

1 Jonathan D. Baker (SBN 196062)  
jdbaker@dickinsonwright.com  
2 DICKINSON WRIGHT RLLP  
3 800 W. California Avenue, Suite 110  
Sunnyvale, CA 94086  
4 Telephone: (408) 701-6200  
5 Facsimile: (844) 670-6009

6 Steven R. Daniels (SBN 235398)  
sdaniels@dickinsonwright.com  
7 Michael D. Saunders (SBN 259692)  
8 msanders@dickinsonwright.com  
9 DICKINSON WRIGHT PLLC  
607 W. 3rd Street, Suite 2500  
10 Austin, Texas 78701  
11 Telephone: (512) 770-4200  
12 Facsimile: (844) 670-6009

13 *Attorneys for Defendant Roku, Inc.*

14 Additional counsel on signature page

15 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
16 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

17 UNIVERSAL ELECTRONICS INC.,  
18 a Delaware Company,

19 Plaintiff,

20 v.

21 ROKU, INC.,  
22 a Delaware Company,

23 Defendant.

Case No. 8:18-cv-01580-JVS-ADS

**ROKU'S OPENING CLAIM  
CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

INTRODUCTION ..... 1

BACKGROUND ..... 1

LEGAL STANDARDS ..... 3

ARGUMENT ..... 4

    I.    THE TEN DISPUTED TERMS FOR CONSTRUCTION AT  
          THE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION HEARING ..... 4

        A.    “key code signal” (Mui ’642, ’389 and ’325 Patents) ..... 4

            1.    The “key code signal” contains a *modulated* key  
                    code ..... 4

            2.    The “key code signal” controls a specific type,  
                    brand, and model of consumer electronic device ..... 6

            3.    UEI has disclaimed signals containing key codes to  
                    be stored on the remote control for later use in  
                    generating IR signals from the scope of “key code  
                    signal” ..... 8

        B.    “key code generator device” (Mui ’642, ’389 and ’325  
                Patents) ..... 9

            1.    “key code generator device” should be construed as  
                    a means-plus-function limitation because “device”  
                    is a nonce word and “key code generator” is purely  
                    functional ..... 9

            2.    The specification does not contain adequate  
                    corresponding structure for generating key codes ..... 11

        C.    “by using an identity associated with the intended target  
                appliance to create a listing comprised of at least a first  
                communication method and a second communication  
                method different than the first communication method for  
                use in controlling each of at least a first functional  
                operation and a second functional operation of the  
                intended target appliance” (Arling ’853 Patent) ..... 13



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1. The “by using an identity” phrase modifies the “to create a listing” phrase.....13

2. The listing must contain at least two different communication methods, each of which can control and is associated with the same two or more functional operations of the same, single target appliance .....14

3. UEI has disclaimed selecting a communication protocol and thereafter using the selected communication protocol for all commands sent to the target appliance .....16

D. “universal controlling device” (Janik ’309, ’504, and ’505 Patents).....17

E. “second data representative of the motion made across the touch-sensitive surface” (Janik ’309 Patent) .....18

F. “second input type indicative of a motion made across the touch-sensitive surface” / “second input type indicative of a moving touch made across the touch-sensitive surface” (Janik ’309, ’504, and ’505 Patents) .....19

G. “automatically created” (Scott ’532 Patent) .....20

H. “sequence of instructions” (Scott ’532 Patent).....20

I. “causing the automatically created sequence of instructions to be executed by the controlling device in response to a selection of a user input element of the controlling device” (Scott ’532 Patent) .....22

J. “event journal” (Scott ’446 Patent).....24

CONCLUSION.....25

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

<b>CASE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
<i>Brand Indus., Ltd. v. Harvest Int’l Corp.</i> , 2016 WL 1452402 (N.D. Iowa April 13, 2016).....	19
<i>Computer Docking Station Corp. v. Dell, Inc.</i> , 519 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	3
<i>Cont’l Circuits LLC v. Intel Corp.</i> , 915 F.3d 788 (Fed. Cir. 2019) .....	17, 25
<i>Edwards Lifesciences LLC v. Cook Inc.</i> , 582 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	17, 25
<i>Elkay Mfg. Co. v. EBCO Mfg. Co.</i> , 192 F.3d 973 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....	16
<i>Eon Corp. v. Silver Springs Networks</i> , 815 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	19
<i>Gentry Gallery, Inc. v. Berkline Corp.</i> , 134 F.3d 1473 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....	3
<i>Indacon, Inc. v. Facebook, Inc.</i> , 824 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	3, 4, 5
<i>Joao Control &amp; Monitoring Sys., LLC v. Protect Am., Inc.</i> , No. 1-14-CV-134-LY, 2015 WL 4937464 (W.D. Tex. Aug. 18, 2015).....	11
<i>Johnson Worldwide Assocs., Inc. v. Zebco Corp.</i> , 175 F.3d 985 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....	17
<i>Mantech Envtl. Corp. v. Hudson Envtl. Servs., Inc.</i> , 152 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....	24
<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.</i> , 52 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 1995), <i>aff’d</i> 517 U.S. 370 (1996).....	3
<i>Mobile Telecom. Techs., LLC v. Blackberry Corp.</i> , 2016 WL 6271703 (N.D. Tex. May 6, 2016).....	12
<i>O2 Micro Int’l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co., Ltd.</i> , 521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	19, 25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (cont.)**

*Phillips v. AWH Corp.*,  
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....3, 4

*Power Integrations, Inc. v. Fairchild Semicon. Int’l, Inc.*,  
711 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....5, 21

*Randall May Int’l Inc. v. Pearl Corp.*,  
2014 WL 2930725 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 11, 2014) (Selna, J.) .....19, 20

*Renishaw PLC v. Marposs Societa’ per Azioni*,  
158 F.3d 1243 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....1

*Ruckus Wireless, Inc. v. Innovative Wireless Sols., LLC*,  
824 F.3d 999 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....7

*Springs Window Fashions LP v. Novo Indus.*,  
323 F.3d 989 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....3, 9, 14

*Trustees of Columbia Univ. v. Symantec*,  
811 F. 3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....4, 21

*Tuna Processors, Inc. v. Hawaii Int’l Seafood, Inc.*,  
327 F. App’x 204 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....24

*Universal Elecs., Inc. v. Peel Techs., Inc.*,  
2014 WL 5488896 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 17, 2014) .....19

*Verizon Servs. Corp. v. Vonage Holdings Corp.*,  
503 F.3d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....7

*Williamson v. Citrix*,  
792 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....9, 10, 11, 12

*WMS Gaming, Inc. v. Int’l Game Tech.*,  
184 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....12

# 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.