

# EXHIBIT 15

1 GEORGE A. RILEY (S.B. #118304) griley@omm.com  
 2 LUANN L. SIMMONS (S.B. #203526) lsimmons@omm.com  
 3 MELODY DRUMMOND HANSEN (S.B. #278786) mdrummondhansen@omm.com  
 4 O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP  
 5 Two Embarcadero Center, 28th Floor  
 6 San Francisco, California 94111-3823  
 7 Telephone: (415) 984-8700  
 8 Facsimile: (415) 984-8701

9 RYAN K. YAGURA (S.B. #197619) ryagura@omm.com  
 10 XIN-YI ZHOU (S.B. #251969) vzhou@omm.com  
 11 BRIAN M. COOK (S.B. #266181) bcook@omm.com  
 12 KEVIN MURRAY (S.B. #275186) kmurray2@omm.com  
 13 O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP  
 14 400 South Hope Street  
 15 Los Angeles, California 90071-2899  
 16 Telephone: (213) 430-6000  
 17 Facsimile: (213) 430-6407

18 Attorneys for Defendant  
 19 **APPLE INC.**

20 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
 21 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
 22 **SAN JOSE**

23 OpenTV, Inc., Nagravision, SA, and Nagra  
 24 France S.A.S.,

25 Plaintiffs,

26 v.

27 Apple Inc.,

28 Defendant.

Case No. 5:15-CV-02008-EJD

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

Judge: Honorable Edward J. Davila  
 Courtroom: 4, 5th Floor

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

	<b>Page</b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. LEGAL STANDARDS.....	1
III. THE '736 PATENT .....	1
A. “automatic and direct access” (Claims 1, 8, 9) .....	2
B. “indicating” (Claims 1, 8, 9) .....	5
C. “means for extracting ...” (Claim 9).....	6
1. Insufficient Structure Disclosed for “Extracting an Address...” .....	7
2. Insufficient Structure Disclosed for “Automatically Establishing...” .....	9
3. An “Access Controller” Also Is Insufficient Structure .....	10
IV. THE '169 PATENT .....	10
A. “directive” (Claims 1, 2, 22, 23) .....	11
B. “prerequisite directive” (Claims 1, 2, 22, 23) .....	12
C. “subset of said set of resources” (Claims 1, 22, 23) .....	15
D. “wherein said prohibiting ...” (Claim 12).....	16
E. “a processing unit configured to ...” (Claim 22) .....	19
F. The Preamble of Claim 22 Is Limiting (Claim 22).....	22
V. THE '740 PATENT .....	23
A. “imprint of data” (Claim 1).....	23
VI. CONCLUSION .....	24

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**Page**

**CASES**

*Aristocrat Techs. Austral. Pty Ltd. v. Int’l Game Tech.*,  
521 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... 20

*Augme Techs., Inc. v. Yahoo! Inc.*,  
755 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 7

*Bicon v. Straumann Co.*,  
441 F.3d 945 (Fed. Cir. 2006)..... 22

*Blackboard, Inc. v. Desire2Learn, Inc.*,  
574 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2009)..... 7, 8, 10

*Cardiac Pacemakers, Inc. v. St. Jude Med., Inc.*,  
296 F.3d 1106 (Fed. Cir. 2002)..... 10

*ePlus, Inc. v. Lawson Software, Inc.*,  
700 F.3d 509 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 8

*Ergo Licensing, LLC v. CareFusion 303, Inc.*,  
673 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 8, 9, 22

*Ex parte Erol*,  
Appeal 2011-001143, 2013 WL 1341107 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 13, 2013)..... 20

*Ex parte Lakkala*,  
Appeal 2011-001526, 2013 WL 1341108 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 13, 2013)..... 20

*Ex parte Smith*,  
Appeal 2012-007631, 2013 WL 1341109 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 14, 2013)..... 20

*Function Media, L.L.C. v. Google Inc.*,  
708 F.3d 1310 (Fed. Cir. 2013)..... 22

*Halliburton Energy Servs., Inc. v. M-I LLC*,  
514 F.3d 1244 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... 1, 19, 22

*Hill-Rom Servs., Inc. v. Stryker Corp.*,  
755 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 1, 12

*Intellectual Ventures I, LLC v. Canon Inc.*,  
2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 38910 (D. Del. Mar. 27, 2015)..... 20

*IPXL Holdings, LLC v. Amazon, Inc.*,  
430 F.3d 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 22

*LG Elecs. U.S.A. In., v. Whirlpool Corp.*,  
2011 WL 1560592 (D.N.J. Apr. 25, 2011) ..... 20

*Mems Tech. Berhad v. ITC*,  
447 F. App’x 142 (Fed. Cir. 2011) ..... 23

*Nautilus v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.*,  
134 S. Ct. 2120 (2014)..... 1, 13

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**  
**(continued)**

	<b>Page</b>
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

**STATUTES**

35 U.S.C. § 101 .....	12
35 U.S.C. § 112(f) .....	1
35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 4 .....	19
35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 6 .....	1, 7, 20, 21, 23

# 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.