

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

WAG ACQUISITION, L.L.C.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

GOOGLE LLC and YOUTUBE, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No.: 6:21-cv-00816-ADA

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

---

**DEFENDANTS GOOGLE LLC AND YOUTUBE, LLC'S REPLY  
CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
<b>I. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	1
<b>II. DISPUTED CLAIM TERMS</b> .....	1
A. “as required to maintain about a predetermined number of media data elements” (’594 Patent, cls. 1, 6, 11).....	1
B. “a predetermined number of media data elements” (’594 Patent, cls. 1, 6, 11).....	3
C. “the media source” (’594 Patent, cls. 1, 6, 11) .....	5
D. “each sending is at a transmission rate as fast as the data connection between the server system and each requesting user system allows” (’824 Patent, cls. 1, 5, 9; ’636 Patent, cls. 1, 5, 9).....	5
E. “all of the media data elements that are sent by the server system to the requesting user systems are sent from the data structure under the control of the server system as the media data elements were first stored therein” (’824 Patent, cls. 1, 5, 9; ’636 Patent, cls. 1, 5, 9) .....	7
F. “supplying, at the server system, media data elements representing the program” (’824 Patent, cls. 1, 5, 9; ’636 Patents, cls. 1, 5, 9) .....	7
<b>III. CONCLUSION</b> .....	8

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page**

**Cases**

*WAG Acquisition, L.L.C. v. Amazon.com, Inc.*,  
 No. 6:21-cv-00815-ADA, Dkt. 37 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 11, 2022).....5

*CUPP Cybersecurity, LLC v. Trend Micro, Inc.*,  
 No. 3:18-cv-1251-M, 2021 WL 5865393 (N.D. Tex. Dec. 10, 2021).....6

*Application of Eltgroth*,  
 419 F.2d 918 (C.C.P.A. 1970) .....6

*K-2 Corp. v. Salomon S.A.*,  
 191 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....4

*Media Rights Techs., Inc. v. Capital One Fin. Corp.*,  
 800 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....5, 6

*Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.*,  
 572 U.S. 898 (2014).....2

*Pall Corp. v. Micron Separations, Inc.*,  
 66 F.3d 1211 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....3

*Phillips v. AWH Corp.*,  
 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....1, 4

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C.

§ 112, paragraph 1.....6

§ 112, paragraph 2.....6

### Table of Disputed Terms and Constructions

Term	Google's Construction	WAG's Construction
<p>“as required to maintain about a predetermined number of media data elements”</p> <p>(’594 Patent, cls. 1, 6, 11)</p>	Indefinite	Plain and ordinary meaning
<p>“a predetermined number of media data elements”</p> <p>(’594 Patent, cls. 1, 6, 11)</p>	“a specified number of media data elements, set prior to the start of playback of the audio or video program”	Plain and ordinary meaning
<p>“the media source”</p> <p>(’594 Patent, cls. 1, 6, 11)</p>	“the storage device or live source device from which the streaming material originates”	Plain and ordinary meaning
<p>“each sending is at a transmission rate as fast as the data connection between the server system and each requesting user system allows”</p> <p>(’824 Patent, cls. 1, 5, 9; ’636 Patent, cls. 1, 5, 9)</p>	Indefinite	Plain and ordinary meaning
<p>“all of the media data elements that are sent by the server system to the requesting user systems are sent from the data structure under the control of the server system as the media data elements were first stored therein”</p> <p>(’824 Patent, cls. 1, 5, 9; ’636 Patent, cls. 1, 5, 9)</p>	“all of the media data elements that are sent by the server system to the requesting user systems are sent from the same data structure under the control of the server system and in the same format as the media data elements were first stored therein”	Plain and ordinary meaning
<p>“supplying, at the server system, media data elements representing the program”</p> <p>(’824 Patent, cls. 1, 5, 9; ’636 Patents, cls. 1, 5, 9)</p>	“creating, at the server system, media data elements representing the program”	Plain and ordinary meaning

...

## I. INTRODUCTION

Under the guise of “plain and ordinary meaning,” Plaintiff WAG Acquisition L.L.C. (“Plaintiff”) proposes constructions that conflict with the claims as a whole and that find no support in the specification. For the terms amenable to construction, Defendants Google LLC and YouTube, LLC (collectively, “Google”) proposed constructions that are not only grounded in the language of the claims, but also align with the intrinsic record. For these reasons, as demonstrated below, Google’s constructions should be adopted. *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc) (construction that “stays true to the claim language and most naturally aligns with the patent’s description of the invention will be, in the end, the correct construction.”).

Google further identified certain terms that are indefinite because they are subject to multiple potential interpretations, where the patent specification provides no guidance on which interpretation is correct. The parties have agreed to the correct interpretation of one of the terms (“all of the media data elements . . . were first stored therein”), but for the other two terms, Plaintiff does not dispute the fact that the terms are subject to multiple interpretations, nor does Plaintiff identify any objective boundaries in the patent specification that define the scope of these terms. Instead, Plaintiff essentially argues that the lack of objective boundaries should be excused in this case. Plaintiff’s arguments are inconsistent with the patent claims, the patent specification, and the law and should be rejected by the Court.

## II. DISPUTED CLAIM TERMS

### A. “as required to maintain about a predetermined number of media data elements” (’594 Patent, cls. 1, 6, 11)

For this term, Plaintiff fails to show that the specification or prosecution history gives a guidepost or any other objective bound for what range of media data elements satisfies “about a predetermined number.”

# 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.