

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

INTEL CORPORATION,

:

:

Plaintiff,

:

:

v.

:

C.A. No. 14-377-LPS

:

FUTURE LINK SYSTEMS, LLC,

:

:

Defendant.

:

Jack B. Blumenfeld, Maryellen Noreika, Paul Saindon, MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT & TUNNELL LLP, Wilmington, DE

Gregory S. Arovas, Jon R. Carter, KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP, New York, NY

Adam Alper, Sarah E. Piepmeier, KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP, San Francisco, CA

Michael W. De Vries, KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP, Los Angeles, CA

Attorneys for Plaintiff Intel Corporation.


Brian E. Farnan, Michael J. Farnan, FARNAN LLP, Wilmington, DE

Benjamin Hattenbach, Ellisen S. Turner, Richard W. Krebs, Amy E. Proctor, Dominik Slusarczyk, IRELL & MANELLA LLP, Los Angeles, CA

Attorneys for Defendant Future Link Systems, LLC.

MEMORANDUM OPINION

August 2, 2016
Wilmington, Delaware


STARK, U.S. District Judge:

On March 24, 2014, Plaintiff Intel Corporation (“Plaintiff” or “Intel”) filed suit for declaratory judgment that patents owned by Defendant Future Link Systems, LLC (“Defendant” or “Future Link”) are “not infringed, invalid, licensed, and/or exhausted.” (D.I. 1 at 1-2) Intel’s initial and first-amended complaints challenged nine patents: U.S. Patent Nos. 5,608,357 (“’357 patent”); 5,870,570 (“’570 patent”); 6,008,823 (“’823 patent”); 6,108,738 (“’738 patent”); 6,606,576 (“’6576 patent”); 6,622,108 (“’108 patent”); 6,636,166 (“’166 patent”); 6,920,576 (“’0576 patent”); and 7,478,302 (“’302 patent”). (D.I. 1 at 2; D.I. 95 at 1-2) On September 2, 2015, Future Link filed a Partial Answer and Counterclaims asserting eight additional patents against Intel: U.S. Patent Nos. 5,754,867 (“’867 patent”); 6,052,754 (“’754 patent”); 6,317,804 (“’804 patent”); 7,685,439 (“’439 patent”); 7,743,257 (“’257 patent”); 7,917,680 (“’680 patent”); 7,983,888 (“’888 patent”); and 8,099,614 (“’614 patent”) (collectively with the nine patents originally challenged by Intel, “Patents-in-Suit”). (See D.I. 135 at 40) The Patents-in-Suit relate to a broad range of computer technology.¹

Pending before the Court are claim construction disputes for thirteen claim terms across the following ten patents: the ’357, ’867, ’570, ’754, ’804, ’6576, ’108, ’302, ’257, and ’680 patents.² (D.I. 324 at 1) The parties submitted technology tutorials on April 28 (see D.I. 302, 304) and completed briefing on claim construction on May 12 (D.I. 288, 290, 315, 318). The

¹The Patents-in-Suit are attached as exhibits to Intel’s First Amended Complaint (D.I. 95) and Future Link’s Partial Answer and Counterclaims (D.I. 135).

²On May 27, the parties submitted a chart of all claims from the Patents-in-Suit that are either challenged by Intel (as not-infringed or invalid) and/or asserted by Future Link. (D.I. 341) The Court will only construe terms that are in claims identified by the parties in this chart.

Court held a claim construction hearing on June 6. (See Transcript, D.I. 351 (“Tr.”))

I. LEGAL STANDARDS

The ultimate question of the proper construction of a patent is a question of law. See *Teva Pharm. USA, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.*, 135 S. Ct. 831, 837 (2015) (citing *Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.*, 517 U.S. 370, 388-91 (1996)). “It is a bedrock principle of patent law that the claims of a patent define the invention to which the patentee is entitled the right to exclude.” *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (internal quotation marks omitted). “[T]here is no magic formula or catechism for conducting claim construction.” *Id.* at 1324. Instead, the court is free to attach the appropriate weight to appropriate sources “in light of the statutes and policies that inform patent law.” *Id.*

