

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

UNILOC USA, INC. ET AL.,
Plaintiffs,

v.
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA,
INC. ET AL.,
Defendants.

Case No. 2:18-cv-00040-JRG-RSP

UNILOC USA, INC. ET AL.,
Plaintiffs,

v.
HUAWEI DEVICE USA INC. ET AL.,
Defendants.

Case No. 2:18-cv-00074-JRG-RSP

CLAIM CONSTRUCTION MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Case No. 2:18-cv-00040 (the “’040 Case”) and Case No. 2:18-cv-00074 (the “’074 Case”) have been consolidated for Claim Construction Proceedings. ’040 Case, Dkt. No. 56; ’074 Case, Dkt. No. 41. Before the Court are the briefs of Uniloc USA, Inc., Uniloc Luxembourg, S.A., and Uniloc 2017 LLC (collectively “Plaintiffs”) (’040 Case, Dkt Nos. 64 and 69; ’074 Case, Dkt Nos. 42 and 45)¹ and the briefs of Samsung Electronics America, Inc., Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd, Huawei Device USA, Inc., and Huawei Device Co. Ltd., (collectively “Defendants”) (’040 Case, Dkt No. 68; ’074 Case, Dkt No. 44). The Court held a hearing on the issues of claim construction and claim definiteness on March 19, 2019. Having considered the arguments and evidence presented by the parties at the hearing and in their briefing, the Court issues this Order.

¹ Citations to the parties’ filings are to the filing’s number in the docket (Dkt. No.) and pin cites are to the page numbers assigned through ECF.

Table of Contents

I. BACKGROUND 3

II. LEGAL PRINCIPLES 4

A. Claim Construction 4

B. Departing from the Ordinary Meaning of a Claim Term..... 7

C. Functional Claiming and 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 6 (pre-AIA) / § 112(f) (AIA)..... 8

D. Definiteness Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 (pre-AIA) / § 112(b) (AIA) 10

III. CONSTRUCTION OF DISPUTED TERMS..... 11

A. “primary station” and “secondary station” 11

B. “inquiry message” 15

C. “predetermined data fields” and “additional data field for polling” 17

D. “determining when” 21

E. “poll,” “been polled,” “polled secondary station,” and “polling” 23

F. “means [are provided] for broadcasting a series of inquiry messages” and
“means are provided for receiving an inquiry message” 26

G. “means for adding to an inquiry message,” “means ... for adding to each
inquiry message,” and “means ... for adding the additional data field at the
end of a respective inquiry message” 29

H. “means [...] for determining when an additional data field has been added
to the plurality of data fields” 34

I. “means ... for determining whether [the secondary station] has been
polled from the additional data field” 37

J. “means ... for responding to a poll when it has data for transmission to the
primary station” 39

K. “means are provided for including an indication in one of the
predetermined data fields” 40

IV. CONCLUSION 42

I. BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs allege infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,993,049 (the “’049 Patent”). The ’049 Patent is entitled “Communication System.” The application leading to the ’049 Patent was filed on June 7, 2001, and the patent issued on January 31, 2006. The ’049 Patent includes a foreign priority claim to an application filed June 26, 2000.

In general, the ’049 Patent is directed to improving the responsiveness of a communication system by polling devices using a broadcast channel as part of the system’s inquiry procedure.

The abstract of the ’049 Patent provides:

A communications system comprises a primary station (100) and at least one secondary station (101). The primary station (100) is arranged to broadcast a series of inquiry messages, each in the form of a plurality of predetermined data fields arranged according to a first communications protocol such as Bluetooth. In addition the primary station (100) adds to some or all of the inquiry messages an additional data field for polling one or more secondary stations, which can respond to the poll if they have data for transmission. This system provides secondary stations (101) with a rapid response time without the need for a permanently active communication link.

