

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

PACKET INTELLIGENCE LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.,

Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Civil Action No. 2:14-cv-252-JRG

Jury Trial Requested

**PACKET INTELLIGENCE LLC'S
OPENING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction and Overview of Patented Technology 1

II. Legal Principles of Claim Construction..... 1

III. Terms for Construction Without MPF Proposals 1

 A. “conversational flow” and “conversational flow sequence” (Ex. L, Terms 5, 6)..... 1

 B. “child protocol” (Ex. L, Term 4) 3

 C. “parser record” (Ex. L, Term 15) 5

 D. “flow entry” (Ex. L, Term 7)..... 7

 E. “none or more” (Ex. L, Term 13) 10

IV. Terms for Construction With MPF Proposals 11

 A. “parser subsystem” (Ex. L, Term 16) 12

 B. “analyzer subsystem” (Ex. L, Term 3) 15

 C. “lookup engine” (Ex. L, Term 11)..... 18

 D. “flow insertion engine” (Ex. L, Term 8) 20

 E. “protocol/state identification mechanism” (Ex. L, Term 18) 22

 F. “mechanism of building a hash” (Ex. L, Term 12) 24

V. Cisco’s Additional Terms Proposed for Construction 25

 A. “packet monitor” (Ex. L, Term 14) 26

 B. “A method of examining packets passing through a connection point on a computer network” (Ex. L, Term 2)..... 28

 C. “A method for analyzing a flow of packets passing through a connection point on a computer network” (Ex. L, Term 1)..... 28

 D. “performing one or more parsing/extraction operations on the packet to create a parser record comprising a function of selected portions of the packet” (Ex. L, Term 17) 28

 E. “looking up a flow-entry database comprising none or more flow-entries for previously encountered conversational flows, the looking up using at least some of the selected packet portions and determining if the packet is of an

existing flow” / looking up a flow-entry database for containing one or more flow-entries for previously encountered conversational flows, the looking up to determine if the received packet is of an existing flow” (Ex. L, Terms 9, 10) 30

VI. Conclusion 30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Allen Eng'g v. Bartell Indus.</i> , 299 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	26
<i>Altiris, Inc. v. Symantec Corp.</i> , 318 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	26, 28
<i>Apex Inc. v. Raritan Comp., Inc.</i> , 325 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	12
<i>Apple Inc. v. Motorola, Inc.</i> , 757 F.3d 1286 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	11, 12, 14
<i>Aspex Eyewear, Inc. v. Marchon Eyewear, Inc.</i> , 672 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	7
<i>Cardiac Pacemakers, Inc. v. St. Jude Med., Inc.</i> , 381 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	29, 30
<i>CollegeNet, Inc. v. ApplyYourself, Inc.</i> , 418 F.3d 1225 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	9
<i>Finisar Corp. v. DirectTV Grp., Inc.</i> , 523 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	14
<i>Intervet Inc. v. Merial Ltd.</i> , 617 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	2
<i>Libel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 898 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	9
<i>Lighting World, Inc. v. Birchwood Lighting, Inc.</i> , 382 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	11, 12, 14, 22
<i>Masco Corp. v. United States</i> , 303 F.3d 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	29, 30
<i>Micro Chem., Inc. v. Great Plains Chem. Co.</i> , 194 F.3d 1250 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	15, 22
<i>Mobilemedia Ideas LLC v. HTC Corp.</i> , No. 2:10-cv-112 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 12, 2012)	1
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2120 (2014).....	10

Ne. Univ. v. Google, Inc.,
2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 118977 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 9, 2010) 25

Personalized Media Communs., LLC v. ITC,
161 F.3d 696 (Fed. Cir. 1998) 13, 25

Phillips v. AWH Corp.,
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc) 1, 7, 9

SciMed Life Sys. v. Advanced Cardiovascular Sys.,
242 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2001) 6

Teleflex, Inc. v. Ficosa N. Am. Corp.,
299 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2002) 26

Teva Pharm. USA, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.,
No. 13-854 (S. Ct. Jan. 20, 2015) 1

Toro Co. v. Textron, Inc.,
502 F. Supp. 2d 904 (D. Minn. 2007)..... 15, 22

Typhoon Touch Techs., Inc. v. Dell, Inc.,
659 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2011) 14

Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic,
90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996) 9

Widevine Techs., Inc. v. Verimatrix, Inc.,
2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 102768 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 4, 2009) 17

Williamson v. Citrix Online, LLC,
770 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2014) passim

Young v. Lumenis, Inc.,
492 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2007) 10

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 112(f)..... 11

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.