

**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,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ADTRAN, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 6:15-cv-00618-JRG-JDL

**LEAD CASE
PATENT CASE**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

DEFENDANTS' RESPONSIVE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
I.	Procedural History	1
II.	Background	2
III.	Person of Ordinary Skill	3
IV.	Terms in Dispute	3
	A. Infinitive “to...” terms	3
	1. The infinitive “to...” terms are statements of intended use not entitled to patentable weight	5
	2. The Infinitive “To...” Terms Require Application of 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 6	7
	a) The Corresponding Structure to the Recited Function of the Asserted Claims of the ’107 Patent	10
	b) The Corresponding Structure to the Recited Function of the Asserted claims of the ’838 Patent	11
	c) The Corresponding Structure to the Recited Function of the Asserted Claims of the ’760 Patent	11
	B. “Ethernet data terminal equipment”/ “Ethernet terminal equipment”/ “end device”	12
	C. “convey information”	14
	D. “connector”	16
	E. “used for normal network communication”/ “used to carry Ethernet communication signals”/ “used to carry BaseT communication signals”	19
	F. “[wherein distinguishing information about the piece of Ethernet data terminal equipment] is associated to impedance within the at least one path”	20
	G. “detection protocol”	20
	H. “distinguishing information about the piece of Ethernet equipment”	22
	I. “current”/“current flow”	24
	J. “BaseT”	26
	K. “path coupled across”	27
	L. “powered off”	28
V.	Conclusion	29

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>Cases</u>	<u>Page</u>
<i>Am. Calcar, Inc. v. Am. Honda Motor Co., Inc.</i> , 651 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	15, 16
<i>Boehringer Ingelheim Vetmedica, Inc. v. Shering-Plough Corp.</i> , 320 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	5
<i>Chef Am, Inc. v. Lamb-Weston, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	28, 29
<i>Elkay Mfg. Co. v. Ebco Mfg. Co.</i> , 192 F.3d 973 (1999)	19, 25
<i>Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc. v. U.S. Surgical Corp.</i> , 93 F.3d 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	24
<i>Ex parte Kriechbaum</i> , Appeal 2011-001428, 2013 WL 4478728 (Bd.Pat.App. & Interf. Aug. 20, 2013)	6
<i>Ex parte Liebich</i> , Appeal 2011-001343, 2013 WL 4692599 (Bd.Pat.App. & Interf. Aug. 30, 2013)	6
<i>Ex parte Lippincott</i> , Appeal 2010-000325, 2012 WL 2166002 (Bd.Pat.App. & Interf. June 13, 2012)	6
<i>Ex parte Yoon</i> , Appeal 2010-000843, 2012 WL 759838 at (Bd.Pat.App. & Interf. Mar. 7, 2012)	6
<i>In re Katz Interactive Call Processing Patent</i> , 639 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	22
<i>In re Stencel</i> , 828 F.2d 751, 754 (Fed. Cir. 1987)	6
<i>Interval Licensing LLC v. AOL, Inc. et al.</i> , 766 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	21
<i>IPXL Holdings, L.L.C. v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , 430 F.3d (Fed. Cir. 2005)	22
<i>Kopykake Enters., Inc. v. Lucks Co.</i> , 264 F.3d 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	27
<i>Kraft Foods, Inc. v. Int'l Trading Co.</i> , 203 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	19
<i>Laitram Corp. v. Rexnord, Inc.</i> , 939 F.2d 1533 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	13
<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments</i> , 52 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 1995)	23, 27

<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.</i> , 134 S.Ct. 2120 (2014)	20
<i>Netword, LLC v. Centraal Corp.</i> , 242 F.3d 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2001)\	15
<i>Network-1 Security Solutions, LLC v. Cisco Systems, Inc.</i> 692 F.Supp.2d 632 (E.D. Tex. 2010)	15
<i>Nystrom v. TREX Co., Inc.</i> , 424 F.3d 1136 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	15
<i>PC Connector Solutions LLC v. SmartDisk Corp.</i> , 406 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	27
<i>Pitney Bowes, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , 182 F.3d 1298, (Fed. Cir. 1999)	6
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	23
<i>Robert Bosch, LLP v. Snap-On Inc.</i> , 769 F.3d 1094 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	9
<i>Seachange Int'l, Inc. v. C-COR Inc.</i> , 413 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	19
<i>Trs. of Columbia Univ. in City of N.Y. v. Symantec Corp.</i> , 811 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	26
<i>Williamson v. Citrix Online, LLC</i> , 792 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	7, 8

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 112	7, 8, 9
35 U.S.C. § 112(6)	3

Plaintiffs Chrimar Systems, Inc. and Chrimar Holding Company, LLC (collectively “Chrimar”) assert four patents against the Defendants¹: U.S. Patent Nos. 8,155,012 (“’012 Patent”), 8,942,107 (“’107 Patent”), 8,902,760 (“’760 Patent”), and 9,019,838 (“’838 Patent”) (collectively “Asserted Patents”). The Asserted Patents share a common specification.²

I. Procedural History

The parties dispute the constructions of fourteen terms from the Asserted Patents. Defendants contend that two of these terms are indefinite. Ten of the disputed terms have been previously construed in two actions involving the asserted patents: *Chrimar Systems, Inc., et al. v. Alcatel-Lucent, Inc., et al.*, No. 6:13-cv-880-JDL (E.D. Tex) (“*Chrimar I*”) and *Chrimar Systems, Inc., et al. v. Alcatel-Lucent USA, Inc., et al.*, No. 6:15-cv-163-JDL (E.D. Tex.) (“*Chrimar II*”). The prior constructions of these ten terms from the *Chrimar I* and *Chrimar II* cases are set forth in **Exhibit A**.³ Chrimar asks that the Court adopt its constructions and rulings on these terms from these prior cases; Defendants ask that the Court adopt constructions for these terms that differ from its constructions in the prior cases.

In addition, the parties agree on the constructions for the following terms.

Term	Agreed Construction
------	---------------------

¹ Defendants are Accton Technology Corporation; Edgecore USA Corp.; Belden, Inc.; Garrettcom, Inc.; Hirschmann, Inc.; Costar Technologies, Inc.; Costar Video System, LLC; D-Link Systems, Inc.; TRENDnet, Inc.; Dell Inc.; Advantech Corporation; Aerohive Networks, Inc.; EnGenius Technologies, Inc.; WatchGuard Technologies, Inc.; Allworx Corporation; ADTRAN, Inc.; TP-Link USA Corporation; Huawei Technologies USA Inc.; and Huawei Enterprise USA Inc.

² As the patents all derive from the same application, the specification for each should be the same and all citations are to the ’012 Patent’s specification.

³ *Chrimar I* Memorandum and Opinion Order (ECF # 92)(“*Chrimar I* Order ECF # 92”), *Chrimar I* Memorandum and Opinion Order (ECF # 99) (“*Chrimar I* Order ECF # 99”), *Chrimar I* Memorandum and Opinion Order (ECF # 102)(“*Chrimar I* Order ECF # 102”), *Chrimar II* Memorandum and Opinion Order (ECF # 122)(“*Chrimar II* Order ECF # 122”), and *Chrimar II* Memorandum and Opinion Order (ECF # 123)(“*Chrimar II* Order ECF# 123”).

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.