

# EXHIBIT 3

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

JAWBONE INNOVATIONS, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. 6:21-CV-00985-ADA

PATENT CASE

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED



\*PUBLIC VERSION\*

**GOOGLE LLC'S OPENING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. LEGAL STANDARD.....	2
III. DISPUTED TERMS.....	3
A. “microphone” (’058 patent, claim 1; ’543 patent, claims 1, 8, 19, 20, & 26) (proposed by Google) .....	3
B. “the acoustic signals” / “the acoustic signal received at the one receiver” / “the acoustic signals received at each of the two receivers” (’058 patent, claim 1) (proposed by Google) .....	9
C. “transfer function” (’091 patent, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 11, 15; ’357 patent, claims 1, 15; ’080 patent, claims 1, 14) (proposed by Jawbone) .....	12
D. “generating one transfer function of the at least two transfer functions . . . when the VAD indicates that user voice activity is present.” (’091 patent, claim 2) (proposed by Google) .....	13
E. “virtual microphone array” (’072 patent, claim 1) (proposed by Google) .....	14
F. “acoustic noise” (proposed by Jawbone) and “less acoustic noise” (proposed by Google) (’072 patent, claims 1, 2, 9) .....	16
G. “approximately similar” / “approximately, dissimilar” / “approximately dissimilar” (’213 patent, claims 2, 37 & 38; ’611 patent, claim 3, 4 & 29) (proposed by Google)....	18
H. “a relationship for speech” (’213 patent claims 14, 42; ’611 patent claim 1) (proposed by Google) .....	22
I. “. . . substantially similar/dissimilar. . .” (’691 patent, claims 1, 23, 27, 28, 29, 41; ’080 patent, claims 1, 14; ’357 patent, claims 1, 15;) (proposed by Google).....	23
J. “apply a varying linear transfer function between the first and second microphone signals” (’357 patent, claims 1, 15) (proposed by Google) .....	28
IV. CONCLUSION.....	30

*Geodynamics*, 2016 WL 6217181, at \*15 (noting that specification’s discussion of “equal” relationship between tunnel depth and the depth of penetration provided no standard for determining scope of claims reciting “substantially equal” tunnel depth and depth of penetration.)

In sum, because nothing in the intrinsic or extrinsic record provides an objective standard for measuring the terms “substantially similar” and “substantially dissimilar” the claims in which those terms appear should be found indefinite.

**J. “apply a varying linear transfer function between the first and second microphone signals” (’357 patent, claims 1, 15) (proposed by Google)**

JAWBONE	GOOGLE
Plain and ordinary meaning; no construction necessary	“calculate a linear transfer function using the first and the second microphone signals to apply the transfer function to a microphone signal”

The meaning of this term is not facially clear, because the claim language does not elucidate what is meant by a varying linear transfer function that is “appl[ied] . . . between” two microphone signals. It is unknown, for example, whether the transfer function is applied to either (i) one of the microphone signals selected from (i.e., in between) the two microphone signals, or (ii) both the microphone signals, or whether the transfer function is derived from the first and second microphone signals or whether it calculates a relationship between the two signals. Ex. 18 (Reader Decl.) ¶ 65. Thus, a person of ordinary skill in the art “would naturally look to the written description for a full understanding of the claims.” *Howmedica Osteonics Corp. v. Zimmer, Inc.*, 822 F.3d 1312, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2016). “Claims ‘must be read in view of the specification, of which they are a part.’” *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1315.

In a series of equations, the ’357 written description confirms the meaning of this otherwise ambiguous claim term. Equations 1-4 of the ’357 written description set forth the process by which the varying linear transfer function, designated  $H_1(z)$ , is calculated and applied to a microphone

signal. In the digital frequency domain, the total acoustic information entering Microphone 1 is denoted as  $M_1(z)$  and the total acoustic information entering Microphone 2 is denoted as  $M_2(z)$ . '357 patent at Eq. 1. The adaptive transfer functions  $H_1(z)$  and  $H_2(z)$  are then calculated each as ratios between the first and the second microphone signals, where the subscripts indicate that either noise (N) or speech (S) is being received:

$$H_1(z) = \frac{M_{1N}(z)}{M_{2N}(z)}, \quad H_2(z) = \frac{M_{2S}(z)}{M_{1S}(z)},$$

*Id.* at Eq. 2; 6:55-56; 6:65-7:2; 7:15-20.

After the transfer functions are each calculated by a ratio of the first and second microphone signals, the specification explains, they are used to remove the noise from the signal. *Id.* at 7:29-30. Equation 4 sets forth the isolation of the speech signal, wherein the transfer function is applied to the second microphone signal, and that product is subtracted from the first microphone signal:

$$S(z) \approx M_1(z) - M_2(z)H_1(z).$$

*Id.* at Eq. 4. Accordingly, while the linear transfer function is calculated using both the first and the second microphone signals, it is ultimately only applied to one microphone signal.

Here, where the claim term is facially ambiguous about what it means to “apply” a varying linear transfer function “between” two signals, Google’s proposed construction reflects the claim language as it is read in view of the specification. *See Hologic*, 639 F.3d at 1335 (where claim did not specify a reference for asymmetry of radiation source’s placement, court examined specification’s description of invention to limit claim term).

# 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.