

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

AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT LLC,	§	Case No. 2:21-cv-00072-JRG
	§	(LEAD CASE)
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	<b><u>JURY TRIAL DEMANDED</u></b>
v.	§	
	§	
T-MOBILE USA, INC. and T-MOBILE US,	§	
INC.,	§	
	§	
LYFT, INC.,	§	Case No. 2:21-cv-00024-JRG
	§	(MEMBER CASE)
	§	
	§	<b><u>JURY TRIAL DEMANDED</u></b>
	§	
UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., d/b/a	§	Case No. 2:21-cv-00026-JRG
UBER,	§	(MEMBER CASE)
	§	
Defendants.	§	<b><u>JURY TRIAL DEMANDED</u></b>
	§	

**PLAINTIFF AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT LLC'S OBJECTIONS  
TO THE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (DKT. 213)**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page(s)</u></b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. LEGAL STANDARD.....	2
III. ARGUMENT .....	2
A. Using the IP Address Previously .....	2
B. Required Response List .....	4
C. “Consisting of” and “Based on” Claim Terms .....	5
IV. CONCLUSION.....	6

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Abbott Labs v. Baxter Pharm. Prods., Inc.</i> , 334 F.3d 1274 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	5
<i>AGIS Software Dev. LLC v. Huawei Device USA, Inc. et al.</i> , No. 2:17-cv-00513-JRG, Dkt. 205 (E.D. Tex. Oct. 10, 2018).....	4
<i>Cont’l Circuits LLC v. Intel Corp.</i> , 915 F.3d 788 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	4
<i>In re Harnisch</i> , 631 F.2d 716 (CCPA 1980) .....	5
<i>Jacoby v. Trek Bicycle Corp.</i> , No. 2:11-CV-124, 2011 WL 3240445 (E.D. Tex. July 28, 2011) .....	2
<i>Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 898 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	4
<i>Ex parte Markush</i> , 1925 Dec. Comm’r Pat. 126 (1924).....	5
<i>Thorner v. Sony Comput. Entm’t Am. LLC</i> , 669 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	4
<i>Waltman v. Int’l Paper Co.</i> , 875 F.2d 468 (5th Cir. 1989) .....	2
<b>Statutes</b>	
28 U.S.C. § 636(b) .....	1
<b>Other Authorities</b>	
Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a) .....	1, 2
MPEP § 2117 .....	2

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a) and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), Plaintiff AGIS Software Development LLC (“AGIS” or “Plaintiff”) hereby objects to five claim constructions issued in the above-captioned case on November 10, 2021.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Claim Construction Memorandum and Order (the “Order” or “Dkt. 213”) is clearly erroneous or contrary to law regarding five specific claim constructions: (1) “using the IP address previously;” (2) “required response list;” and (3) the “consisting of” and “based on” terms.

The Court’s construction of “using the IP address previously” as indefinite is clearly erroneous because it ignores the “exchang[ed] IP addresses” disclosed in the beginning of the same limitation. The Court’s concern regarding indefiniteness is undermined by Plaintiff’s expert’s un rebutted testimony that claim 9 of the ’724 Patent recites two alternatives for IP-based transmission: (1) direct participant-to-participant IP communication; and (2) server-based IP communication, and accordingly, a POSITA would understand that “using the IP address previously” is consistent with the specification of the ’724 Patent which discloses “the server receives each network identifier. . .along with its dynamic IP address . . .”

The construction of “required response list” term is clearly erroneous or contrary to law because it improperly reads in the term “manual response” with that of “required response list.” By requiring the “required response list” to mean “list of responses, one of which must be selected before the list can be cleared from the display,” renders other limitations redundant and reads in only a certain input method. The Order did not identify why the “required response list” must be “manual.”

Finally, the Court’s construction of the “consisting of” and “based on” terms is clearly erroneous or contrary to the law because it improperly holds that these claim terms are Markush claims. The Order limited the claimed “consisting of” and “based on” terms to “only” certain

options, yet the claims are not written in the alternative. Because a Markush claim “recites a list of *alternatively* usable members,” (MPEP § 2117) and these claim terms are not written in the alternative, the Order improperly held that these claim terms are Markush claims.

## II. LEGAL STANDARD

A non-dispositive decision must be modified or set aside if it is “clearly erroneous or is contrary to law.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a).

Motions for reconsideration “serve the narrow purpose of allowing a party to correct manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence.” *Waltman v. Int’l Paper Co.*, 875 F.2d 468, 473 (5th Cir. 1989). In considering a motion for reconsideration, the moving party must show “(1) an intervening change in controlling law; (2) the availability of new evidence not previously available; or (3) the need to correct a clear error of law or prevent manifest injustice.” *Jacoby v. Trek Bicycle Corp.*, No. 2:11-CV-124, 2011 WL 3240445, at \*1 (E.D. Tex. July 28, 2011).

## III. ARGUMENT

### A. Using the IP Address Previously<sup>1</sup>

A person of ordinary skill in the art would understand that “using the IP address previously” refers to the previously-received IP address in the beginning of the limitation. The Order committed a clear error by rejecting Plaintiff’s proposed construction and holding this claim limitation indefinite. It was erroneous to hold that “using the IP address previously” was indefinite where the ’724 Patent claims and specification disclose that claim 9 of the ’724 Patent recites two alternatives for IP-based transmission: (1) direct participant-to-participants IP communication; and (2) server-based IP communication. Dkt. 213 at 26. While the Court acknowledged AGIS’s

---

<sup>1</sup> AGIS incorporates by reference its arguments set forth in its opening claim construction brief and reply claim construction brief. *See* Dkt. 145 at 15-16; Dkt. 166 at 5.

# 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.