

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

UNILOC 2017 LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE LLC,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 2:18-cv-00553-JRG

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

DEFENDANT GOOGLE LLC'S RESPONSIVE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---|--------------------|
| I. THE ‘908 PATENT | 1 |
| II. “KEYFACT” (ALL CLAIMS) | 2 |
| A. As a Coined Term, “Keyfact” Must be Defined by the Specification | 2 |
| B. The Specification’s Definition Of “Keyfact” As an “Important Fact” Renders the Term Indefinite | 3 |
| C. Uniloc’s Construction Omits Key/Important from “Keyfact” | 6 |
| III. “KEYWORD” (CLAIM 6)..... | 8 |
| IV. “EXTRACTING KEYWORDS WITHOUT PART-OF-SPEECH AMBIGUITY” (CLAIM 6) | 12 |
| V. STEP-PLUS-FUNCTION TERMS | 14 |
| A. “KEYFACT EXTRACTING STEP FOR ANALYZING A DOCUMENT COLLECTION AND A USER QUERY, AND EXTRACTING KEYWORDS WITHOUT PART-OF-SPEECH AMBIGUITY FROM SAID DOCUMENT COLLECTION AND SAID USER QUERY, AND RESPECTIVELY EXTRACTING KEYFACTS OF SAID DOCUMENT COLLECTION AND SAID USER QUERY FROM SAID KEYWORDS” (CLAIM 6) | 15 |
| B. “KEYFACT INDEXING STEP FOR CALCULATING THE FREQUENCY OF SAID KEYFACTS OF SAID DOCUMENT COLLECTION AND GENERATING A KEYFACT LIST OF SAID DOCUMENT COLLECTION FOR A KEYFACT INDEX STRUCTURE” (CLAIM 6)..... | 19 |
| C. “KEY FACT RETRIEVING” ELEMENTS..... | 22 |
| 1. “Keyfact retrieving step for receiving said keyfact of said user query and said keyfacts of said document collection” (Claim 6) | 22 |
| 2. “Keyfact retrieving step for . . . defining a keyfact retrieval model in consideration of weigh factors according to a keyfact pattern” (Claim 6) | 24 |
| 3. “Keyfact retrieving step for . . . generating a retrieval result” (Claim 6) | 26 |
| VI. ORDERING DISPUTES | 27 |
| A. ORDER OF METHOD STEPS (CLAIM 6)..... | 27 |
| B. ORDER OF METHOD STEPS (CLAIM 11)..... | 29 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| Cases | <u>Page</u> |
|--|--------------------|
| <i>Agere Sys., Inc. v. Atmel Corp.</i> , No. CIV.A. 02-864, 2003 WL 21652264 (E.D. Pa. May 27, 2003)..... | passim |
| <i>Baxalta Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.</i> , No. 17-509-TBD, 2018 WL 6304351 (D. Del. Dec. 3, 2018)..... | 8 |
| <i>Bell Atl. Network Servs., Inc. v. Covad Commc’ns Grp., Inc.</i> , 262 F.3d 1258 (Fed. Cir. 2001)..... | 9 |
| <i>Bicon, Inc. v. Straumann Co.</i> , 441 F.3d 945 (Fed. Cir. 2006)..... | 7, 14 |
| <i>Biosig Instruments, Inc. v. Nautilus, Inc.</i> , 783 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... | 5 |
| <i>Blackboard, Inc. v. Desire2Learn, Inc.</i> , 574 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2009)..... | passim |
| <i>C.R. Bard, Inc. v. U.S. Surgical Corp.</i> , 388 F.3d 858 (Fed. Cir. 2004)..... | 3, 8 |
| <i>Centricut, LLC v. Esab Grp., Inc.</i> , 390 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2004)..... | 6 |
| <i>Datamize, LLC v. Plumtree Software, Inc.</i> , 417 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... | 3, 4 |
| <i>Elcommerce.com, Inc. v. SAP AG</i> , 564 F. App’x 599 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... | 6 |
| <i>Elcommerce.com, Inc. v. SAP AG</i> , 745 F.3d 490 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... | 6 |
| <i>Eon Corp. IP Holdings v. Silver Spring Networks</i> , 815 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... | 11 |
| <i>Fran Nooren Afdichtingssystemen B.V. v. Stopaq Amcorr Inc.</i> , 744 F.3d 715 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... | 7, 14 |
| <i>Function Media, LLC v. Google, Inc.</i> 708 F.3d 1310 (Fed. Cir. 2013)..... | 29 |
| <i>GE Lighting Solutions, LLC v. AgiLight</i> , 750 F.3d 1304 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... | 2 |
| <i>Gemalto S.A. v. HTC Corp.</i> , 754 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... | 7 |
| <i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.</i> , 902 F.3d 1372..... | 3, 4 |

Interval Licensing LLC v. AOL, Inc.,
766 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 2, 3, 4, 5

Intervet Inc. v. Merial Ltd.,
617 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2010)..... 2

Iridescent Networks, Inc. v. AT&T Mobility, LLC,
933 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2019)..... 2, 3

Masco Corp. v. United States,
303 F.3d 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2002)..... 14

Micro Chem., Inc. v. Great Plains Chem. Co.,
194 F.3d 1250 (Fed. Cir. 1999)..... 19

Mobile Telecommc 'ns Techs., LLC v. Sprint Nextel Corp.,
Nos. 2:12-CV-832-JRG-RSP, 2;13-CV-258-JRG-RSP, 2;13-CV-259-JRG-RSP, 2014 WL
10726788, (E.D. Tex. May 2, 2014) 6

Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.,
572 U.S. 898 (2014)..... 3

Noah Sys., Inc. v. Intuit Inc.,
675 F.3d 1302 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 18

Nystrom v. TREX Co., Inc.,
424 F.3d 1136 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 9

O.I. Corp. v. Tekmar Co., Inc.,
115 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1997)..... 15

O2 Micro Int'l v. Beyond Innovation Tech.,
521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... 12, 14, 29

Personalized Media Commc 'ns, LLC v. Int'l Trade Comm 'n,
161 F.3d 696 (Fed. Cir. 1998)..... 5

Phillips v. AWH Corp.,
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 3, 7, 8

Seal-Flex, Inc. v. Athletic Track & Court Const.,
172 F.3d 836 (Fed. Cir. 1999)..... 14, 16, 17, 18

Secure Web Conf. Corp. v. Microsoft Corp.,
640 F. App'x 910 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 9

Sinorgchem Co. v. Int'l Trade Comm 'n,
511 F.3d 1132 (Fed. Cir. 2007)..... 8

Skin Medica, Inc. v. Histogen Inc.,
727 F.3d 1187 (Fed. Cir. 2013)..... 9

Spreadsheet Automation Corp. v. Microsoft Corp.,
No. 2:06-CV-127-DF, 2006 WL 6143063 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 9, 2006)..... 29

TALtech Ltd. v. Esquel Apparel, Inc.,
279 F. App'x 974 (Fed. Cir. 2008) 27, 28, 30

Teva Pharms. USA, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.,
789 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... 5

United States v. Jackson,
426 F.3d 301 (5th Cir. 2005) 7

Warner-Jenkinson Co., Inc. v. Hilton Davis Chemical Co.,
520 U.S. 17 (1997)..... 7, 14

Williamson v. Citrix Online, LLC,
792 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... 20

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 2

35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 6..... passim

Other Authorities

The Fact Extraction Using the Keyfact, 140..... 2

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.