

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

GESTURE TECHNOLOGY
PARTNERS, LLC,

Plaintiff

v.

HUAWEI DEVICE CO., LTD.,
HUAWEI DEVICE USA, INC.,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CASE NO. 2:21-cv-00040-JRG
(Lead Case)

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

GESTURE TECHNOLOGY
PARTNERS, LLC,

Plaintiff

v.

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.
AND SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS
AMERICA, INC.,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CASE NO. 2:21-cv-00041-JRG
(Member Case)

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

DEFENDANTS' RESPONSIVE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. '431 PATENT.....	2
A. “means for controlling a function of said apparatus using said information” (Claim 7)	2
B. “computer means within said housing for analyzing said image to determine information concerning a position or movement of said object” (Claim 7)	5
C. “display function which is controlled” (Claim 9).....	8
D. “sensing means associated with said device” (Claim 1).....	8
E. “means for transmitting information” (Claim 11)	9
F. “a light source for illuminating said object” (Claim 12).....	10
G. “wherein said movement is sensed in 3 dimensions” (Claim 4) / “wherein said information is obtained in 3 dimensions” (Claim 19)	10
H. “electro-optically sensing” (Claim 1) / “electro-optical sensing” (Claim 2)	11
III. '924 PATENT.....	11
A. “oriented to view” (Claim 1).....	11
B. “oriented to view a user” (Claim 1) / “oriented to view an object other than the user” (Claim 1).....	13
C. “wherein the gesture is performed by a person other than the user of the handheld device” (Claim 9)	16
D. “a computer within the housing . . . adapted to perform a control function of the handheld device based on at least one of the first camera output and the second camera output” (Claim 1).....	17
E. “gesture” (Claims 6, 9)	19
F. “adapted to” (Claims 1, 3–5, 8, 10, 12, 14)	20
IV. '079 PATENT.....	21
A. “gesture” (Claims 1, 4–5, 11, 18–21, 24–25)	21
B. “light source adapted to direct illumination through a work volume above the light source” / “light source adapted to illuminate a human body part within a work volume generally above the light source” / “light source in fixed relation relative to the camera and adapted to direct illumination through the work volume” (Claims 1–3, 9–11, 14–15, 21–23, 30)	21
C. “a processor adapted to determine the gesture performed in the work volume and illuminated by the light source based on the camera output” (Claim 11).....	22

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

		Page
D.	“the first and second cameras” (Claim 26)	24
E.	“adapted to” (Claims 1, 11, 21)	24
F.	“three-dimensional position” (Claims 8, 28)	24
G.	“work volume above the light source” / “work volume generally above the light source” / “work volume above the camera” (Claims 1, 6–7, 11–12, 21)	24
V.	’949 PATENT	25
A.	“gesture” (Claims 1–3, 8–10, 13–15)	25
B.	“forward facing portion” (Claims 1, 8, 13) / “forward facing light source” (Claims 5, 16).....	27
C.	“the detected gesture is identified by the processing unit apart from a plurality of gestures” (Claim 13)	27
D.	“the electro-optical sensor” / “the electro-optical sensor field of view” (Claim 13).....	28
E.	“processing unit” terms (Claims 1, 8, and 13).....	29
F.	“adapted to” (Claims 1, 13)	30
G.	“electro-optical sensor” (Claims 1, 4, 6–8, 11–13).....	30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Apple Inc. v. Motorola, Inc.</i> , 757 F.3d 1286 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	17, 23, 29
<i>Aristocrat Techs. Austl. Pty Ltd. v. Int'l Game Tech.</i> , 521 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	7
<i>Aspex Eyewear Inc. v. Marchon Eyewear Inc.</i> , 672 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	20, 24, 30
<i>B. Braun Med., Inc. v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 124 F.3d 1419 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	5
<i>Barkan Wireless IP Holdings, L.P. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , No. 2:18-CV-28-JRG, 2019 WL 497902 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 7, 2019)	20, 24, 30
<i>Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Grp., LP</i> , 616 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	22
<i>Bell Atl. Network Servs., Inc. v. Covad Commc'ns Grp., Inc.</i> , 262 F.3d 1258 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	10, 22
<i>Brown v. Baylor Healthcare Sys.</i> , No. H-08-0372, 2009 WL 1011186 (S.D. Tex. Apr. 15, 2009).....	7
<i>Bushnell Hawthorne, LLC v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , 813 F. App'x 522 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	24
<i>Catch Curve, Inc. v. Venali, Inc.</i> , No. CV 05-4820, 2007 WL 3308101 (C.D. Cal. May 11, 2007).....	7
<i>Custom Media Techs. LLC v. Comcast Cable Commc'ns LLC</i> , Nos. 13-1421, 13-1424, 2015 WL 4743671 (D. Del. Aug. 11, 2015).....	7
<i>In re Giannelli</i> , 739 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	20, 24, 30
<i>GoDaddy.com, LLC v. RPost Commc'ns Ltd.</i> , No. CV-14-00126-PHX-JAT, 2016 WL 212676 (D. Ariz. Jan. 19, 2016), <i>aff'd</i> <i>on other grounds</i> , 685 F. App'x 992 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	18
<i>H-W Tech., L.C. v. Overstock.com, Inc.</i> , 758 F.3d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	13

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

(continued)

	Page(s)
<i>Harris Corp. v. Ericsson Inc.</i> , 417 F.3d 1241 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	4, 7
<i>Huawei Technologies Co. v. T-Mobile US, Inc.</i> , No. 2:16-CV-00056-JRG-RSP, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 79836 (E.D. Tex. May 24, 2017)	29
<i>IPXL Holdings, L.L.C. v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , 430 F.3d 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	1, 13, 15, 16
<i>In re Katz Interactive Call Processing Patent Litig.</i> , 639 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	7, 13, 17
<i>Koninklijke Philips N.V. v. Asustek Comput. Inc.</i> , No. 15-1125-GMS, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 106501 (D. Del. July 11, 2017)	9
<i>Medtronic, Inc. v. Advanced Cardiovascular Sys., Inc.</i> , 248 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	2
<i>Merck & Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	13
<i>Micro Chemical, Inc. v. Great Plains Chemical Co.</i> , 194 F.3d 1250 (Fed Cir. 1999).....	3
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.</i> , 572 U.S. 898 (2014).....	27
<i>Nevro Corp. v. Boston Sci. Corp.</i> , 955 F.3d 35 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	20, 24, 30
<i>O2 Micro Int'l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co.</i> , 521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	1, 19
<i>Optis Cellular Tech., LLC v. Kyocera Corp.</i> , No. 2:16-cv-0059-JRG-RSP, 2017 WL 541298 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 8, 2017).....	23
<i>Parity Networks, LLC v. ZyXEL Commc 'ns, Inc.</i> , No. SACV 20-697JVS(KESx), 2020 WL 8569299 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 22, 2020), <i>reconsideration denied sub nom. Parity Networks, LLC v. ZyXEL Commc 'ns,</i> <i>Inc.</i> , No. SACV 20-697JVS(KESx), 2021 WL 545282 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 26, 2021)	18
<i>Pers. Audio, LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> , No. 9:09CV111, 2011 WL 11757163 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 31, 2011)	18

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.