

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

SMART MOBILE TECHNOLOGIES LLC,
Plaintiff,

v.

APPLE INC.,
Defendant.

Case No. 6:21-cv-00603-ADA-DTG

SMART MOBILE TECHNOLOGIES LLC,
Plaintiff,

v.

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., and
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA,
INC.,
Defendants.

Case No. 6:21-cv-00701-ADA-DTG

**PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSIVE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF
REGARDING THE '434 PATENT FAMILY**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. ARGUMENT 1

A. “system on a chip” (’291 Patent, claims 5, 16)..... 1

B. “A communication system including one or more communication modules and processors for use in a portable handheld mobile device with a plurality of antennas, said communication system implemented as a system on a chip, said system comprising:” (’291 Patent, claim 5) 3

C. “is configured to” (’434 Patent, claims 1, 6; ’653 Patent, claims 1, 4, 8, 14, 17, 27); ’946 Patent, claims 1, 4, 8, 14, 17, 27; ’291 Patent, claim 5; ’083 Patent, claims 5, 8, 12; ’943 Patent, claims 1, 5, 8, 12)..... 3

D. “wherein a transmission interface is created and wherein said transmission interface uses a plurality of IP enabled interfaces on the mobile device which utilize the plurality of wireless transmit and receive components on the mobile device to enable a single interface comprised of multiplexed signals from the plurality of wireless transmit and receive components” (’653 Patent, claim 1) / “wherein a first interface for transmission is created and wherein said first interface for transmission uses a plurality of interfaces for Internet Protocol communication on the mobile device which utilize the plurality of wireless transmit and receive units on the mobile device to enable a single interface comprised of multiplexed signals from the plurality of wireless transmit and receive units” (’946 Patent, claim 1) 8

E. “wherein the first wireless transmit and receive component is enabled to communicate using one or more antennas simultaneously/ wherein the first wireless transmit and receive unit is enabled to communicate using one or more antennas simultaneously” (’653 Patent, claim 14; ’946 Patent, claim 14) 14

F. “USB communication” (’291 Patent, claim 5; ’946 Patent, claim 5) 16

G. “dynamically” (’434 Patent, claim 1; ’863 Patent, claim 4)..... 19

H. “ports” (’653 Patent, claims 14, 15, 28; ’863 Patent, claim 1; ’946 Patent, claims 14, 15, 28, 29; ’291 Patent, claims 6; ’083 Patent, claim 1; ’075 Patent, claim 1) 21

I. “application / applications” (’434 Patent, claim 2; ’653 Patent, claims 5-6, 10-11, 17; ’863 Patent, claims 6, 12; ’291 Patent, claim 12; ’946 Patent, claims, 5-6, 10-11, 17) 25

J.	“one or more subtasks are assigned to one or more channels” (’943 Patent, claims 1, 5, 8, 12).....	26
K.	“channel” (’943 Patent, claims 1-2, 5, 8, 12; ’083 Patent, claims 1-2, 5, 8, 12).....	27
L.	“the device is ... further configured with enhanced capabilities to differentiate between various signals or to combine multiple paths into a single communication channel” (’943 Patent, claim 2).....	32
M.	“interface” (’653 Patent, claims 1, 6, 10, 11, 17; ’863 Patent, claim 14; ’946 Patent, claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 11, 17)	34
N.	“multiplex / multiplexes / multiplexed / multiplexing” (’653 Patent, claims 1-4, 27); ’946 Patent, claims 1-4, 16, 27; ’291 Patent, claim 7; ’083 Patent, claims 5, 8, 12, 19; ’943 Patent, claims 2, 11; ’075 Patent, claim 1).....	40
O.	“server” (’653 Patent, claims 4, 15, 27, 28; ’863 Patent, claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 11, 14, 19, 24; ’946 Patent, claims 1, 4, 15, 17, 27, 28, 29, 30; ’083 Patent, claims 6, 8; ’943 Patent, claim 6; ’075 Patent, claim 1).....	45
III.	CONCLUSION.....	45

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Cases**

<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Comm'ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	21
<i>Aspex Eyewear, Inc. v. Marchon Eyewear, Inc.</i> , 672 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	4
<i>Baldwin Graphics Sys., Inc. v. Siebert, Inc.</i> , 512 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	45
<i>Brocade Communications Systems, Inc. v. A10 Networks, Inc.</i> , 2013 WL 831528 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 10, 2013)	5, 7
<i>Brookhill-Wilk 1, LLC. v. Intuitive Surgical, Inc.</i> , 334 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	9
<i>Cellspin Soft, Inc. v. Fitbit, Inc.</i> , 2021 WL 1417419 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 14, 2021)	18
<i>Celltrace LLC v. AT & T Inc.</i> , 2011 WL 738927 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 23, 2011)	19
<i>Comark Communications, Inc. v. Harris Corp.</i> , 156 F.3d 1182 (Fed.Cir.1998)	30
<i>Cox Commc'ns, Inc. v. Sprint Commc'n Co. LP</i> , 838 F.3d 1224 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	8
<i>E.I. du Pont De Nemours & Company v. Unifrax I LLC</i> , 921 F.3d 1060 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	24
<i>Ecolab, Inc. v. FMC Corp.</i> , 569 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	13
<i>Fundamental Innovation Sys. Int'l LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 2018 WL 647734 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 31, 2018).....	17
<i>Honeywell Intern., Inc. v. ITT Indus., Inc.</i> , 452 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	39
<i>IGT v. Bally Gaming Int'l, Inc.</i> , 659 F.3d 1109 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	21

<i>Info-Hold, Inc., v. Applies Media Techs. Corp.,</i> 783 F.3d 1262 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	26
<i>Littelfuse, Inc. v. Mersen USA EP Corp.,</i> 29 F.4 th 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2022)	40
<i>Mentor Graphics Corporation v. EVE-USA, Inc.,</i> 851 F.3d 1275 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	35
<i>Metabolite Labs., Inc. v. Lab. Corp. of Am. Holdings,</i> 370 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	21
<i>Nautilus Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.,</i> 572 U.S. 898 (2014).....	8
<i>Novartis Pharm. Corp. v. Accord Healthcare, Inc.,</i> 21 F.4 th 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2022)	36
<i>Pause Technology, LLC v. TiVo, Inc.,</i> 419 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	29
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.,</i> 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	15, 24, 44
<i>Polaris PowerLED Tech., LLC v. Samsung Elec. America Inc. et al.,</i> No. 2:17-cv-715-JRG, (E.D. Tex. Jun. 7, 2019).....	4
<i>Pulse Elec., Inc. v. U.D. Elec. Corp.,</i> 860 Fed. Appx. 735 (Fed. Cir. 2021).....	26
<i>Radware Ltd. v. A10 Networks, Inc.,</i> 2014 WL 1572644 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 18, 2014).....	4, 6
<i>Radware, Ltd. v. A10 Networks, Inc.,</i> 2014 WL 2738538 (N.D. Cal. Jun. 11, 2014).....	5
<i>Regents of Univ. of Minnesota v. AGA Medical Corp.,</i> 717 F.3d 929 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	39
<i>S Life Sys. Inc. v. Advanced Cardiovascular Sys., Inc.,</i> 242 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	39
<i>SIPCO, LLC v. ABB, Inc.,</i> 2012 WL 3112302 (E.D. Tex. Jul. 30, 2012)	4

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.