

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20436

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

In the Matter of

CERTAIN ROBOTIC VACUUM
CLEANING DEVICES AND
COMPONENTS THEREOF SUCH AS
SPARE PARTS

Investigation No. 337-TA-1057

RESPONDENTS' OPENING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	RELEVANT CLAIM CONSTRUCTION PRINCIPLES	2
	A. GENERAL PRINCIPLES	2
	B. MEANS-PLUS-FUNCTION LIMITATIONS.....	4
III.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION OF THE DISPUTED TERMS	5
	A. '308 PATENT	5
	1. '308 brief summary	5
	2. '308 level of skill in the art	7
	3. '308 disputed terms	8
	a. “Sensor subsystem for an autonomous robot”	8
	B. '090 PATENT	9
	1. '090 brief summary	9
	2. '090 level of skill in the art	10
	3. '090 disputed terms	10
	a. “Housing”	10
	C. '233 PATENT	13
	1. '233 brief summary	13
	2. '233 patent level of skill in the art	15
	3. '233 disputed terms	15
	a. “Pass between”	15
	D. '490 PATENT	18
	1. '490 brief summary	18
	2. '490 level of skill in the art	19
	3. '490 disputed terms	21
	a. “Bounce mode”	21
	b. “Isolated area”	26
	c. “Control system”	30
	E. '553 PATENT	39
	1. '553 brief summary	39
	2. '553 level of skill in the art	42

..

3.	<i>'553 disputed terms</i>	42
a.	“Speed setting”	42
b.	“Heading setting”	43
c.	“While continuing toward the object”	44
F.	'924 PATENT	50
1.	<i>'924 brief summary</i>	50
2.	<i>'924 level of skill in the art</i>	51
3.	<i>'924 disputed terms</i>	51
IV.	CONCLUSION	56

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Advanced Display Sys. v. Kent State University</i> , 212 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	2, 50
<i>Advanced Ground Info. Sys., Inc. v. Life360, Inc.</i> , 830 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	34
<i>Advanced Ground Info. Sys. v. Life360, Inc.</i> , No. 2015-1732, 2016 U.S. App. LEXIS 13707 (Fed. Cir. Jul. 28, 2016).....	5
<i>Amgen, Inc. v. Hoechst Marion Roussel</i> , 314 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	30
<i>Athletic Alternatives, Inc. v. Prince Mfg.</i> , 73 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	58
<i>B. Braun Med., Inc. v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 124 F.3d 1419 (Fed.Cir. 1997).....	35
<i>Becton Dickinson & Co. v. C.R. Bard, Inc.</i> , 922 F.2d 792. (1990).....	55
<i>Becton, Dickinson and Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Group</i> , 616 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	11
<i>CAE Screenplates Inc. v. Heinrich Fiedler GmbH & Co. KG</i> , 224 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	48
<i>CCS Fitness, Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.</i> , 288 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	4
<i>Certain Computing or Graphics Systems</i> , Inv. No. 337-TA-984, Order No. 42, at 12 (Jul. 15, 2016).....	5
<i>Edwards Lifesciences LLC v. Cook Inc.</i> , 582 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	4
<i>Engel Indus. Inc. v. Lockformer Co.</i> , 96 F.3d 1398 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	11
<i>Enviroco Corp. v. Clestra Cleanroom, Inc.</i> , 209 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	5

<i>Gaus v. Conair Corp.</i> , 363 F.3d 1284 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	11
<i>Halliburton Energy Servs., Inc. v. M-I LLC</i> , 514 F.3d 1244 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	48
<i>Interactive Gift Exp., Inc. v. Compuserve Inc.</i> , 256 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	11, 47
<i>IPXL Holdings, L.L.C. v. Amazon.Com, Inc.</i> , 430 F.3d 1377, 1384 (2005).....	40
<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.</i> , 52 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (<i>en banc</i>), <i>aff'd</i> , 517 U.S. 370 (1996).....	2
<i>Mas-Hamilton Group v. LaGard, Inc.</i> , 156 F.3d 1206, 1213 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	34
<i>Massachusetts Instit. of Tech. v. Abacus Software</i> , 462 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	34
<i>Media Rights Techs, Inc. v. Capital One Financial Corp.</i> , 800 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	34
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Multi-Tech Sys., Inc.</i> , 357 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	49
<i>O2 Micro Int'l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co.</i> , 521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	46
<i>Pacing Techs., LLC v. Garmin Intern., Inc.</i> , 778 F. 3d 1021 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	8, 9
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (<i>en banc</i>)	2, 3, 16
<i>Primos, Inc. v. Hunter's Specialties, Inc.</i> , 451 F.3d 841 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	11
<i>Renishaw PLC v. Marposs Societa' per Azioni</i> , 158 F.3d 1243 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	3
<i>Rheox, Inc. v. Entact, Inc.</i> , 276 F.3d 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	4
<i>Robert Bosch, LLC v. Snap-On Inc.</i> , 769 F.3d 1094 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	5, 34

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.