

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MIDLAND-ODESSA DIVISION

RESONANT SYSTEMS, INC. d/b/a
RevelHMI,

Plaintiff,

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 7:23-cv-00077-DC

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

DEFENDANT APPLE INC.'S OPENING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
TECHNOLOGY OVERVIEW	2
LEGAL PRINCIPLES OF CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	4
AGREED CONSTRUCTIONS	5
ARGUMENT	5
I. “Control Component ...” is a Means-Plus-Function Term in All (Not Just Some) of the Asserted Patents and Should Be Construed as Having the Function and Corresponding Structure Apple Proposes	5
A. Legal Principles of Means-Plus-Function Claiming under 35 U.S.C. § 112(f).....	6
B. “Control Component” Should Be Construed as a Means-Plus-Function Term Under § 112(f).....	7
1. Legal Principles Regarding When § 112(f) Applies.....	7
2. “Control Component ...” Is a Means-Plus-Function Term Under § 112(f) Because It Does Not Provide Sufficient Structure.....	8
C. The Construction of “Control Component ...” Under § 112(f).....	11
1. Legal Principles of Construing § 112(f) Limitations.....	11
2. There Is No Dispute Over the Function of the “Control Component ...” Terms Under § 112(f).....	12
3. The Corresponding Structure of the “Control Component ...” Is the Structure Disclosed in Each Respective Specification, as Required Under § 112(f).....	12
II. The Preamble of Each Asserted Claim Is Limiting	22
III. Indefiniteness	24
A. This Court Should Find Indefinite the Asserted Claims that Lack Antecedent Basis.....	25
1. Claim 4 of the ’830 Patent and Claims 17, 19, and 20 of the ’882 Patent Are Indefinite Because They Lack Any Antecedent Basis.....	26

2.	Claims 1, 3–7, and 10 of the '882 Patent Are Indefinite Because They Fail to Limit the Claim to One of Two Possible Antecedent Bases.	26
3.	Claim 1 of the '767 Patent and Claim 20 of the '882 Patent Are Indefinite Because the Antecedent Basis Conflicts with a Recited Term.	27
B.	Claim 1 of the '767 Patent and Claim 4 of the '830 Patent Are Indefinite Because They Lack Objective Boundaries.	28
IV.	The Court Should Not Rewrite Two of Resonant's Claims	28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Amdocs (Israel) Ltd. V. Openet Telecom, Inc.</i> , 2018 WL 1699429 (E.D. Va. Apr. 6, 2018)	8
<i>Arlington Indus., Inc. v. Bridgeport Fittings, Inc.</i> , 345 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	29
<i>B. Braun Med. Inc. v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 124 F.3d 1419 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	12
<i>Biomedino, LLC v. Waters Techs. Corp.</i> , 490 F.3d 946 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	21
<i>Bushnell Hawthorne v. Cisco</i> , 813 F. App'x 522 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	25
<i>Cardiac Pacemakers, Inc. v. St. Jude Med., Inc.</i> , 296 F.3d 1106 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	11
<i>Cellular Commc'ns Equip. v. AT&T, Inc.</i> , 2016 WL 7364266 (E.D. Tex. 2016)	30
<i>Chef Am., Inc. v. Lamb-Weston, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	25
<i>Corning Glass Works v. Sumitomo Elec. U.S.A., Inc.</i> , 868 F.2d 1251 (Fed. Cir. 1989).....	23
<i>Cypress Lake Software, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Am., Inc.</i> , 382 F. Supp. 3d 586 (E.D. Tex. 2019).....	8
<i>Default Proof Credit Card Sys. v. Home Depot U.S.A., Inc.</i> , 412 F.3d 1291 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	14
<i>Diebold Nixdorf, Inc. v. In'l Trade Com'n</i> , 899 F.3d 1291 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	11
<i>Display Techs., LLC v. Mechtronics Corp.</i> , 335 F. Supp. 2d 431 (S.D.N.Y. 2004).....	22
<i>E.I. du Pont De Nemours & Co. v. Unifrax I LLC</i> , 921 F.3d 1060 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	4

<i>Egenera, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , 972 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	9
<i>Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 9 F. Supp. 3d 1126 (C.D. Cal. 2014)	6
<i>Halliburton Energy Servs., Inc. v. M-I LLC</i> , 514 F.3d 1244 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	25
<i>Halliburton Oil Well Cementing Co. v. Walker</i> , 329 U.S. 1 (1946).....	6
<i>Hearing Components, Inc. v. Shure Inc.</i> , 600 F.3d 1357, 94 USPQ2d 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	23
<i>Holland Furniture Co. v. Perkins Glue Co.</i> , 277 U.S. 245 (1928).....	6
<i>Image Processing Technologies, LLC v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.</i> , 2017 WL 2672616 (E.D. Tex. 2017)	27
<i>Intell. Ventures I LLC v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.</i> , 902 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	28
<i>Interval Licensing LLC v. AOL, Inc.</i> , 766 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	25, 28
<i>Lockheed Martin Corp. v. Space Systems/Loral, Inc.</i> , 324 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	7
<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.</i> , 517 U.S. 370 (1996).....	4
<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.</i> , 52 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	4
<i>Mass. Inst. of Tech. v. Abacus Software</i> , 462 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	10
<i>MEMS Tech. Berhad v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 447 F. App’x 142 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	24
<i>Micro Chem., Inc. v. Great Plains Chem. Co., Inc.</i> , 194 F.3d 1250 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	11
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.</i> , 572 U.S. 898 (2014).....	24, 25

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.