“[T]he words of a claim are generally given their ordinary and customary meaning . . . [which is] the meaning that the term would have to a person of ordinary skill in the art in question at the time of the invention, i.e., as of the effective filing date of the patent application.” *Id.* at 1312-13 (internal citations and quotation marks omitted). “[T]he ordinary meaning of a claim term is its meaning to the ordinary artisan after reading the entire patent.” *Id.* at 1321 (internal quotation marks omitted). The patent specification “is always highly relevant to the claim construction analysis. Usually, it is dispositive; it is the single best guide to the meaning of a disputed term.” *Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptoronic, Inc.*, 90 F.3d 1576, 1582 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

While “the claims themselves provide substantial guidance as to the meaning of particular claim terms,” the context of the surrounding words of the claim also must be considered. *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1314. Furthermore, “[o]ther claims of the patent in question, both asserted and unasserted, can also be valuable sources of enlightenment . . . [b]ecause claim terms are

normally used consistently throughout the patent” *Id.* (internal citation omitted).

It is likewise true that “[d]ifferences among claims can also be a useful guide For example, the presence of a dependent claim that adds a particular limitation gives rise to a presumption that the limitation in question is not present in the independent claim.” *Id.* at 1314-15 (internal citation omitted). This “presumption is especially strong when the limitation in dispute is the only meaningful difference between an independent and dependent claim, and one party is urging that the limitation in the dependent claim should be read into the independent claim.” *SunRace Roots Enter. Co., Ltd. v. SRAM Corp.*, 336 F.3d 1298, 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2003).

It is also possible that “the specification may reveal a special definition given to a claim term by the patentee that differs from the meaning it would otherwise possess. In such cases, the inventor’s lexicography governs.” *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1316. It bears emphasis that “[e]ven when the specification describes only a single embodiment, the claims of the patent will not be read restrictively unless the patentee has demonstrated a clear intention to limit the claim scope using words or expressions of manifest exclusion or restriction.” *Hill-Rom Servs., Inc. v. Stryker Corp.*, 755 F.3d 1367, 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (quoting *Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.*, 358 F.3d 898, 906 (Fed. Cir. 2004)) (internal quotation marks omitted).

In addition to the specification, a court “should also consider the patent’s prosecution history, if it is in evidence.” *Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.*, 52 F.3d 967, 980 (Fed. Cir. 1995), *aff’d*, 517 U.S. 370 (1996). The prosecution history, which is “intrinsic evidence,” “consists of the complete record of the proceedings before the PTO [Patent and Trademark Office] and includes the prior art cited during the examination of the patent.” *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1317. “[T]he prosecution history can often inform the meaning of the claim language by

demonstrating how the inventor understood the invention and whether the inventor limited the invention in the course of prosecution, making the claim scope narrower than it would otherwise be.” *Id.*

In some cases, “the district court will need to look beyond the patent’s intrinsic evidence and to consult extrinsic evidence in order to understand, for example, the background science or the meaning of a term in the relevant art during the relevant time period.” *Teva*, 135 S. Ct. at 841. Extrinsic evidence “consists of all evidence external to the patent and prosecution history, including expert and inventor testimony, dictionaries, and learned treatises.” *Markman*, 52 F.3d at 980. For instance, technical dictionaries can assist the court in determining the meaning of a term to those of skill in the relevant art because such dictionaries “endeavor to collect the accepted meanings of terms used in various fields of science and technology.” *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1318. In addition, expert testimony can be useful “to ensure that the court’s understanding of the technical aspects of the patent is consistent with that of a person of skill in the art, or to establish that a particular term in the patent or the prior art has a particular meaning in the pertinent field.” *Id.* Nonetheless, courts must not lose sight of the fact that “expert reports and testimony [are] generated at the time of and for the purpose of litigation and thus can suffer from bias that is not present in intrinsic evidence.” *Id.* Overall, while extrinsic evidence “may be useful” to the court, it is “less reliable” than intrinsic evidence, and its consideration “is unlikely to result in a reliable interpretation of patent claim scope unless considered in the context of the intrinsic evidence.” *Id.* at 1318-19. Where the intrinsic record unambiguously describes the scope of the patented invention, reliance on any extrinsic evidence is improper. *See Pitney Bowes, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.*, 182 F.3d 1298, 1308 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (citing *Vitronics*, 90

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.