

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION

|                           |   |                                |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| MOBILE TELECOMMUNICATIONS | § |                                |
| TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,        | § |                                |
|                           | § | Case No. 2:16-cv-00002-JRG-RSP |
| Plaintiff,                | § |                                |
| v.                        | § | JURY TRIAL REQUESTED           |
|                           | § |                                |
| GOOGLE INC.,              | § |                                |
| Defendant.                | § |                                |
|                           | § |                                |

---

|                           |   |                               |
|---------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| MOBILE TELECOMMUNICATIONS | § |                               |
| TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,        | § |                               |
|                           | § | Case No. 2:15-cv-2122-JRG-RSP |
| Plaintiff,                | § |                               |
| v.                        | § | JURY TRIAL REQUESTED          |
|                           | § |                               |
| MICROSOFT CORPORATION,    | § |                               |
| Defendant.                | § |                               |
|                           | § |                               |

**MTEL'S OPENING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. U.S. PATENT NO. 5,581,804 (THE “’804 PATENT”)..... 1

A. Seven Terms Require Construction ..... 2

1. “base transmitter(s)” /“base receiver(s)”/“base [device]”/“mobile [device]” (Terms 46, 48-50) ..... 2

2. “set of base transmitters” (Term 47)..... 4

3. “systemwide probe signal” (Term 51) ..... 4

4. “registration signal” (Term 52)..... 5

5. “disable the mobile transceiver’s capability to transmit a registration signal” (Term 53)..... 5

B. The Remaining Terms of the ’804 Patent Should Be Given Their Plain and Ordinary Meaning ..... 6

C. “preambles of the asserted claims” (Term 45)..... 7

D. “processing the stored number of registration signals” / “sending a message to the mobile transceiver to disable...” (Term 54/55)..... 7

E. “weak signal area” (Terms 57 & 58) ..... 7

F. “order of method steps” (Term 60)..... 8

II. U.S. PATENT NO. 5,754,946 (THE “’946 PATENT”)..... 8

A. Defendants Would Waste Judicial Resources..... 8

B. “(means for) detecting errors in the received message” (Terms 69 and 75)..... 10

C. Defendants Identify Structure Beyond What Is Necessary..... 11

III. U.S. PATENT NO. 5,894,506 (THE “’506 PATENT”)..... 12

A. Defendants Ignore This Court’s Prior Holdings ..... 13

B. Defendants Ignore the Plain Meaning of Commonly Understood Terms ..... 13

C. The Means-Plus-Function Terms Are Not Indefinite. .... 14

1. “means responsive to the received message code for retrieving from the memory the canned message assigned thereto” (’506 Patent, Term 30)..... 15

2. “means for determining whether a receiving terminal in the network can receive the canned message in text form or in message code form” (’506 Patent, Term 31)..... 17

3. “means for updating the canned message file stored in the memory and a corresponding canned message file stored in a memory in at least the calling terminal” (’506 Patent, Term 32)..... 18

4. “means for retrieving from the memory those canned multiple response options assigned to response codes received from the calling terminal by the receiver, the retrieved canned message and multiple response options being transmitted to the receiving terminal by the transmitter” (’506 Patent, Term 33)..... 19

5. “means for routing a selected canned multiple response option received from the receiving terminal to the calling terminal in either text or response code form” (’506 Patent, Term 34) ..... 20

D. “A Message Compiler for Compiling” ..... 21

IV. U.S. PATENT NO. 5,809,428 (“THE ’428 PATENT”)..... 21

A. The Court’s Prior Rulings Should Guide the Court..... 21

B. To Assert Indefiniteness Defendants Must Ignore Known Structure ..... 21

C. The ’428 Patent Discloses Sufficient Structure for Terms Governed by §112, ¶ 6..... 22

1. Collateral Estoppel Does Not Preclude MTel’s Constructions..... 22

2. Sufficient Structure Exists to Perform the Claimed Function ..... 24

3. “means for determining whether an acknowledgment message is an acknowledgment to a data message or an acknowledgment to a probe message” (’428 Patent, Term 15) ..... 25

4. “means for transmitting a probe message to the mobile unit if, after transmitting a data message to the mobile unit, no data acknowledgment message is received” (’428 Patent, Term 16)..... 27

5. “means for marking a data message as undelivered and storing the undelivered data message if, after transmitting a probe message to the mobile unit, no probe acknowledgment message is received” (’428 Patent, Term 17)..... 27

D. Dial-in Access ..... 30

V. CONCLUSION..... 30

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

| <b>Federal Cases</b>  | <b>Page(s)</b> |
|---|----------------|
| <i>Alexam, Inc. v. Best Buy Co.</i> ,<br>No. 2:10-cv-93, 2012 WL 1188406 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 9, 2012) .....   | 5              |
| <i>Alfred E. Mann Found. for Sci. Research v. Cochlear Corp.</i> ,<br>No. CV 07-8108-GHK (SHX), 2012 WL 12877984 (C.D. Cal. June 18, 2012)..... | 14             |
| <i>Applied Med. Res. Corp. v. U.S. Surgical Corp.</i> ,<br>435 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....  | 22             |
| <i>Atmel Corp. v. Info. Storage Devices, Inc.</i> ,<br>198 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....  | 14, 26, 29     |
| <i>Avondale Shipyards, Inc. v. Insured Lloyd's.</i> ,<br>786 F.2d 1265 (5th Cir. 1986) .....  | 23             |
| <i>CardSoft, LLC v. First Data Corp.</i> ,<br>No. 2:13-cv-290-JRG-RSP, 2014 WL 2879695 (E.D. Tex. June 24, 2014) .....                          | 23             |
| <i>CEATS, Inc. v. Cont'l Airlines</i> ,<br>No. 6:10-CV-120, 2011 WL 2971243 (E.D. Tex. July 21, 2011) .....                                     | 8              |
| <i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Telcordia Techs., Inc.</i> ,<br>590 F.Supp. 2d 828 (E.D. Tex. 2008).....   | 23             |
| <i>Comark Commc'ns, Inc. v. Harris Corp.</i> ,<br>156 F.3d 1182 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....   | 11, 30         |
| <i>Dana v. E.S. Originals, Inc.</i><br>342 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....  | 23             |
| <i>Electro Med. Sys., S.A. v. Cooper Life Sciences, Inc.</i> ,<br>34 F.3d 1048 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....  | 6              |
| <i>Globespanvirata, Inc. v. Texas Instruments</i> ,<br>No. 03-2854(GEB), 2005 WL 984346 (D. N.J. Apr. 7, 2005) .....                            | 21, 27         |
| <i>Graco Children's Prods., Inc. v. Regalo Int'l</i> ,<br>77 F. Supp. 2d 660 (E.D. Pa. 1999) .....  | 24             |
| <i>In re IBM Peripheral EDP Devices Antitrust Litig.</i> ,<br>481 F. Supp. 965 (N.D. Cal. 1979) .....   | 18             |
| <i>Innovative Display Techs. LLC v. Hyundai Motor Co.</i> ,<br>No. 2:14-CV-201-JRG, 2015 WL 2090651 (E.D. Tex. May 4, 2015) .....               | 8              |

# 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.