

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

**MAXELL, LTD.,**

**Plaintiff,**

**vs.**

**APPLE INC.,**

**Defendant.**

Civil Action No. 5:19-cv-00036-RWS

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. THE COURT SHOULD REJECT MAXELL’S IMPROPER “PLAIN AND ORDINARY MEANING” INVOCATIONS AND CONSTRUE THE DISPUTED TERMS .....	2
III. MAXELL CANNOT USE “PLAIN AND ORDINARY MEANING” TO AVOID MEANS-PLUS-FUNCTION CONSTRUCTIONS .....	3
IV. THE ’794 PATENT .....	5
A. “capacity detector for detecting a remaining [battery] capacity of said battery” (Claims 1, 9).....	6
1. The “capacity detector” phrase is a means-plus-function limitation. ....	6
2. Apple’s construction correctly applies § 112, ¶ 6.....	8
V. THE ’306 PATENT .....	8
A. “ringing sound generator” (Claims 2, 12, 13).....	8
VI. THE ’438 PATENT .....	10
A. “an input unit for receiving an input entered by a user” (Claim 1).....	10
B. “means for selecting an object displayed on said display apparatus” (Claim 3) .....	12
C. “display apparatus” (Claim 1-7) .....	12
D. “adding a comment to contributed data” (Claim 2) .....	14
VII. THE ’991 PATENT .....	15
A. “communication apparatus” (Claims 1, 8).....	15
VIII. THE ’493 PATENT .....	18
A. “effective scanning lines ... of a display screen” (Claim 1).....	18
1. The specification defines “effective scanning line” in the context of an interlaced scanning display.....	19
2. Maxell’s construction excludes the preferred embodiments and is otherwise unsupported by the specification.....	20
B. The “mixing” and “culling” terms (Claims 1, 5, 10) .....	22
1. “Mixing”: Apple’s construction is supported by the intrinsic evidence. ....	22
2. “Culling”: The term carries specialized meaning and requires construction.....	23
IX. THE ’498, ’317, AND ’999 (WALKING NAVIGATION) PATENTS .....	25

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

(continued)

	<b>Page</b>
A. “a device for getting location information denoting a present place of said portable terminal” (all independent claims of the ’498, ’317, ’999 patents) .....	25
1. Prosecution history disclaimer requires including an “infrared ray sensor” in the term’s construction.....	26
2. The specification supports Apple’s construction.....	27
B. “a device for retrieving a route from said present place to said destination” / “a device for getting a location information another terminal ... via connected network” / “a device for getting the location information of another portable terminal” (’317 Claims 10, 15, 18; ’999 Claims 1, 5, 6) .....	29
X. CONCLUSION.....	30

..

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Accent Packaging, Inc. v. Leggett &amp; Platt, Inc.</i> , 707 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	20
<i>Advanced Ground Info. Sys., Inc. v. Life360, Inc.</i> , 830 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	3, 7, 9
<i>Akzo Nobel Coatings, Inc. v. Dow Chem. Co.</i> , 811 F.3d 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	14
<i>Atmel Corp. v. Info. Storage Devices, Inc.</i> , 997 F. Supp. 1210 (N.D. Cal. 1998) .....	11
<i>Aylus Networks, Inc. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 856 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	26, 27
<i>Azure Networks, LLC v. CSR PLC</i> , 771 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	2
<i>Bd. of Regents of the Univ. of Texas Sys. v. BENQ Am. Corp.</i> , 533 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	26
<i>Blackboard, Inc. v. Desire2Learn, Inc.</i> , 574 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	8, 12
<i>Cellular Commc 'ns Equip. LLC v. HTC Corp.</i> , No. 6:13-cv-00507-KNM, 2015 WL 10741012 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 9, 2015) .....	11
<i>CommScope Techs. LLC v. Dali Wireless, Inc.</i> , No. 3:16-CV-477, 2017 WL 6549933 (N.D. Tex. Dec. 19, 2017) .....	10
<i>Diebold Nixdorf, Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n.</i> , 899 F.3d 1291 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....	4
<i>Eon Corp. IP Holdings LLC v. Silver Spring Networks, Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	2
<i>Eon-net LP v. Flagstar Bancorp.</i> , 653 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	16
<i>ePlus, Inc. v. Lawson Software, Inc.</i> , 700 F.3d 509 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	5
<i>Fonar Corp. v. General Elec. Co.</i> , 107 F.3d 1543 (Fed. Cir. 1997) .....	10, 11

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

Continued

	<b>Page</b>
<i>GPNE Corp. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 830 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	13, 14, 16
<i>IPCom GMBH &amp; Co. v. HTC Corp.</i> , 861 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	28
<i>Kensey Nash Corp. v. Perclose, Inc.</i> , 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 12754 (E.D. Pa. Aug. 21, 2001) .....	7
<i>Laitram Corp. v. Rexnord, Inc.</i> , 939 F.2d 1533 (Fed. Cir. 1991) .....	5
<i>Lochner Techs., LLC v. Lenovo (United States) Inc.</i> , No. 2:10-CV-430-JRG, 2015 WL 293625 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 21, 2015) .....	10, 11
<i>Luminara Worldwide, LLC v. Liown Elecs. Co., Ltd.</i> , 814 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	13
<i>Mas-Hamilton Grp. v. LaGard, Inc.</i> , 156 F.3d 1206 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....	5
<i>Maxell Ltd. v. Huawei Device USA Inc.</i> , 297 F. Supp. 3d 668 (E.D. Tex. 2018) .....	passim
<i>Mettler-Toledo, Inc. v. B-Tek Scales, LLC</i> , 671 F.3d 1291 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	25, 28
<i>Mobilemedia Ideas, LLC v. Apple Inc.</i> , 178 F. Supp. 3d 209 (D. Del. 2016) .....	9
<i>Noah Sys. Inc. v. Intuit Inc.</i> , 675 F.3d 1302 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	5, 10
<i>O2 Micro Int'l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co., Ltd.</i> , 521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	2
<i>Omega Eng'g, Inc. v. Raytek Corp.</i> , 334 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	27, 30
<i>Optis Wireless Tech., LLC v. Huawei Device Co.</i> , No. 2:17-CV-123-JRG-RSP, 2018 WL 476054 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 18, 2018) .....	10
<i>Parallel Networks, LLC v. Abercrombie &amp; Fitch Co.</i> , 704 F.3d 958 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	17
<i>Personalized Media Commc'n, LLC v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 161 F.3d 696 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....	6

# 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.