

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

ASETEK DANMARK A/S,

Plaintiff,

v.

SHENZHEN APALTEK CO., LTD., A/K/A  
SHENZHEN ANG PAI TECHNOLOGY CO.,  
LTD., and GUANGDONG APALTEK LIQUID  
COOLING TECHNOLOGY CO., LTD., A/K/A  
GUANGDONG ANG PAI LIQUID COOLING  
TECHNOLOGY CO., LTD., OR DONGGUAN  
APALCOOL,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 6:21-cv-00501-ADA

**JURY TRIAL DEMAND**

**DEFENDANTS' REPLY CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

- I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1
- II. ADDITIONAL AGREED CONSTRUCTIONS ..... 1
- III. ARGUMENT: “FLUIDLY COUPLED” ..... 2
  - A. Asetek is estopped from disputing the construction of “fluidly coupled.” ..... 3
  - B. The interpretation of “fluidly coupled” is at issue in this case. .... 5
  - C. Apaltek’s proposed construction lines up with the agreed constructions. .... 5
- IV. Conclusion ..... 8

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

|  | <b>Page(s)</b> |
|--|----------------|
| <b>Cases</b>   |                |
| <i>ACQIS LLC v. Alcatel-Lucent USA Inc.</i> ,<br>2015 WL 1737853, at *7 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 13, 2015) .....            | 6              |
| <i>Asetek Danmark A/S v. CMI USA Inc.</i> ,<br>852 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....                                 | 1, 3           |
| <i>Aspex Eyewear, Inc. v. Zenni Optical LLC</i> ,<br>713 F.3d 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....                           | 4              |
| <i>IGT v. Bally Gaming Int’l, Inc.</i> ,<br>659 F.3d 1109, 1117 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....                              | 7              |
| <i>Lightforce USA, Inc. v. Leupold &amp; Stevens, Inc.</i> ,<br>2019 WL 2146245, at *2 (D. Or. May 15, 2019) ..... | 6-7            |
| <i>Mirror Imaging, LLC v. PNC Bank, N.A.</i> ,<br>2022 WL 229363 (W.D. Tex., Jan. 26, 2022) (Albright, J.).....    | 4              |

## I. INTRODUCTION

This case involves liquid cooling technology for personal computers. According to Asetek, prior art devices had a pump and a heat exchanger (or “cold plate”) that were physically separable and connected via tubes, gaskets, or the like. But the separate pump and heat exchanger occupied more space, and the connectors tended to leak. Asetek’s purported innovation was to combine the pump and heat exchanger into a unitary and seamless “single receptacle” device, shrinking its footprint and eliminating leakage by removing any need for a connector. Others in the industry adopted a similar unitary design. But Asetek then asserted its patents across the industry from its home base in San Jose, California, obtaining settlements and at least one notable trial win. So the industry returned to the old systems with separable pumps and heat exchangers, while improving the connecting tubes and gaskets to reduce leakage. Now, Asetek asserts the same patents against these prior-art designs, attempting to recapture what it has disclaimed in the prior California cases.

## II. ADDITIONAL AGREED CONSTRUCTIONS

Asetek initially asked for new constructions for “reservoir,” “vertically displaced chambers,” “vertically spaced apart,” “spaced apart ... in a vertical direction,” “stator,” and “fluidly coupled”—even though all these terms already had been construed by the Northern District of California and (in the case of “reservoir”) affirmed by the Federal Circuit. ECF No. 55 at 1-2; *see Asetek Danmark A/S v. CMI USA Inc.*, 852 F.3d 1352, 1357-58 (Fed. Cir. 2017). Apaltek asked only for a construction of “chamber.” ECF No. 55 at 1. But two-and-a-half weeks after Apaltek’s opening brief—which proposed the same seven constructions ordered by two federal district judges in California—Asetek reversed course and agreed to abide by the Northern District’s constructions of six terms (ECF No. 56 at 8):

| Claim Term                                 | Stipulated Construction   |
|--|---|
| “reservoir”                                | “single receptacle defining a fluid flow path”  |
| “chamber”                                  | “compartment within the reservoir” (with “reservoir” construed as above)  |
| “vertically displaced chambers”            | “vertically arranged (with reference to each other and the heat exchanging interface) chambers” (with “chamber” construed as above) |
| “vertically spaced apart”                  | “vertically arranged (with reference to each other and the heat exchanging interface) chambers” (with “chamber” construed as above) |
| “spaced apart ... in a vertical direction” | “vertically arranged (with reference to each other and the heat exchanging interface) chambers” (with “chamber” construed as above) |
| “stator”                                   | “stationary parts of the motor that perform or support an electrical or magnetic function of the motor”                             |

The parties agreed to the emendation (*with “chamber” construed as above*) in an email on April 12. The confirming email is attached hereto as Exhibit 1 to the Shaneyfelt declaration.

### III. ARGUMENT: “FLUIDLY COUPLED”

| Claim term   | Apaltek proposed construction  | Asetek proposed construction  |
|--|--|---|
| “fluidly coupled”<br>’362 pat. cls. 1, 13, 14, 17<br>’764 pat. cls. 1, 9, 15, 28, 30 | “fluidly connected, and where a means of coupling is specified, that is the exclusive means of connection” | Prior proposal: “fluidly connected (directly or indirectly)”<br><br>Current proposal: “fluidly connected” |

The only remaining issue is how the Court should construe the one remaining disputed term: *fluidly coupled*. Asetek has previously litigated the meaning of this claim term, which appears in many claims of both asserted patents. It means “fluidly connected,” and “where a means of coupling is specified, that is the exclusive means of connection” under the court’s ruling. ECF

# 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.