

No. 2014-1110

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

IN RE PAPST LICENSING DIGITAL CAMERA  
PATENT LITIGATION

PAPST LICENSING GMBH & CO. KG,

*Plaintiff-Appellant,*

v.

FUJIFILM CORPORATION, FUJIFILM NORTH AMERICA  
CORPORATION (formerly known as FUJIFILM USA, INC.), HEWLETT-  
PACKARD COMPANY, JVC COMPANY OF AMERICA, NIKON  
CORPORATION, NIKON, INC., OLYMPUS CORP., OLYMPUS IMAGING  
AMERICA INC., PANASONIC CORPORATION (formerly known as  
MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INDUSTRIAL CO., LTD.), PANASONIC  
CORPORATION OF NORTH AMERICA, SAMSUNG OPTO-  
ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., SAMSUNG TECHWIN CO., AND  
VICTOR COMPANY OF JAPAN, LTD.,

*Defendant-Appellees.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in  
Case No. 1:07-mc-00493-RMC, United States District Judge Rosemary M. Collyer

---

**BRIEF FOR PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT  
PAPST LICENSING GMBH & CO. KG**

---

*Attorneys for Plaintiff-Appellant  
Papst Licensing GmbH & Co. KG*

February 20, 2014

Alan M. Fisch  
R. William Sigler  
John T. Battaglia  
Thomas C. Chen  
FISCH HOFFMAN SIGLER LLP  
5335 Wisconsin Avenue NW  
Eighth Floor  
Washington, DC 20015  
(202) 362-3500

## CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST

Counsel for Plaintiff-Appellant Papst Licensing GmbH & Co. KG. certifies:

1. The full name of every party or amicus represented by me is:

Papst Licensing GmbH & Co. KG

2. The name of the real party in interest (if the party named in the caption is not the real party in interest) represented by me is:

Not Applicable

3. All parent corporations and any publicly held companies that own 10 percent or more of the stock of the parties or amicus represented by me are:

None

4. The names of all law firms and partners or associates that appeared for the party or amicus now represented by me in the trial court or agency or are expected to appear in this court are:

Fisch Hoffman Sigler LLP: Alan M. Fisch; Roy William Sigler; John T. Battaglia, Thomas C. Chen

Husch Blackwell LLP: Jerold B. Schnayer; Walter J. Kawula, Jr.; William Francis Demarest, Jr.; James P. White; John Aron Carnahan; Joseph E. Cwik; Raymond R. Ricordati, III; Daniel R. Cherry; Yasmin S. Schnayer

Stein Mitchell & Muse, LLP: Robert F. Muse

Date: February 20, 2014

/s/ John T. Battaglia  
John T. Battaglia

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST ..... i

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ..... vii

STATEMENT OF RELATED CASES ..... xiii

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT ..... 1

INTRODUCTION ..... 2

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES ..... 6

STATEMENT OF THE CASE ..... 7

    I.    THE PATENTS-IN-SUIT ..... 7

        A.    Background of the Invention: Interface Devices  
            and Drivers ..... 7

            1.    Prior Art Interface Devices Suffered  
                Undesirable Tradeoffs Between Flexibility  
                Versus Speed ..... 8

                a.    Prior Art Interface Devices ..... 8

                b.    Prior Art Interface Devices Could Be  
                    Used in Specific Configurations for  
                    Specific Applications ..... 10

            2.    The Claimed Interface Device  
                Simultaneously Achieves Both Flexibility  
                and Speed By Relying on Host Drivers ..... 11

                a.    The Claimed Interface Device ..... 12

                b.    The Claimed Interface Device Can Be  
                    Used in Specific Configurations for  
                    Specific Applications ..... 12

            3.    The Patents Describe Various Embodiments  
                of the Claimed Invention to Demonstrate Its

..

Overall Superiority—*Independent* of Any  
Specific Structure or Use .....14

B. The Independent Claims Broadly Define the  
Interface Device Without Specifying Any  
Particular Structure or Use.....15

C. The Specification Discloses Various Ways in  
Which the Interface Device and Its Components  
May Be “Attached” .....20

D. The Specification Discloses Various “Customary”  
Input/Output Devices That May Be Simulated By  
the Claimed Interface Device.....21

E. The File History Confirms Patentability Did Not  
Turn on Any Specific Structural Configurations,  
Uses, or Types of Devices .....22

II. THE ACCUSED PRODUCTS.....22

III. THE DISTRICT COURT PROCEEDINGS .....23

A. Papst’s History of Innovation and Licensing.....23

B. Litigation Began After Unsuccessful Licensing  
Negotiations .....24

C. The District Court Narrowly Construed Several  
Claim Limitations and Granted Summary  
Judgment .....25

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....27

I. THE DISTRICT COURT REPEATED TWO  
FUNDAMENTAL CLAIM CONSTRUCTION  
ERRORS .....27

A. The District Court Wrongly Construed the  
Claimed “Interface Device” as a Separate, Stand-  
Alone Structure .....27

B. The District Court Wrongly Construed Single Words In Isolation, Divorced From Their Proper Context .....27

STANDARD OF REVIEW .....28

ARGUMENT .....29

I. THE DISTRICT COURT ERRED IN CONSTRUING “INTERFACE DEVICE” TO REQUIRE A STAND-ALONE STRUCTURE .....29

A. Papst’s Construction Is Correct Based on the Intrinsic Record and This Court’s Precedent.....30

1. The Claims Do Not Include Language Limiting the “Interface Device” to a Separate Stand-Alone Structure .....30

2. Nothing in the Specification Limits the Claimed “Interface Device” to a Separate, Stand-Alone Structure .....33

3. This Court Has Repeatedly Held That Separate Claim Elements Do *Not* Require Separate, Stand-Alone Structures .....35

B. The District Court’s Construction of “Interface Device” Relied on Additional Errors.....38

1. The District Court Further Read “Attached” as Requiring the “Interface Device” *Not* Have “Permanent” Attachments.....39

2. The District Court Improperly Relied on the Specification’s Embodiments and Figures to Narrow the Claims .....39

3. The District Court Misread Statements Regarding “Desirable” Flexibility to Narrow the Claims .....42

# 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.