

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

PAPST LICENSING GMBH & CO.	§	
KG,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	CASE NO. 6:15-cv-01095
vs.	§	
	§	[LEAD CASE]
	§	
APPLE INC., et al.,	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

This Memorandum Opinion construes disputed claim terms in U.S. Patent Nos. 6,470,399 (“the ’399 Patent”), 6,895,449 (“the ’449 Patent”), 8,504,746 (“the ’746 Patent”), 8,966,144 (“the ’144 Patent”), and 9,189,437 (“the ’437 Patent”) (collectively, the “patents-in-suit”) asserted by Plaintiff Papst Licensing GmbH & Co., KG (“Plaintiff”) against Defendants Apple Inc. (“Apple”), Lenovo (United States) Inc. (“Lenovo”), Motorola Mobility LLC (“Motorola”), LG Electronics, Inc., LG Electronics U.S.A., Inc., LG Electronics MobileComm U.S.A., Inc., (“LG”), Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd., Huawei Technologies USA, Inc. (“Huawei”), Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., Samsung Electronics America, Inc. (“Samsung”), and ZTE (USA) Inc. (“ZTE”) (collectively “Defendants”). On January 5, 2017, the parties presented oral arguments on the disputed claim terms at a *Markman* hearing. For the reasons stated below, the Court **ADOPTS** the following constructions.¹

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BACKGROUND 3

APPLICABLE LAW 3

 Section 112(b): Indefiniteness 5

 Section 112(f): Means-Plus-Function Limitations..... 6

AGREED TERMS 7

CLAIM CONSTRUCTION OF DISPUTED TERMS 7

 1. “connecting device” Terms 7

 2. “first command interpreter” and “second command interpreter” 13

 3. “multi-purpose interface” 17

 4. “specific driver for the multi-purpose interface” 19

 5. “parameter” and “signal” Terms 20

 6. “customary” Terms 25

 7. “automatic” Terms 29

 8. “data transmit/receive device” 34

 9. “simulating a virtual file system to the host” 37

 10. “user-loaded” Terms 39

 11. “input/output (i/o) port” 43

 12. “analog signal acquisition channel[s],” “acquisition channels,” and “analog acquisition channel” 44

APPENDIX A: COLLECTED CONSTRUCTIONS 47

BACKGROUND

“The five asserted patents share a common specification.” Dkt. No. 185 at 1 n.1. “The Patents generally relate to a unique method for achieving high data transfer rates for data acquisition systems (e.g., still pictures, videos, voice recordings) to a general-purpose computer, without requiring an end user to purchase, install, and/or run specialized software for each system.” Dkt. No. 175 at 1 (citing ’399 Patent at 4:23–27).

Terms in the ’399 and ’449 Patents have been construed in a Multi-District Litigation proceeding: *In re Papst Licensing GmbH & Co. KG Patent Litig.*, MDL No. 1880, Misc. Action No. 07-493 (D.D.C.) (“*Papst MDL*”). Claim constructions reached in the *Papst MDL* have been addressed by the Federal Circuit. See *In re Papst Licensing Digital Camera Patent Litig.*, 778 F.3d 1255, 1261–70 (Fed. Cir. 2015) (“*Papst Opinion*”).

APPLICABLE LAW

“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 1313–14; *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)); see *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. Elan 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.

Although “less significant than the intrinsic record in determining the legally operative meaning of claim language,” the Court may rely on extrinsic evidence to “shed useful light on the relevant art.” *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1317 (quotation omitted). Technical dictionaries and treatises may help the Court understand the underlying technology and the manner in which one skilled in the art might use claim terms, but such sources may also provide overly broad definitions or may not be indicative of how terms are used in the patent. *Id.* at 1318. Similarly, expert testimony may aid the Court in determining the particular meaning of a term in the pertinent field, but “conclusory, unsupported assertions by experts as to the definition of a claim term are not useful.” *Id.* Generally, extrinsic evidence is “less reliable than the patent and its prosecution history in determining how to read claim terms.” *Id.*

Section 112(b): Indefiniteness

Patent claims must particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. 35 U.S.C. § 112(b). “A claim is invalid for indefiniteness if its language, when read in light of the specification and the prosecution history, ‘fail[s] to inform, with reasonable certainty, those skilled in the art about the scope of the invention.’” *Biosig Instruments, Inc. v. Nautilus, Inc.*, 783 F.3d 1374, 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2015) (quoting *Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.*, 134 S. Ct. 2120, 2124 (2014)). Whether a claim meets this definiteness requirement is a matter of law. *Young v. Lumenis, Inc.*, 492 F.3d 1336, 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2007). A party seeking to

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.