

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
WACO DIVISION**

SCRAMOGE TECHNOLOGY LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 6:21-cv-00579-ADA

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

**PLAINTIFF SCRAMOGE TECHNOLOGY LTD.'S RESPONSIVE  
CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

1. DISPUTED TERMS..... 1

    A. “Receiving Space” ’565 Patent, Claims 1 and 12; ’740 Patent, Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 8, and 16..... 1

        i. No construction of “receiving space” is necessary ..... 1

        ii. A construction of “receiving space” should not import extraneous limitations..... 4

    B. “overlaps the receiving space in a [second] direction parallel to the upper surface of the substrate” ’565 Patent, Claims [1], 12..... 8

    C. “a first region in which at least one of the first layer and the second layer overlaps the wireless power receiving coil in a vertical direction perpendicular to an upper surface of the shielding unit” ’842 Patent, Claims 1 and 19..... 11

    D. “reception space in a predetermined area” ’842 Patent, Claim 15..... 16

II. CONCLUSION..... 19

**TABLE OF AUTHORITES**

**Cases**

*Arlington Indus., Inc. v. Bridgeport Fittings, Inc.*,  
345 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2003)..... 5, 12

*AstraZenaca LP v. Apotex, Inc.*,  
633 F.3d 1042 (Fed. Cir. 2010)..... 4

*Bancorp Servs., L.L.C. v. Hartford Life Ins. Co.*,  
359 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2004)..... 10

*Brooktree Corp. v. Advanced Micro Devices, Inc.*,  
977 F.2d 1555 (Fed. Cir. 1992)..... 13

*CCS Fitness, Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.*,  
288 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2002)..... 14

*Commonwealth Sci. & Indus. Rsch. Organisation v. Buffalo Tech. (USA), Inc.*,  
542 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... 15

*Epos Techs Ltd. v. Pegasus Techs.*,  
766 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 4, 17

*Evolution Concepts, Inc. v. HOC Events, Inc.*,  
No. 2021-1963, 2022 WL 128577 (Fed. Cir. Jan. 14, 2022)..... 5

*Exmark Mfg. Co. Inc. v. Briggs & Stratton Corp.*,  
830 F. App'x 305 (Fed. Cir. Oct. 6, 2020)..... 5

*Hill-Rom Servs., Inc. v. Stryker Corp.*,  
755 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 1

*Invitrogen Corp. v. Biocrest Mfg., L.P.*,  
424 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 8

*Kara Tech. Inc. v. Stamps.com Inc.*,  
582 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2009)..... 17

*Koito Mfg. Co. v. Turn-Key-Tech, LLC*,  
381 F.3d 1142 (Fed. Cir. 2004)..... 14

*Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.*,  
358 F.3d 898 (Fed. Cir. 2004)..... 18

*Mentor Graphics Corp. v. EVE-USA, Inc.*,  
851 F.3d 1275 (Fed. Cir. 2017)..... 9

*Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instrus., Inc.*,  
572 U.S. 898 (2014)..... 8

*Nuance Commc’ns, Inc. v. Vlingo, Corp.*,  
No. 1:09-cv-00585-LPS, 2011 WL 3948803 (D. Del. Sept. 7, 2011) ..... 3

*Omega Eng’g, Inc. v. Raytek Corp.*,  
334 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2003)..... 1

*Orion IP, LLC v. Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC*,  
516 F. Supp. 2d 720 (E.D. Tex. 2007)..... 3

*Phillips v. AWH Corp.*,  
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 11

*Plantronics, Inc. v. Aliph, Inc.*,  
724 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2013)..... 7

*R2 Sols. LLC v. Deezer S.A.*,  
No. 4:21-CV-122, 2022 WL 36240 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 4, 2022)..... 11

*Schering Corp. v. Amgen Inc.*,  
222 F.3d 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2000)..... 14

*SightSound Techs., LLC v. Apple Inc.*,  
809 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... 6

*SkinMedica, Inc. v. Histogen Inc.*,  
727 F.3d 1187 (Fed. Cir. 2013)..... 4

*Softspikes LLC v. MacNeill Eng’g Co., Inc.*,  
No. CV 08-469 (GMS), 2010 WL 11031657 (D. Del. Apr. 29, 2010)..... 3

*Sonix Tech. Co. v. Pubs. Int’l, Ltd.*,  
844 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2017)..... 8

*Steel Recovery, LLC v. X-Body Equip., Inc.*,  
808 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... 7

*Thorner v. Sony Comput. Entm’t Am. LLC*,  
669 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 1

*Toshiba Corp. v. Imation Corp.*,  
681 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 1, 16

*TQP Dev., LLC v. Ticketmaster Ent., Inc.*,  
No. 2:09-CV-00279, 2011 WL 4458430 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 23, 2011)..... 16

*Twist, Inc. v. B GSE Grp., LLC*,  
No. 3:19-cv-00583-MOC-DSC, 2021 WL 2210892 (W.D.N.C. June 1, 2021)..... 9

*Whirlpool Corp. v. Ozcan*,  
No. 2:15-CV-2103-JRG, 2016 WL 7474517 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 29, 2016)..... 9

*Xoft, Inc. v. Cytoc Corp.*,  
No. C-05-05312 RMW, 2007 WL 1241990 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 27, 2007)..... 16

# 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.