

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

---

Molo Design, Ltd.

Case No. 21-CV-1578 (VEC)

Plaintiff,

-v-

Chanel, Inc.

Defendant.

---

**DEFENDANT CHANEL, INC.'S CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. LEGAL PRINCIPLES ..... 1

II. DISPUTED CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS ..... 1

    A. “supports” ..... 1

        1. Summary of the Dispute ..... 2

        2. Evidence Supporting Chanel’s Construction ..... 3

        3. Response to Molo’s Arguments ..... 7

    B. “self-supporting” ..... 8

        1. Summary of the Dispute ..... 9

        2. Evidence Supporting Chanel’s Construction ..... 9

        3. Response to Molo’s Arguments ..... 10

    C. “flaccid” ..... 12

        1. Summary of the Dispute ..... 12

        2. Evidence Supporting Chanel’s Construction ..... 12

        3. Response to Molo’s Arguments ..... 15

    D. “operable” ..... 15

        1. Summary of the Dispute ..... 15

        2. Evidence Supporting Chanel’s Construction ..... 16

        3. Response to Molo’s Arguments ..... 16

    E. “end panels” ..... 17

        1. Summary of the Dispute ..... 17

        2. Evidence Supporting Chanel’s Construction ..... 18

        3. Response to Molo’s Arguments ..... 21

III. AGREED CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS ..... 23

IV. CONCLUSION ..... 24

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Advanced Cardiovascular Sys. v. Medtronic</i> , 265 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	6
<i>AFG Indus., Inc. v. Cardinal IG Co.</i> , 239 F.3d 1239 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	1, 22
<i>Becton, Dickinson &amp; Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Grp., LP</i> , 616 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	4, 18
<i>In re Certain Mobile Devices With Multifunction Emulators</i> , Inv. No. 337-TA-1170, Initial Determination (ITC Mar. 16, 2021).....	16
<i>Comcast Cable Communs., LLC v. Promptu Sys. Corp.</i> , 838 Fed. App'x 551 (Fed. Cir. 2021).....	4, 18
<i>Default Proof Credit Card Sys. Inc. v. Home Depot U.S.A., Inc.</i> , 412 F.3d 1291 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	12
<i>Eon Corp. IP Holdings LLC v. Silver Spring Networks, Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	7, 22
<i>Halliburton Energy Servs., Inc. v. M-I LLC</i> , 514 F.3d 1244 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	15
<i>Interactive Gift Express, Inc. v. CompuServe Inc.</i> , 256 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	3
<i>Interval Licensing LLC v. AOL, Inc.</i> , 766 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	13
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.</i> , 572 U.S. 898 (2014).....	12, 14
<i>Neville v. Found. Constructors, Inc.</i> , 972 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	4, 18
<i>Nexstep, Inc. v. Comcast Cable Communs.</i> , No. 19-cv-1031, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 202726 (D. Del. Oct. 30, 2020).....	6
<i>Niazi Licensing Corp. v. Boston Sci. Corp.</i> , No. 17-cv-5094, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 181611 (D. Minn. Oct. 21, 2019).....	14, 15
<i>O2 Micro Int'l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co.</i> , 521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	1, 3, 7, 22

*Phillips v. AWH Corp.*,  
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc)..... *passim*

*Server Tech., Inc. v. Am. Power Conversion Corp.*,  
No. 3:06-cv-00698, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 49101 (D. Nev. Apr. 16, 2010).....8

*Small v. Nobel Biocare USA, LLC*,  
2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 91387 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 11, 2011).....7, 22

*Teva Pharm. USA, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.*,  
574 U.S. 318 (2015).....1

*TQ Delta, LLC v. ADTRAN, Inc.*,  
No. 14-cv-954, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 153622 (D. Del. Sep. 9, 2019) .....16

*TQ Delta, LLC v. ADTRAN, Inc.*,  
No. 14-cv-954, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 188640 (D. Del. Oct. 31, 2019).....16

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2.....12

**Other Authorities**

Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary (11th ed. 2004).....10

Oxford Compact English Dictionary (2nd ed. 2003).....10, 16

Webster’s II New College Dictionary (2001).....16

Pursuant to Local Patent Rule 12(b) and the Court’s Scheduling Order, Defendant Chanel, Inc. (“Chanel”) hereby submits its claim construction brief regarding the asserted claims of the patents-in-suit.<sup>1</sup> For the reasons explained below, Chanel respectfully requests that the Court adopt Chanel’s constructions for disputed terms, plus the parties’ agreed constructions.

## I. LEGAL PRINCIPLES

A patent’s claims define the patentee’s rights. *Teva Pharm. USA, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.*, 574 U.S. 318, 321 (2015). “When the parties present a fundamental dispute regarding the scope of a claim term, it is the court’s duty to resolve it.” *O2 Micro Int’l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co.*, 521 F.3d 1351, 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2008); *see also AFG Indus., Inc. v. Cardinal IG Co.*, 239 F.3d 1239, 1247 (Fed. Cir. 2001) (“It is critical for trial courts to set forth an express construction of the material claim terms in dispute, in part because the claim construction becomes the basis of the jury instructions, should the case go to trial.”).

The key principles that courts apply to determine the meaning of disputed claim terms are explained at length in *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 1311–19 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc). These principles are discussed in context throughout the remainder of Chanel’s brief.

## II. DISPUTED CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS

### A. “supports”

Claim Term/Phrase	Chanel’s Construction	Molo’s Construction
“supports” <sup>2</sup>	“supporting panels that are different from the laminar panels that form the core”	No construction necessary

<sup>1</sup> The asserted claims are: claims 1, 2, 5–7, 13, and 20–23 of U.S. Patent No. 7,866,366 (“’366 patent”) (Dkt. 1–1); claims 21–23 of U.S. Patent No. 8,561,666 (“’666 patent”) (Dkt. 1–2); claims 1, 5, and 6 of U.S. Patent No. 9,797,134 (“’134 patent”) (Dkt. 1–4); and claims 2, 14, 18, 19, 20, and 22 of U.S. Patent No. 9,689,161 (“’161 patent”) (Dkt. 1–3).

<sup>2</sup> This term is recited in the following asserted claims: ’366 claims 1, 2, and 13.

# 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.