Claims 1 and 11 of the ’049 Patent, exemplary system and method claims respectively, recite as follows:

1. A communications system comprising a primary station and at least one secondary station, wherein the primary station has means for broadcasting a series of inquiry messages, each in the form of a plurality of predetermined data fields arranged according to a first communications protocol, and means for adding to an inquiry message prior to transmission an additional data field for polling at least one secondary station, and wherein the at least one polled secondary station has means for determining when an additional data field has been added to the plurality of data fields, for determining whether it has been polled from the additional data field and for responding to a poll when it has data for transmission to the primary station.

11. A method of operating a communication system comprising a primary station and at least one secondary station, the method comprising the primary station broadcasting a series of inquiry messages, each in the form of a plurality of predetermined data fields arranged according to a first communications protocol, and adding to an inquiry message prior to transmission an additional data field for polling at least one secondary station, and further comprising the

at least one polled secondary station determining when an additional data field has been added to the plurality of data fields, determining whether it has been polled from the additional data field and responding to a poll when it has data for transmission to the primary station.

II. LEGAL PRINCIPLES

A. Claim Construction

“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) (en banc) (quoting *Innova/Pure Water Inc. v. Safari Water Filtration Sys., Inc.*, 381 F.3d 1111, 1115 (Fed. Cir. 2004)). To determine the meaning of the claims, courts start by considering the intrinsic evidence. *Id.* at 1313; *C.R. Bard, Inc. v. U.S. Surgical Corp.*, 388 F.3d 858, 861 (Fed. Cir. 2004); *Bell Atl. Network Servs., Inc. v. Covad Commc’ns Group, Inc.*, 262 F.3d 1258, 1267 (Fed. Cir. 2001). The intrinsic evidence includes the claims themselves, the specification, and the prosecution history. *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1314; *C.R. Bard, Inc.*, 388 F.3d at 861. The general rule—subject to certain specific exceptions discussed *infra*—is that each claim term is construed according to its ordinary and accustomed meaning as understood by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention in the context of the patent. *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1312–13; *Alloc, Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n*, 342 F.3d 1361, 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *Azure Networks, LLC v. CSR PLC*, 771 F.3d 1336, 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (“There is a heavy presumption that claim terms carry their accustomed meaning in the relevant community at the relevant time.”) (vacated on other grounds).

“The claim construction inquiry . . . begins and ends in all cases with the actual words of the claim.” *Renishaw PLC v. Marposs Societa’ per Azioni*, 158 F.3d 1243, 1248 (Fed. Cir. 1998). “[I]n all aspects of claim construction, ‘the name of the game is the claim.’” *Apple Inc. v. Motorola, Inc.*, 757 F.3d 1286, 1298 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (quoting *In re Hiniker Co.*, 150 F.3d 1362, 1369 (Fed.

Cir. 1998)). First, a term's context in the asserted claim can be instructive. *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1314. Other asserted or unasserted claims can also aid in determining the claim's meaning because claim terms are typically used consistently throughout the patent. *Id.* Differences among the claim terms can also assist in understanding a term's meaning. *Id.* For example, when a dependent claim adds a limitation to an independent claim, it is presumed that the independent claim does not include the limitation. *Id.* at 1314–15.

“[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) (en banc)). “[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. Conceptor, Inc.*, 90 F.3d 1576, 1582 (Fed. Cir. 1996)); *Teleflex, Inc. v. Ficoso N. Am. Corp.*, 299 F.3d 1313, 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2002). But, “[a]lthough the specification may aid the court in interpreting the meaning of disputed claim language, particular embodiments and examples appearing in the specification will not generally be read into the claims.” *Comark Commc'ns, Inc. v. Harris Corp.*, 156 F.3d 1182, 1187 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (quoting *Constant v. Advanced Micro-Devices, Inc.*, 848 F.2d 1560, 1571 (Fed. Cir. 1988)); *see also Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1323. “[I]t is improper to read limitations from a preferred embodiment described in the specification—even if it is the only embodiment—into the claims absent a clear indication in the intrinsic record that the patentee intended the claims to be so limited.” *Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.*, 358 F.3d 898, 913 (Fed. Cir. 2004).

The prosecution history is another tool to supply the proper context for claim construction because, like the specification, the prosecution history provides evidence of how the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (“PTO”) and the inventor understood the patent. *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1317.

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.