

1 KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP  
2 STEVEN D. MOORE (State Bar No. 290875)  
smoore@kilpatricktownsend.com  
Two Embarcadero Center, Suite 1900  
3 San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: (415) 576-0200  
4 Facsimile: (415) 576-0300

5 MEGAN M. CHUNG (State Bar No. 232044)  
mchung@kilpatricktownsend.com  
6 1801 Century Park East, Suite 2300  
Los Angeles, CA 90067  
7 Telephone: (310) 248-3830  
Direct: (858) 350-  
8 Facsimile: (310) 860-0363

9 Attorneys for Defendant WALMART INC.  
10 (Additional Counsel Included On Signature Page)

11  
12                                   **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
13                                   **FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
14                                   **SOUTHERN DIVISION**

15 CARAVAN CANOPY INT'L,  
16 INC., a California Corporation,

17                                   Plaintiff,

18                                   v.

19 WALMART INC., a Delaware  
20 Corporation; and DOES 1 through  
10, inclusive,

21                                   Defendants.

Case No. 8:19-cv-01072-PSG-ADS  
Case No. 5:19-cv-01224-PSG-ADS  
Case No. 2:19-cv-06224-PSG-ADS  
Case No. 2:19-cv-06952-PSG-ADS  
Case No. 2:19-cv-06978-PSG-ADS

**DEFENDANTS' JOINT OPENING  
CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

Judge: Hon. Philip S. Gutierrez

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
Petitioners Exhibit 1012  
Patent 5 011 010

1  
2                   **TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
3

I.	Introduction .....	1
II.	The '040 Patent .....	1
	A.    Relevant Disclosures from the Specification.....	1
	B.    Relevant Prosecution History .....	5
	C.    Prior Litigation Involving the '040 Patent.....	5
III.	Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art .....	6
IV.	Claim Construction Legal Principles .....	6
V.	Construction of the Disputed Terms .....	7
	A.    The claim term “center pole” should be construed to mean a “centrally-disposed, long, slender object”.....	7
	i.     The Court should adopt Defendants’ construction.....	7
	ii.     Plaintiff’s proposal is wrong.....	10
	iii.     This Court is not bound by the <i>E-Z Up</i> construction.....	12
	B.    The term “constructed for stretching and sustaining a tent’s roof” should be construed as “made to heighten and hold up the tent covering” .....	13
	C.    The term “being collapsible at the hinge joint in accordance with a sliding motion of said slider along a side pole” means “when the tent frame is collapsed, the center pole ribs bend at the hinge joint, and the slider slides along the side pole.”.....	15
	D.    The term “hinge joint” means “a connector that pivots to raise or lower the collapsible tent frame”.....	16
	E.    The “support link” should be construed as “a structure that connects a rib member with a slider associated with a side pole”. ....	18
	F.     “[S]ubstantially equal length” is indefinite.....	20

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	Page(s)
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Aubin Indus., Inc. v. Caster Concepts, Inc.</i> , No. 2:14-cv-02082-MCE-CKD, 2017 WL 4284715 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 27, 2017) .....	20
<i>Aug. Tech. Corp. v. Camtek, Ltd.</i> , 655 F.3d 1278 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	6
<i>Baxter HealthCare Corp. v. Mylan Lab. Ltd.</i> , 2016 WL 1337279 (D.N.J. 2016) .....	17
<i>Biosig Instruments, Inc. v. Nautilus, Inc.</i> , 783 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	20
<i>Effective Exploration, LLC v. Bluestone Natural Res. II, LLC</i> , No. 2:16-CV-00607-JRG-RSP, 2017 WL 3193322 (E.D. Tex. July 27, 2017) .....	21
<i>Fin Control Sys. Pty., Ltd. v. OAM, Inc.</i> , 265 F.3d 1311 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....	8
<i>GE Lighting Solutions, LLC v. AgiLight, Inc.</i> , 750 F.3d 1304 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	10
<i>GE Lighting Solutions, LLC v. Lights of Am., Inc.</i> , 663 Fed. App'x 938 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	20
<i>Geodynamics, Inc. v. Dynaenergetics US, Inc.</i> , No. 2:15-CV-1546-RSP, 2016 WL 6217181 (E.D. Tex. Oct. 25, 2016) .....	21
<i>GPNE Corp. v. Apple, Inc.</i> , No. 12-CV-02885-LHK, 2013 WL 4446819 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 13, 2013) .....	15, 16
<i>Guardian Media Techs. Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , No. CV 13-8369 PSG, 2015 WL 12656953 (C.D.Cal. Apr. 1, 2015) .....	19
<i>Halliburton Energy Servs., Inc. v. M-I LLC</i> , 514 F.3d 1244 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	20

1	<i>HZNP Meds. LLC v. Acavis Labs. UT, Inc.</i> , 940 F.3d 680 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	11
2		
3	<i>Int'l E-Z Up, Inc., et al. v. Caravan Canopy Int'l, Inc., et al.</i> , No. 2:01-cv-06530 (C.D. Cal. July 30, 2001).....	<i>passim</i>
4		
5	<i>Jackson Jordan, Inc. v. Plasser American Corp.</i> , 747 F.2d 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....	12
6		
7	<i>Liberty Ammunition, Inc. v. United States</i> , 835 F.3d 1388 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	20
8		
9	<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.</i> , 517 U.S. 370 (1996) .....	6, 12, 13
10		
11	<i>Maytag Corp. v. Electrolux Home Products, Inc.</i> , 411 F. Supp. 2d 1008 (N.D. Iowa 2006) .....	14
12		
13	<i>NobelBiz, Inc. v. Global Connect, LLC</i> , 2017 WL 3044641 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	17
14		
15	<i>NuVasive, Inc. v. Globus Medial, Inc.</i> , 2013 WL 3705731 (D. Del. 2013) .....	17
16		
17	<i>Phillips v. AHW Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	6, 13, 18, 19
18		
19	<i>Power-One, Inc. v. Artesyn Techs., Inc.</i> , 599 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	15
20		
21	<i>Rheox, Inc. v. Entact, Inc.</i> , 276 F.3d 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2002) .....	17
22		
23	<i>Stumbo v. Eastman Outdoors, Inc.</i> , 508 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	11
24		
25	<i>Teleflex, Inc. v. Ficosa N. Am. Corp.</i> , 299 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2002) .....	11
26		
27	<i>Thorner v. Sony Computer Entm't Am. LLC</i> , 669 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	6
28		
	<i>Townshend Intellectual Prop., L.L.C. v. Broadcom Corp.</i> , No. C-06-05118 JF (RS), 2008 WL 171039 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 18, 2008).....	13

1	<i>Valmont Indus., Inc. v. Reinke Mfg. Co.,</i>	
2	983 F.2d 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1993) .....	12
3	<i>In re Walter,</i>	
4	698 Fed. App'x 1022 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	20
5	<i>Williamson v. Citrix Online, LLC,</i>	
6	792 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	12
7	<i>Wilson Sporting Goods Co. v. Hillerich &amp; Bradsby Co.,</i>	
8	442 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	10
9	<b>Statutes</b>	
10	35 U.S.C. § 112(6) .....	12
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

# 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.