

**UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION  
Washington, DC**

**Before the Honorable Thomas B. Pender  
Administrative Law Judge**

**In the Matter of**

**CERTAIN AUDIO PROCESSING  
HARDWARE AND SOFTWARE AND  
PRODUCTS CONTAINING THE SAME**

Investigation No. 337-TA-949

**COMMISSION INVESTIGATIVE STAFF'S  
INITIAL MARKMAN BRIEF**

Margaret D. Macdonald, Director  
Jeffrey T. Hsu, Supervisory Attorney  
Lisa A. Murray, Investigative Attorney  
**OFFICE OF UNFAIR IMPORT INVESTIGATIONS**  
U.S. International Trade Commission  
500 E Street SW, Suite 401  
Washington, DC 20436  
202-205-2734  
202-205-2158 (facsimile)

October 19, 2015

## Table of Contents<sup>1</sup>

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Legal Standards.....	2
III.	Technology Overview.....	6
	A. Audio Processing Technology at the Relevant Time.....	7
	B. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	9
	C. “Most Significant” Disputed Claim Terms.....	10
IV.	The ’345 Patent.....	11
	A. Disputed Claim Constructions.....	13
	1. magnitude of the frequency bin/magnitude of the corresponding frequency bin (claims 1, 38)* .....	13
	2. current minimum value (claims 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 39).....	16
	3. future minimum value (claims 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 39, 40).....	18
	4. subtractor for subtracting said noise elements/subtracting said noise elements (claims 13, 38) .....	20
	B. Agreed Claim Constructions.....	22
V.	The ’637 Patent.....	23
	A. Disputed Claim Construction.....	25
	1. canceled (claims 1, 5, 8, 12)* .....	25
	B. Agreed Claim Constructions.....	29
VI.	The ’607 Patent.....	32
	A. Disputed Claim Constructions.....	33
	1. interference signal (claims 1, 2, 25, 26)* .....	33
	a) Claims 1 and 25 .....	35

---

<sup>1</sup> Claim terms marked with an asterisk are terms that the parties have identified as “most significant to the resolution of the case” in accordance with Ground Rule 8.3.

b) Claims 2 and 26 .....	37
2. main signal (claims 5, 8, 12, 29, 32, 36)* .....	40
3. transform function (claims 9, 33)* .....	43
4. beam splitter . . . for beam-splitting said target into band limited target signals . . and beam-splitting said interference signal into band-limited interference signals . . . (claim 1)* .....	46
5. beam-splitting said target signal into a plurality of band limited target signals/beam splitting said interference signal into band-limited interference signals . . . (claim 25)* .....	48
6. band-limited . . . (target, interference) . . . signals (claims 1, 25, 27)* .....	49
7. adaptively filtering . . . each band-limited interference signal from each corresponding band-limited target signal (claim 25)* .....	50
B. Agreed Claim Constructions .....	52
VII. Conclusion .....	53

## Table of Authorities

### Cases

<i>Abbott Labs. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 544 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	2
<i>AllVoice Computing PLC v. Nuance Commc'ns., Inc.</i> , 504 F.3d 1236 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	29
<i>Applied Med. Res. Corp. v. U.S. Surgical Corp.</i> , 448 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	26
<i>Atmel Corp. v. Info. Storage Devices, Inc.</i> , 198 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	35
<i>Ballard Med. Products v. Allegiance Healthcare Corp.</i> , 268 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....	26
<i>Biogen Idec, Inc. v. GlaxoSmithKline LLC</i> , 713 F.3d 1090 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	5, 6
<i>Bose Corp. v. JBL, Inc.</i> , 274 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....	41, 44, 45
<i>Catalina Marketing Int'l., Inc. v. Coolsavings.com, Inc.</i> , 289 F.3d 801 (Fed. Cir. 2002) .....	3
<i>Chimie v. PPG Indus., Inc.</i> , 402 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	5
<i>Datamize, LLC v. Plumtree Software, Inc.</i> , 417 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2005), <i>abrogated on other grounds by Nautilus</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2120.....	40
<i>Deere &amp; Co. v. Bush Hog, LLC</i> , 703 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	3
<i>Dow Chem. Co. v. Nova Chemicals Corp. (Canada)</i> , 2015 WL 5060947 (Fed. Cir. Aug. 28, 2015) .....	35
<i>Energizer Holdings, Inc. v. International Trade Comm'n</i> , 435 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	41, 44
<i>Epcon Gas Sys. v. Bauer Compressors</i> , 279 F.3d 1022 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	4
<i>In re Donaldson Co.</i> , 16 F.3d 1189 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (en banc).....	29
<i>Innova/Pure Water, Inc. v. Safari Water Filtration Sys., Inc.</i> , 381 F.3d 1111 (Fed. Cir. 2004)).....	3, 4, 42
<i>L &amp; P Prop. v. JTM, LLC</i> , 578 F. Supp. 2d 318 (D. Mass. 2008) .....	26
<i>Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 898 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	4, 47
<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.</i> , 517 U.S. 370 (1996) .....	35

<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.</i> , 52 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (en banc), <i>aff'd</i> , 517 U.S. 370 (1996).....	3, 4, 5
<i>Multiform Dessicants, Inc. v. Medzam, Ltd.</i> , 133 F.3d 1473 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....	2
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2120 (2014) .....	35, 37, 39, 46
<i>Network Commerce, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 422 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	6
<i>Noah Sys., Inc. v. Intuit Inc.</i> , 675 F.3d 1302 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	26, 29
<i>O2 Micro Int'l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co. Ltd.</i> , 521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	2
<i>Omega Eng'g, Inc., v. Raytek Corp.</i> , 334 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	4, 52
<i>On Demand Mach. Corp. v. Ingram Indus., Inc.</i> , 442 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	4
<i>Personalized Media Communications, LLC v. International Trade Comm'n</i> , 161 F.3d 696 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	35
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F. 3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	passim
<i>Praxair, Inc. v. ATMI, Inc.</i> , 543 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	5, 47
<i>Purdue Pharma L.P. v. Endo Pharms., Inc.</i> , 438 F.3d 1123 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	6
<i>Renishaw PLC v. Marposs Societa' per Azioni</i> , 158 F.3d 1243 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....	5
<i>RF Delaware, Inc. v. Pacific Keystone Techs.</i> , 326 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	5, 15, 47
<i>Southwall Techs., Inc. v. Cardinal IG Co.</i> , 54 F.3d 1570 (Fed. Cir. 1995) .....	5, 6
<i>Teva Pharm. USA, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 135 S. Ct. 831 (2015) .....	3
<i>Texas Digital Sys. Inc. v. Telegenix, Inc.</i> , 308 F.3d 1193 (Fed. Cir. 2002) .....	4
<i>Varco, L.P. v. Pason Sys. USA Corp.</i> , 436 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	3
<i>Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.</i> , 90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	4, 6, 15
<i>ZMI Corp. v. Cardiac Resuscitator Corp.</i> , 884 F.2d 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1988) .....	5
<b><u>Statutes</u></b>	
19 U.S.C. § 1337.....	1
35 U.S.C. § 112.....	passim

# 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.