

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

ALACRITECH, INC., Plaintiff, v. CENTURYLINK COMMUNICATIONS LLC, et al. Defendants.	Case No. 2:16-cv-693-JRG-RSP LEAD CASE JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
ALACRITECH, INC., Plaintiff, v. WINSTRON CORPORATION, et al., Defendants.	Case No. 2:16-cv-692-JRG-RSP JURY TRIAL DEMANDED MEMBER CASE
ALACRITECH, INC., Plaintiff, v. DELL INC., Defendant. INTEL CORPORATION, Intervenor.	Case No. 2:16-cv-695-RWS-RSP JURY TRIAL DEMANDED MEMBER CASE

ALACRITECH'S OPENING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. “FAST-PATH PROCESSING” / “SLOW-PATH PROCESSING” (’205:1,8,31)1

II. “A DESTINATION [] IN THE MEMORY OF THE COMPUTER” / “A DESTINATION [IN] MEMORY” / “A DESTINATION . . . ON THE HOST COMPUTER SYSTEM” (’205:1,8,22,31,36; ’241:1,22; ’699:1,2,7,13,20; ’880:5).....5

III. “CONTEXT [FOR COMMUNICATION]” (’036:1,3-7; ’072:1,2,7,9,15,16,19)8

IV. “STATUS INFORMATION” (’072:2,3,9,10,14,15,17).....11

V. “DATABASE” (’880:13,32)13

VI. “OPERATION CODE” (’880:1,17,32,34,45)14

VII. “PREPENDING” / “PREPENDED” (’036:4; ’241:7,9,12,15,17,18; ’072:1,9,15; ’104:1,21-23)14

VIII. “SIGNIFICANT” / “SUBSTANTIALLY” TERMS (’205:22,31).....15

IX. WITHOUT AN INTERRUPT DIVIDING (’241:1,18,22)16

X. “TRAFFIC CLASSIFIER” (’880:41,42).....18

XI. “FLOW” TERMS (’880:1,9,10,12,22,23,32,35,42,43).....19

XII. “[FLOW] RE-ASSEMBLER” (’880:41,43)21

XIII. “PACKET BATCHING MODULE” (’880:41)22

XIV. “MEANS FOR RECEIVING/SENDING, BY THE NETWORK INTERFACE DEVICE...” TERMS (’104:22)24

XV. “MEANS, COUPLED TO THE HOST COMPUTER...” (’205:31).....27

XVI. “FIRST MECHANISM” / “SECOND MECHANISM” (’241:1,3,4,5,7,8,17)28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Cases</u>	
<i>Accent Packaging, Inc. v. Leggett & Platt, Inc.</i> , 707 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	14
<i>Biomedino, LLC v. Waters Techs. Corp.</i> , 490 F.3d 946 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	26, 27, 28
<i>Braintree Labs., Inc. v. Novel Labs., Inc.</i> , 749 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	10
<i>Cox Commc'ns, Inc. v. Sprint Commc'n Co. LP</i> , 838 F.3d 1224 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	3
<i>Customedia Techs., LLC v. DISH Networks Corp.</i> , No. 2:16-CV-129-JRG, 2017 WL 568669 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 13, 2017)	15, 18
<i>Freeny, et al. v. Murphy USA Inc.</i> , No. 2:13-CV-791-RSP, 2015 WL 294102 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 21, 2015)	11
<i>Freeny v. Apple Inc.</i> , No. 2:13-CV-00361-WCB, 2014 WL 4294505 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 28, 2014).....	4
<i>Genband USA LLC v. Metaswitch Networks Ltd.</i> , No. 2:14-CV-33-JRG-RSP, 2015 WL 4722185 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 7, 2015)	23
<i>Infernal Tech., LLC v. Elec. Arts Inc.</i> , No. 2:15-CV-1523-JRG-RSP, 2016 WL 5415429 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 28, 2016).....	13, 16, 17
<i>Inventio AG v. ThyssenKrupp Elevator Americas Corp.</i> , 649 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	25, 30
<i>Jack Guttman, Inc. v. Kopykake Enterprises, Inc.</i> , 302 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	2
<i>Linear Tech. Corp. v. Impala Linear Corp.</i> , 379 F.3d 1311 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	18, 22
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2120 (2014).....	11, 17
<i>Nazomi Communications, Inc. v. ARM Holdings, PLC</i> , 403 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	8
<i>O2 Micro Int'l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co.</i> , 521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	15
<i>Papst Licensing GmbH & Co. KG v. Apple Inc.</i> , No. 6:15-cv-01095, 2017 WL 897172 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 7, 2017)	24

PerDiemco, LLC. v. Industrack LLC,
 No. 2:15-CV-00726-JRG-RSP, 2016 WL 6662865, at *3 (E.D. Tex. Oct. 28, 2016),
report and recommendation adopted, No. 2:15-CV-00726-JRG-RSP,
 2016 WL 6652728 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 10, 2016)12, 16, 17

Phillips v. AWH Corp.,
 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... *passim*

In re Skvorecz,
 580 F.3d 1262 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....20

Sonix Tech. Co. v. Publications Int'l, Ltd.,
 844 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....4

Sycamore IP Holdings LLC v. AT&T Corp.,
 2017 WL 1045949 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 16, 2017)4

TriMed, Inc. v. Stryker Corp.,
 514 F.3d 1256 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....24, 25, 26

Uniloc USA, Inc. v. Autodesk, Inc.,
 Case No. 2:15-cv-1187-JRG-RSP,
 2016 WL 3647977 (E.D. Tex. July 7, 2016)19, 22, 23, 29

U.S. Surgical Corp. v. Ethicon, Inc.,
 103 F.3d 1554 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....15

Williamson v. Citrix Online, LLC,
 792 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....19, 24, 26, 29, 30

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 112..... *passim*

MPEP § 2173.05(e).....20

NOTE ON CITATIONS

- The patents-in-suit, U.S. Patent Nos. 7,124,205 (“the ‘205 patent”); 7,237,036 (“the ‘036 patent”); 7,337,241 (“the ‘241 patent”); 7,673,072 (“the ‘072 patent”); 7,945,699 (“the ‘699 patent”); 8,131,880 (“the ‘880 patent”); 8,805,948 (“the ‘948 patent”); and 9,055,104 (“the ‘104 patent”) are attached as Exhibits A through H, respectively. References to the patents-in-suit are indicated by column and line number, or by claim number. For example, “‘205 4:3-10” refers to Column 4, lines 3-10 of the U.S. Patent No. 7,124,205. *All emphases to patent citations are added unless otherwise noted.*
- The original applications for the ‘205 patent, the ‘241 patent, and the ‘072 patent are attached as Exhibits I, J, and K, respectively.
- The Declaration of Paul S. Min in Support of Plaintiff’s Claim Construction Brief is attached as Exhibit L. References to Dr. Min’s opening declaration are designated “Min 1st Decl.” followed by the paragraph number.
- The Rebuttal Declaration of Paul S. Min in Support of Plaintiff’s Claim Construction Brief is attached as Exhibit M. References to Dr. Min’s rebuttal declaration are designated “Min 2nd Decl.” followed by the paragraph number.
- The Declaration of Mr. Mark R. Lanning Regarding Claim Construction is attached as Exhibit N. References to Mr. Lanning’s opening declaration are designated “Lanning 1st Decl.” followed by the paragraph number.
- The Rebuttal Declaration of Mr. Mark R. Lanning Regarding Claim Construction is attached as Exhibit O. References to Mr. Lanning’s rebuttal declaration are designated “Lanning 2nd Decl.” followed by the paragraph number.

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.