

EXHIBIT D3

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

AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT, LLC,	§	
	§	Case No. 2:17-cv-513-JRG
	§	(LEAD CASE)
Plaintiff,	§	
v.	§	
	§	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
HUAWEI DEVICE USA INC., ET AL.,	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	
	§	

**PLAINTIFF AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT, LLC'S
REPLY CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page No(s).

I. ARGUMENT..... 1

A. “means for attaching a forced message alert software packet to a voice or text message creating a forced message alert that is transmitted by said sender PDA/cell phone to the recipient PDA/cell phone, [said forced message alert software packet containing a list of possible required responses]” (Claim 1 of the ’970 Patent)..... 1

B. “[means for. . .] requiring the forced message alert software on said recipient PDA/cell phone to transmit an automatic acknowledgment to the sender PDA/cell phone as soon as said forced message alert is received by the recipient PDA/cell phone” (’970 Patent Claim 1)..... 4

C. “means for requiring a required manual response from the response list by the recipient in order to clear recipient’s response list from recipient’s cell phone display” (’970 Patent, Claim 1)..... 5

D. “means for periodically resending said forced message alert to said recipient PDA/cell phones that have not automatically acknowledged the forced message alert” (’970 Patent, Claim 1) 6

E. Claim 54 of the ’838 Patent, Claims 24, 29, and 31 of the ’251 Patent, Claims 28, 32, 33, 34, and 36 of the ’055 Patent, and Claim 68 of the ’829 Patent – Claim Terms That Do Not Recite “Means” Language..... 7

1. The Claims Are Not Governed by 35 U.S.C. § 112(6)..... 8

2. AGIS’s Expert Does Not “Fill In” Missing Structure 9

3. Defendants Admit That the Claims Contain Sufficient Structure in the Form of Algorithms 10

F. “a forced message alert software application program” (’970 Patent, Claims 1, 6)..... 10

G. “manual response” (’970 Patent, Claims 1, 6)..... 11

H. “the repeating voice alert” (’970 Patent, Claim 6)..... 12

I. “group” (’838 Patent, Claims 1, 54, 55, 84; ’251 Patent, Claims 1, 24; ’829 Patent, Claims 1, 34, 35, 68)..... 13

1. A “Group” Does Not Exclude Groups of Two..... 13

2. A “Group” Does not Require the Superfluous Limitations
“Associated Together Without Having To Pre-Enter Data Into A
Web Or Identify Other Users By Name, E-Mail Addresses Or
Phone Numbers” 15

J. “receiving a message from a second device” (’251 Patent, Claims 1, 24) 18

K. “an identifier corresponding to the group” (’838 Patent, Claims 1, 54,
55, and 84) 19

L. “database of entities” (’838 Patent, Claim 23; ’251 Patent, Claim 14) 20

M. “Short Message Service (SMS) messages” (’055 Patent, Claims 1, 54) 20

N. “the other symbol” (’055 Patent, Claims 2, 42)..... 21

O. “User selection of the sub-net” (’055 Patent, Claims 7, 34)..... 22

II. CONCLUSION..... 22

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Apple Inc. v. AGIS Software Development, LLC</i> , Case No. IPR 2018-00818, (P.T.A.B., March 22, 2018).....	21
<i>Aristocrat Techs. Australia Pty Ltd. v. Int’l Game Tech.</i> , 521 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	3, 6
<i>Augme Techs., Inc. v. Yahoo! Inc.</i> , 755 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	3
<i>Bell Atl. Network Servs., Inc. v. Covad Commc’ns Grp., Inc.</i> , 262 F.3d 1258 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	14
<i>C.F. Verizon Servs. Corp. v. Vonage Holdings Corp.</i> , 503 F.3d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	17
<i>Chicago Board Options Exchange, Inc. v. International Securities Exchange, LLC</i> , 748 F.3d 1134 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	3, 6, 7
<i>Cole v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.</i> , 102 F.3d 524 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	8
<i>Default Proof Credit Card Sys., Inc. v. Home Depot U.S.A., Inc. (d/b/a The Home Depot)</i> , 412 F.3d 1291 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	3
<i>Gemalto S.A. v. HTC Corp.</i> , No. 6:10-CV-561 LED-JDL, 2012 WL 2505745 (E.D. Tex. June 28, 2012).....	8, 9, 10
<i>Nobelbiz, Inc. v. Glob. Connect, L.L.C.</i> , 876 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	21
<i>PPC Broadband, Inc. v. Corning Optical Commc’ns RF, LLC</i> , 815 F.3d 747 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	19
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	18
<i>Spectra-Physics, Inc. v. Coherent, Inc.</i> , 827 F.2d 1524, 3 USPQ2d 1737 (Fed. Cir. 1987)	20
<i>Williamson v. Citrix Online LLC</i> , 792 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	8

...

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.