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

UNILOC 2017 L	LC,	§	Civil Action No. 2:19 ov 551 IDC	
	Plaintiff	§ Civil Action No. 2:18-cv-551-JF § §		
V.		§ § §	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED	
GOOGLE LLC,	Defendant.	§ § §		

DEFENDANT GOOGLE LLC'S RESPONSIVE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF

TABLE OF CONTENTS

				Page
I.	INTR	ODUC'	TION	1
II.	LAW	OF CL	AIM CONSTRUCTION AND INDEFINITENESS	1
III.	BACI	KGROU	JND OF THE TECHNOLOGY	1
IV.	DISP	UTED (CLAIM TERMS	3
	A.	Claim	1 Is Invalid for Indefiniteness	3
		1.	"wherein the recursive filtering step is intended to use a recursive filter such as: Rf[i]=(1—.alpha.[i]) (R1[i]+Rmc[i]), where Rf[i], R1[i] and Rmc[i] are transformed coefficients comprised in the transformed signals (Rf,R1,Rmc) and .alpha.[i] is a filter coefficient comprised between 0 and 1"	3
		2.	Google Has Not Waived Its Indefiniteness Argument	6
	B.	"trans	formed coefficients" (claim 1) "transformed signal[s]" (claims 1, 4).	7
	C.	"trans	sformed motion-compensated signal" (claims 1, 4)	10
V.	CON	CLUSIO	ON	10

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
Callicrate v. Wadsworth Mfg., Inc., 427 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	4
Centricut, LLC v. Esab Group, Inc., 390 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	7
Elcommerce.com, Inc. v. SAP AG, 564 F. App'x 599 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	7
Elcommerce.com, Inc. v. SAP AG, 745 F.3d 490 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	7
Ex Parte Hall, 83 U.S.P.Q. 38 (Bd. App. 1949)	4
Harcol Research, LLC v. Europea Sports Prods., Inc., No. 2:13-cv-228-JRG-RSP, 2014 WL 5603653 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 3, 2014)	6
Innova/Pure Water, Inc. v. Safari Water Filtration Sys., Inc., 381 F.3d 1111 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	6
Innovative Display Techs. LLC v. Hyundai Motor Co., No. 2:14-cv-201-JRG, 2015 WL 2090651 (E.D. Tex. May 4, 2015)	6
Mobile Telecommc'ns Techs., LLC v. Sprint Nextel Corp., No. 2:12-CV-832-JRG-RSP, 2014 WL 10726788 (E.D. Tex. May 2, 2014)	7
Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc., 572 U.S. 898 (2014)	1, 6
Schumer v. Lab. Comput. Sys., Inc., 308 F.3d 1304 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	7
Sonix Tech. Co. v. Publ'ns Int'l, Ltd., 844 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	7
Teva Pharm. USA, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc., 789 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	6
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2	1, 4
35 U.S.C. 8 112 ¶ 6	7



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (continued)

	Page(s)
Other Authorities	
MPEP § 2173.05(d)	4



I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

Plaintiff Uniloc 2017 LLC ("Plaintiff" or "Uniloc") alleges that Defendant Google LLC ("Defendant" or "Google") infringes claims 1, 4, and 5 of U.S. Patent No. 7,012,960 ("the '960 Patent"). Claim 1 fails to satisfy the definiteness requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2. It includes a facially ambiguous limitation containing the phrases "intended to" and "such as." The uncertain language of that limitation results in the absence of reasonable certainty regarding the scope of the invention. This renders claim 1 invalid for indefiniteness.

Claims 1 and 4 include multiple terms requiring construction: "transformed coefficients," "transformed signal[s]," and "transformed motion-compensated signal." The plain and ordinary meaning of those terms, when read in light of the surrounding claim language and specification, encompasses video data that has been discrete cosine transformed and inverse quantized. Those terms must be construed accordingly.

II. LAW OF CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AND INDEFINITENESS

In view of the Court's familiarity with the applicable law for claim construction, Defendant cites pertinent cases in the context of disputed issues. Patent claims must point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the applicant regards as the invention. 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2. A patent is invalid for indefiniteness "if its claims, read in light of the specification delineating the patent, and the prosecution history, fail to inform, with reasonable certainty, those skilled in the art about the scope of the invention." *Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.*, 572 U.S. 898, 901 (2014). The definiteness requirement "mandates clarity." *Id.* at 910. Patent claims "must be precise enough to afford clear notice of what is claimed." *Id.* at 909.

III. BACKGROUND OF THE TECHNOLOGY

The '960 Patent is directed to transcoding a video stream from a higher bitrate to a lower bitrate with a filtering step to improve picture quality. '960 Patent at Abstract, 1:24–29. The '960



DOCKET

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.

