THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D.C.

The Honorable Cameron R. Elliot Administrative Law Judge

In the Matter of

CERTAIN CAPACITIVE TOUCH-CONTROLLED MOBILE DEVICES, COMPUTER AND COMPONENTS THEREOF

Investigation No. 337-TA-1193

COMPLAINANT NEODRON LTD.'S OPENING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INT	INTRODUCTION					
II.	CLA	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION PRINCIPLES					
III.	LEV	EL OI	EL OF SKILL IN THE ART				
IV.		PATENTS WITH AGREED CONSTRUCTIONS AND NO DISPUTED CONSTRUCTIONS					
	A.	The '425 Patent					
		1.	Back	ground of the '425 Patent	8		
		2.	Stipu	lated Constructions for the '425 Patent	. 10		
	В.	The '092 Patent					
		1.	Back	ground of the '092 Patent	. 11		
		2.	Stipu	alated Constructions for the '092 Patent	. 13		
V.	PAT	PATENTS WITH DISPUTED CONSTRUCTIONS					
	A.	The '251 Patent			. 13		
		1.	Back	ground of the '251 Patent	. 13		
		2.	"deactivation of measurement of changes in capacitance"		. 15		
			a)	This Term Needs No Further Construction, As a Layperson, Let Alone a POSITA, Would Not Need to Redefine "Deactivation"	. 16		
			b)	Respondents' Redefining Construction Is Not Required By the Term's Plain Meaning or the Intrinsic Record; Indeed, It Imports Words <i>Not Found</i> <i>Anywhere</i> in the Record			
			c)	Respondents' Construction Also Creates <i>Tension With</i> The Intrinsic Record or, At the Very Least, It Creates More Questions Than it Resolves			
	В.	The '472 Patent					
		1.	Back	ground of the '472 Patent	. 22		
		2.	"the	controller [configured/operable] to:"	. 25		



	a)	Even Method Claims "Are Not Ordinarily Construed	
		to Require" Any Unrecited Order—and There is No	
		Authority to Require Such Order in System Claims,	
		Which Are the Only Claims in Dispute On This Term	
		Here	. 26
	b)	Where the Patentee Wanted to Recite An Order to The Functions Recited in the Claims, He Did—Which Only Further Exposes The Error In Respondents'	
		Construction.	. 28
	c)	Respondents' Construction Also Excludes a Preferred Embodiment.	29
		Embodiment	. 29
3.	"afte	r adjusting the stored threshold value"	.30



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Certain Touch-Controlled Mobile Devices, Computers, and Components Thereof, Inv. No. 337-TA- 1162, Order No. 15 at 8 (Nov. 25, 2019
Dow Chem. Co. v. Sumitomo Chem. Co. 257 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2001)
Epistar Corp. v. ITC, 566 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2009)
Interactive Gift Express, Inc. v. Compuserv, Inc., 256 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2001)
JVW Enters. v. Interact Accessories, Inc., 424 F.3d 1324, 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2005)
O2 Micro Int'l v. Beyond Innovation Tech., 521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008)
Omega Engineering, Inc. v. Raytek Corp., 334 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2003)
Phillips v. AWH Corp., 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)passin
SanDisk Corp. v. Memorex Prods., 415 F.3d 1278 (Fed. Cir. 2005)
Teleflex, Inc. v. Ficosa N. Am. Corp., 299 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2002)
Thorner v. Sony Computer Entertainment Am. LLC, 669 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012)passin

I. INTRODUCTION

Neodron and Respondents offer not just competing claim-construction proposals, but very different approaches to claim construction. The Federal Circuit has set forth straightforward rules to guide claim construction. For example, where claim terms have a plain and ordinary meaning to a person of ordinary skill in the technical art, there is a heavy presumption that meaning applies. In each case, Neodron's claim term proposals stay faithful to that plain meaning and narrow from that plain meaning on when necessary under controlling Federal Circuit law or when helpful to narrow the disputes for this ALJ.

Respondents' proposals, on the other hand, ask this ALJ to recharacterize and burden clear terms with artificial and extraneous baggage, but cannot point to any clear or unmistakable disclaimer or lexicography to do so. This invites reversible error. *E.g.*, *JVW Enters. v. Interact Accessories, Inc.*, 424 F.3d 1324, 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2005). Indeed, many of their proposals are inconsistent with—and even exclude—embodiments taught in the specification. Such constructions are "rarely, if ever, correct." *SanDisk Corp. v. Memorex Prods.*, 415 F.3d 1278, 1285-86 (Fed. Cir. 2005). For other proposals, Defendants' proposed constructions are inconsistent with the claim language itself. These are also improper under controlling law—and do nothing to help any fact-finder, but rather only make that job more difficult. Respondents' legally flawed and results-oriented proposals should be rejected.



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.

