

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
WACO DIVISION**

MULTIMEDIA CONTENT	§	
MANAGEMENT LLC,	§	Civil Action No.: 6:18-cv-00207-ADA
Plaintiff	§	
	§	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
v.	§	
	§	PATENT CASE
DISH NETWORK L.L.C.,	§	
Defendant.	§	
	§	

**PLAINTIFF’S RESPONSIVE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

In accordance with the Court’s Initial Scheduling Order, Plaintiff Multimedia Content Management LLC (“Plaintiff” or “MCM”) submits the following brief in response to Defendant Dish Network L.L.C.’s (“Defendant” or “Dish) opening claim construction brief, D.I. 48.

Contents

- I. Introduction ..... 4
- II. Disputed Terms of the Independent Claims ..... 4
  - A. Disputed Term No. 1 – “to generate controller instructions” ..... 4
  - B. Disputed Term No. 2 – “a controller node” ..... 7
  - C. Disputed Term No. 3 – “a service provider network” ..... 9
  - D. Disputed Term No. 4 – “selectively transmit[ing, by the plurality of gateway units,] the content requests to the service provider network in accordance with the controller instructions” ..... 11
  - E. Disputed Term No. 5 – “gateway units” ..... 13
  - F. Disputed Term No. 6 – “network elements” ..... 14
- III. Disputed Terms of the Independent Claims ..... 14
  - A. Disputed Term No. 7 – “if the gateway unit enters the inactive state” (’468 Patent, Claim 29) 15
  - B. Disputed Term No. 8 – “registration information” (’468 Patent, Claim 33) ..... 15
  - C. Disputed Term No. 9 – “uniquely” ..... 16
  - D. Disputed Term No. 13 – “initial operating parameters” (’468 Patent, Claim 33) ..... 16
  - E. Disputed Term No. 8 – “subscriber management system” (’925 Patent, Claim 25) ..... 17
  - F. Disputed Term No. 9 – “authenticate subscribers or devices before allowing access into the service provider network” (’925 Patent, Claim 25) ..... 17
- IV. Dish’s Expert Declaration ..... 18
  - A. Dish’s Declaration ..... 18
  - B. Dish’s Declaration is Irrelevant to Claim Construction ..... 20
- V. Conclusion ..... 21

## Exhibit List

Exhibit No.	Description
2001	Declaration of Mr. Joel R. Williams
2002	File History of U.S. Patent Application No. 13/369,174
2003	Decision Denying Institution of <i>Inter Partes</i> Review, IPR2017-01934, Paper No. 10
2004	U.S. Patent No. 8,799,468
2005	U.S. Patent No. 9,465,925

## I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Multimedia Content Management LLC (“Plaintiff” or “MCM”) submits the following brief in response to Dish’s claim constructions brief submitted to the Court on March 15, 2019, D.I. 48. As detailed below, Dish’s proposed constructions are not supported by, and are inconsistent with, the specifications and file histories of the patents-in-suit.

In accordance with the Court’s Scheduling Order, D.I. 33 (Jan. 4, 2019), and the parties’ Joint Stipulation Regarding Proposed Amended Scheduling Order, D.I. 42 (March 12, 2019), the parties have not scheduled any exchange of extrinsic evidence regarding claim construction and no discovery has taken place. MCM does not believe any extrinsic evidence is necessary for the Court to properly construe the disputed terms, and therefore MCM has not cited to any extrinsic evidence in support of its proposed constructions. MCM objects to Dish’s Expert Declaration, submitted as Exhibit E to Dish’s Claim Construction Brief, as wholly irrelevant to any issue of claim construction and MCM submits that such Declaration should be disregarded in its entirety.

## II. DISPUTED TERMS OF THE INDEPENDENT CLAIMS

### A. Disputed Term No. 1 – “to generate controller instructions”

Plaintiff’s Construction	Defendant’s Construction
“generate computer processor-executable instructions, excluding merely a uniform resource locator (URL) or an internet protocol (IP) address”	“to create[ing] or bring[ing] into being computer executable instructions that determine whether to transmit or not transmit a content request from a user to the service provider network”
Plaintiff’s Amended Construction	
“generate computer processor-executable instructions, excluding merely a uniform resource locator (URL) or an internet protocol (IP) address, <u>excluding operations in which the controller instructions are only transmitted or are relayed by a device</u> ”	

Dish's primary concern with MCM's proposed construction appears to be "when controller instructions are 'transmitted' or 'relayed,' the instructions do not fall within the scope of the claimed 'generating' term." Dish's Opening Claim Construction Brief ("Dish Brief"), Dkt. 48 at 3. MCM agrees with this statement. *See* Ex. A to Dish Brief (Patent Owner's Preliminary Response in IPR2017-01934) at 12–13; Dish Brief at 4–5. In an effort to simplify claim construction issues, MCM therefore proposes to amend its proposed construction to make explicit that generating controller instructions does not include merely transmitting or relaying instructions. Dish rejected MCM's offer to jointly approve this amended construction.

Dish proposes to interpret "generate" as "create" or "bring into being." Dish Brief at 3–5. Dish offers no explanation as to why these additional words are more helpful, less ambiguous, or more consistent with the specification of the '468 Patent than the word "generate." *Id.* Dish instead relies on a general-purpose dictionary. *Id.* While noting that this extrinsic evidence is unnecessary, MCM has addressed, with the amended construction, Dish's concern that "generate" may somehow include "a construction encompassing 'transmitted' or 'relayed' instructions." *Id.* at 5.

The parties agree that "controller instructions" are computer-processor executable. *Id.* at 3; MCM's Opening Claim Construction Brief ("MCM Brief") at 8. Beyond that, Dish attempts to limit "controller instructions" to those controller instructions that are only concerned with "instructions that determine whether to transmit or not transmit a content request from a user to the service provider network." Dish Brief at 3, 5–6. This construction improperly narrows "controller instructions" to a specific embodiment of the '468 Patent and is inconsistent with the specification of the '468 Patent.

First, Dish argues that determining whether to transmit or not transmit a content request "is more appropriately included in the construction of 'controller instructions' because that

# 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.