

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION

QUEST NETTECH CORPORATION,

Plaintiff,

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§

C.A. No. 2:19-cv-118-JRG

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**APPLE INC.'S RESPONSIVE
CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. THE '137 PATENT 1

III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS..... 4

 A. “financial transaction records relative to the multiple accounts” (claim 10) and “records relative to the multiple accounts” (claim 33)..... 4

 B. “wherein said memory is of sufficient size to store financial transaction records related to a predetermined time period” (claim 10) 9

 C. “transfer of data stored in the memory to a new multiple account electronic credit card” (claim 10) 11

 D. “multiple account electronic credit card” (claims 10 and 33)..... 13

 E. “operation of the [credit] card” (claims 10 and 33) 17

IV. CONCLUSION..... 18

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Astute Tech., LLC v. Learners Digest Int’l LLC,
 No. 2:12-CV-689-JRG, 2014 WL 1385191 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 2, 2014) 14

Chef Am., Inc. v. Lamb–Weston, Inc.,
 358 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2004)..... 16

Edwards Lifesciences LLC v. Cook Inc.,
 582 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2009)..... 7

Express Mobile, Inc. v. Svanaco, Inc.,
 No. 2:17-cv-00130-JRG-RSP, 2018 WL 746472 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 7, 2018)..... 18

Hill-Rom Servs., Inc. v. Stryker Corp.,
 755 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 7

Honeywell Int’l, Inc. v. ITT Indus.,
 452 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2006)..... 5

IPXL Holdings, L.L.C. v. Amazon.com, Inc.,
 430 F.3d 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 10

Micro Int’l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co.,
 521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... 9

Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.,
 134 S. Ct. 2120 (2014)..... 9

Orion IP, LLC v. Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC,
 516 F. Supp. 2d 720 (E.D. Tex. 2007)..... 16

Philips v. AWH Corp.,
 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 14, 17

Rembrandt Data Techs., LP v. AOL, LLC,
 641 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2011)..... 16

SciMed Life Sys., Inc. v. Advanced Cardiovascular Sys., Inc.,
 242 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2001)..... 5

Verizon Servs. Corp. v. Vonage Holdings Corp.,
 503 F.3d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 2007)..... 5, 7

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 101..... 16

Other Authorities

The American Heritage Dictionary (1996)..... 15

The New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary (1993) 15

I. INTRODUCTION

Defendant Apple Inc. (“Apple”) hereby submits its responsive claim construction brief. Apple and Plaintiff Quest NetTech Corporation (“NetTech”) dispute the meaning of five claim terms in asserted U.S. Patent No. RE38,137 (“the ’137 patent”). The disputes are resolved by applying several well-established legal principles. First, the patent’s characterization of “the present invention” compels the adoption of Apple’s constructions for the “[financial transaction] records” and “memory is of sufficient size” terms. Second, the plain language of claim 10 itself resolves the dispute over the meaning of the term “data” in Apple’s favor. Third, the prohibitions against broadening claims beyond their plain meaning and construing terms to preserve validity require that the term “multiple account electronic credit card” be given its plain and ordinary meaning as Apple has proposed. And fourth, the prohibition against importing limitations from the specification into the claims militates against adopting NetTech’s proposed construction for “operation of the credit card.”

Apple’s constructions should be adopted because they stay true to the intrinsic record and these principles.

II. THE ’137 PATENT

The ’137 patent—titled “Programmable Multiple Company Credit Card System”—claims priority to an application filed on September 28, 1995. The priority application issued as U.S. Patent No. 5,859,419 (“the ’419 patent”) on January 12, 1999. Subsequently, the patent owner filed an application seeking reissue of the ’419 patent on January 11, 2001. That application gave rise to the ’137 patent, which issued on June 10, 2003. The ’137 patent expired on September 28, 2015.

The ’137 patent is directed to a “universal financial data card for compiling and storing financial transaction records pertaining to a plurality of financial accounts.” ’137 patent at

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.