

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

UNILOC 2017 LLC,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 18-01841-RGA-SRF (cons.)
)	
MOTOROLA MOBILITY, LLC,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

JOINT CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF

O'KELLY ERNST, LLC
Sean T. O'Kelly (#4349)
Thomas H. Kramer(#6171)
901 N. Market St.
Suite 1000
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 778-4000
sokelly@oelgal.com
tkramer@oelegal.com

POTTER ANDERSON & CORROON LLP
Philip A. Rovner (#3215)
Jonathan A. Choa (#5319)
Hercules Plaza
P.O. Box 951
Wilmington, DE 19899
(302) 984-6000
provner@potteranderson.com
jchoa@potteranderson.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Attorneys for Defendant

OF COUNSEL:

OF COUNSEL:

Paul J. Hayes
Kevin Gannon
James J. Foster
Aaron Jacobs
PRINCE LOBEL TYE LLP
One International Place, Suite 3700
Boston, MA 02110
Tel: (617) 456-8000

Martin Bader
Nam Kim
Michael Heins
SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER
& HAMPTON LLP
12275 El Camino Real
San Diego, CA 92130-4092
(858) 720-8900

Lai L. Yip
Yasamin Parsafar
SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER &
HAMPTON LLP
Four Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, CA 94111
(415) 434-9100

Dated: December 23, 2019

MICROSOFT - EXHIBIT 1018
MICROSOFT CORP. v.
UNILOC 2017 LLC
IPR2019-01471

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Plaintiff’s Opening Introductory Remarks.....	1
B. Defendant’s Answering Introductory Remarks	2
C. Plaintiff’s Reply Introductory Remarks.....	7
D. Defendant’s Sur-Reply Introductory Remarks	7
II. AGREED TERMS	8
III. DISPUTED TERMS.....	9
A. “linked user identification module” (Claims 1-20).....	9
B. “blocking means for preventing a normal operation of the mobile radiotelephony device” (Claims 1-9).....	30
C. “timing means for activating the blocking means in response to the mobile radiotelephony device being inactive during the normal operation of the mobile radiotelephony device for a defined period of time subsequent to a mounting of a linked user identification module inside the mobile radiotelephony device” (Claims 1-9).....	45
D. “deblocking means for permitting the normal operation of the mobile radiotelephony device in response to a supply of a deblocking code to the mobile radiotelephony device subsequent to the mounting of the linked user identification module inside the mobile radiotelephony device and subsequent to the defined period of time” (Claims 1-9).....	54
E. “locking means” (Claim 4)	61
F. “connecting means” (Claim 5).....	65
G. (i) “inactivity of the mobile radiotelephony device during a normal operation of the mobile radiotelephony device” (Claims 10-14, 17, 18);	69
(ii) “inactive during the normal operation of the mobile radiotelephony device” (Claims 10-14, 17, 18).....	69
H. (i) “in response to the verification of the linked user identification module and in response to the detection of the period of inactivity of the mobile radiotelephony device” (Claims 10-14, 17, 18);.....	71

(ii) “in response to the verification of the linked user identification module and in response to a supply of a deblocking code to the mobile radiotelephony device subsequent to the detection of the period of inactivity of the mobile radiotelephony device” (Claims 10-14, 17, 18).....71

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
<u>Cases</u>	
<i>Abbott Labs. V. Sandoz, Inc.</i> 544 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	10, 11, 25
<i>Amgen Inc. v. Hoechst Marion Roussel, Inc.</i> 314 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	22, 28
<i>Aristocrat Techs. Australia Pty Ltd. v. Int’l Game Tech.</i> 521 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	36, 37
<i>B. Braun Med., Inc. v. Abbott Labs.</i> 124 F.3d 1419 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	62
<i>BASF Corp. v. Johnson Matthey Inc.</i> 875 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	41
<i>Biosig Instruments, Inc. v. Nautilus, Inc.</i> 783 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	49
<i>Blackboard, Inc. v. Desire2Learn, Inc.</i> 574 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	36, 47, 48
<i>Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.</i> 732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	21
<i>Cave Consulting Grp., LLC v. OptumInsight, Inc.</i> 725 F. App’x 988 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	28
<i>Chiron Corp. v. Genentech, Inc.</i> 363 F.3d 1247 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	19
<i>Comark Commc’ns, Inc. v. Harris Corp.</i> 156 F.3d 1182 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	22, 28
<i>Ecolab Inc. v. Paraclipse, Inc.</i> 285 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	22, 28
<i>EON Corp. IP Holdings LLC v. AT & T Mobility LLC</i> 785 F.3d 616 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	37, 47, 48
<i>EON Corp. IP Holdings, LLC v. FLO TV Inc.</i> No. CV 10-812-RGA, 2014 WL 906182 (D. Del. Mar. 4, 2014) (Andrews, J.)	37
<i>Ergo Licensing, LLC v. CareFusion 303, Inc.</i> 673 F.3d 1361 (Fed.Cir.2012).....	37

Forest Labs., LLC v. Sigmapharm Labs., LLC
 918 F.3d 928 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....12, 25

GE Lighting Sols., LLC v. AgiLight, Inc.
 750 F.3d 1304 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....25, 30

Gentry Gallery, Inc. v. Berkline Corp.
 134 F.3d 1473 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....19

Hockerson-Halberstadt, Inc. v. Converse Inc.
 183 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....45

Honeywell International, Inc. v. ITT Industries, Inc.
 452 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....13, 25, 30

In re Johnston
 435 F.3d 1381 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....58

JVW Enter., Inc. v. Interact Accessories, Inc.
 424 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....31, 46, 55, 62, 66

In re Katz Interactive Call Processing Patent Litig.
 639 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....37, 47, 51, 67, 69

KCJ Corp. v. Kinetic Concepts, Inc.
 223 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....40

Lockhead Martin Corp. v. Space Sys./Loral, Inc.
 249 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....39, 40, 57, 58, 63

Luminara Worldwide, LLC v. Liown Elecs. Co.
 814 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....12

Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.
 52 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (*en banc*), aff'd, 517 U.S. 370 (1996).....9

Medical Instrumentation & Diagnostics Corp. v. Elekta AB
 344 F.3d 1205 (Fed.Cir.2003).....38

Meds. Co. v. Mylan, Inc.
 853 F.3d 1296 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....12

Micro Chem., Inc. v. Great Plains Chem. Co.
 194 F.3d 1250 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....34, 35, 57, 61

Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.
 572 U.S. 898 (2014).....51

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.