

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

FINTIV, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Civil Action No.: 6:18-CV-372-ADA

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

PLAINTIFF FINTIV, INC.'S RESPONSIVE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|-------------|
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| II. LEGAL FRAMEWORK FOR CLAIM CONSTRUCTION | 2 |
| A. Claims are Presumed to Carry Their Plain and Ordinary Meaning | 2 |
| B. In Claim Construction, a Layperson’s Perspective Should Not be Substituted for the Perspective of a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art | 3 |
| C. Claims Need Not Be Expressly Construed | 4 |
| III. THE DISPUTED CLAIM TERMS | 5 |
| A. “wallet management applet (WMA)” (Claims 11 and 23) | 5 |
| 1. Apple’s Construction is Improper and Should be Rejected | 6 |
| 2. Apple Cites to No Evidence of Claim Scope Disclaimer | 7 |
| a. The ’125 Patent Specification Does not Support Apple’s Narrowing of Claim Scope | 8 |
| b. Apple’s Mischaracterization of Case Law Does Not Overcome its Obligation to Prove Claim Scope Disclaimer | 9 |
| 3. Fintiv’s Proposal Should be Adopted | 10 |
| B. “widget” (claims 11, 18, and 23) | 11 |
| 1. Apple’s Construction is Improper and Should be Rejected | 11 |
| 2. Fintiv’s Proposal Should be Adopted | 13 |
| C. “mobile wallet application” (all asserted claims) | 13 |
| 1. Apple’s Construction is Improper and Should be Rejected | 14 |
| 2. Fintiv’s Proposal Should be Adopted | 15 |
| D. “SE information” (Claims 14 and 23) | 16 |
| E. “mobile device information” (Claims 14, 18, and 23) | 16 |
| 1. Apple’s Construction is Improper and Should be Rejected | 16 |
| 2. Fintiv’s Proposal Should be Adopted | 17 |
| F. “over-the-air (OTA) proxy” (Claim 23) and “OTA proxy” (claim 16) | 18 |
| 1. Apple’s Construction is Improper and Should be Rejected | 18 |
| 2. Fintiv’s Proposal Should be Adopted | 19 |
| G. “provision[ing]” (Claims 11 and 23) | 21 |
| IV. CONCLUSION | 21 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| | Page(s) |
|--|----------------|
| Cases | |
| <i>Cadence Pharm. Inc. v. Exela PharmSci Inc.</i> , 780 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... | 2, 9 |
| <i>Epistar Corp. v. Int’l Trade Com’n</i> , 566 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2009)..... | 2 |
| <i>Info-Hold, Inc. v. Applied Media Techs. Corp.</i> , 783 F.3d 1262 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... | 7, 14, 17, 18 |
| <i>Interval Licensing LLC v. AOL, Inc.</i> , 766 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... | 10 |
| <i>Iridescent Networks, Inc. v. AT&T Mobility, LLC</i> , 933 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2019)..... | 9 |
| <i>Levitation Arts, Inc. v. Fascinations Toys & Gifts, Inc.</i> , No. A-07-CA-990-SS, 2009 WL 1270394 (W.D. Tex. April 2, 2009) | 5 |
| <i>Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 898 (Fed. Cir. 2004)..... | 7, 12 |
| <i>MV3 Partners LLC v. Roku, Inc.</i> , No.6:18-cv-308-ADA, D.I. 90 (W.D. Tex. Oct. 2, 2019)..... | 4 |
| <i>NTP, Inc. v. Research In Motion, Ltd.</i> , 418 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... | 4 |
| <i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (<i>en banc</i>) | 3 |
| <i>Pisony v. Commando Constr., Inc.</i> , No. W-17-CV-00055-ADA, 2019 WL 928406 (W.D. Tex. Jan. 23, 2019) | 4, 5 |
| <i>Searfoss v. Pioneer Consol. Corp.</i> , 374 F.3d 1142 (Fed. Cir. 2004)..... | 3 |
| <i>Teleflex, Inc. v. Ficoso N. Am. Corp.</i> , 229 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2002)..... | 7, 12 |
| <i>Thorner v. Sony Computer Entm’t Am. LLC</i> , 669 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... | 7, 12 |

U.S. Surgical Corp. v. Ethicon, Inc.,
103 F.3d 1554 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....16, 21

Western Union Co. v. Moneygram Int’l, Inc.,
No. A-07-CA-372-SS, 2008 WL 5731946 (W.D. Tex. Nov. 6, 2008).....5

Other Authorities

Random House Webster’s Dictionary 4th Edition.....6

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Fintiv, Inc. (“Fintiv”) submits this Responsive Claim Construction Brief in support of Fintiv’s proposed claim construction of the terms and phrases identified for construction from the claims of U.S. Patent No. 8,843,125 (“the ’125 Patent” or “Patent-in-Suit”) and in response to Defendant Apple Inc.’s (“Apple”) Opening Claim Construction Brief.

Despite Apple’s lengthy arguments, the ’125 Patent’s claims are clear, unambiguous, and can be readily understood by a person of ordinary skill in the art. Apple seeks to rewrite the claims without showing that the patentee acted as his own lexicographer or disclaimed claim scope. Accordingly, no special construction need to be given to these terms, and they should be afforded their plain and ordinary meaning.

In its Opening Brief (D.I. 71), Apple asks the Court to ignore the plain and ordinary meaning of the disputed claim terms and limit those terms based on selective portions of the intrinsic record. Apple does this in a transparent attempt to manufacture a non-infringement argument rather than to clarify ambiguous claim terms as intended by *Markman*. The Court should not re-write the claims to advance Apple’s non-infringement arguments.

Apple also improperly asks the Court to substitute a layperson’s perspective for that of a person of ordinary skill in the art to construe the claims in contravention of well-established Federal Circuit law. The constructions Apple proposes, however, would not assist the jury, and would result in jury confusion.

For these reasons and as set forth more fully below, this Court should reject Apple’s proposed constructions and adopt those of Fintiv.

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.