possess their ordinary meaning, this presumption can be overcome by statements of clear disclaimer. See *SciMed Life Sys., Inc. v. Advanced Cardiovascular Sys., Inc.*, 242 F.3d 1337, 1343-44 (Fed. Cir. 2001). This presumption does not arise when the patentee acts as his own lexicographer. See *Irdeto Access, Inc. v. EchoStar Satellite Corp.*, 383 F.3d 1295, 1301 (Fed. Cir. 2004).

The specification may also resolve ambiguous claim terms “where the ordinary and accustomed meaning of the words used in the claims lack sufficient clarity to permit the scope of the claim to be ascertained from the words alone.” *Teleflex, Inc.*, 299 F.3d at 1325. For example, “[a] claim interpretation that excludes a preferred embodiment from the scope of the claim ‘is rarely, if ever, correct.’” *Globetrotter Software, Inc. v. Elam Computer Group Inc.*, 362 F.3d 1367, 1381 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (quoting *Vitronics Corp.*, 90 F.3d at 1583). But, “[a]lthough the specification may aid the court in interpreting the meaning of disputed language in the claims, particular embodiments and examples appearing in the specification will not generally be read into the claims.” *Constant v. Advanced Micro-Devices, Inc.*, 848 F.2d 1560, 1571 (Fed. Cir. 1988); see also *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1323.

The prosecution history is another tool to supply the proper context for claim construction because a patentee may define a term during prosecution of the patent. *Home Diagnostics Inc. v. LifeScan, Inc.*, 381 F.3d 1352, 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (“As in the case of the specification, a patent applicant may define a term in prosecuting a patent.”). The well-established doctrine of prosecution disclaimer “preclud[es] patentees from recapturing through claim interpretation specific meanings disclaimed during prosecution.” *Omega Eng’g Inc. v. Raytek Corp.*, 334 F.3d 1314, 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2003). The prosecution history must show that the patentee clearly and unambiguously disclaimed or disavowed the proposed interpretation during

# 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.