

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

NEODRON LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

DELL TECHNOLOGIES INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:19-cv-00819-ADA

NEODRON LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

HP, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:19-cv-00873-ADA

NEODRON LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:19-cv-00874-ADA

NEODRON LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

AMAZON.COM, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:19-cv-00898-ADA

NEODRON LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD. and
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:19-cv-00903-ADA

**DEFENDANTS' OPENING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF ON
THE DISPUTED TERMS OF THE TOUCH PROCESSING PATENTS**

(U.S. PATENT NOS. 8,102,286 and 10,365,747)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Person Of Ordinary Skill In The Art.....	2
III. The Disputed Terms Of U.S. Patent No. 8,102,286	2
A. “sensor value” (’286 patent, claims 1, 3-5, 8-10, 13, 15-17, 20-21, 24).....	3
1. The Specification Requires Defendants’ Construction.....	4
2. The Claims Support Defendant’s Construction	7
3. Extrinsic Evidence Supports Defendants’ Construction.....	9
4. Neodron’s Construction Is Incorrect.....	9
IV. The Disputed Terms Of U.S. Patent No. 10,365,747	11
A. “to measure a parameter of the first variable resistance electrode” (’747 patent, claims 10, 16).....	12
V. Conclusion	16

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Apple Computer, Inc. v. Articulate Sys., Inc.</i> , 234 F.3d 14 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	4
<i>GPNE Corp. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 830 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	4, 7
<i>Honeywell Int'l, Inc. v. ITT Indus., Inc.</i> , 452 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	4
<i>O2 Micro Int'l, Ltd v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co., Ltd.</i> , 521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	13
<i>Superior Indus., Inc. v. Masaba, Inc.</i> , No. 15-1594, 2016 WL 3090851 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	4
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 112.....	22

Defendants respectfully submit their opening claim construction brief for the disputed terms of U.S. Patent Nos. 8,102,286 and 10,365,747 (collectively the “touch processing patents”).¹ The agreed constructions for these patents are set out in the Joint Claim Construction Statement.

I. INTRODUCTION

In this series of cases, Neodron asserts more than 150 claims of 13 patents against seven groups of defendants. Despite the obvious need to narrow the scope and breadth of these cases before fact and expert discovery and trial, Defendants have identified below only the key claim terms requiring construction. For most terms, Defendants’ constructions reflect the plain and ordinary meaning to one of ordinary skill in the art, as informed by the patent specification and file history. Where Defendants’ constructions depart from the plain and ordinary meaning, it is only because (a) the claim term in dispute has no accepted plain and ordinary meaning, (b) the applicants acted as their own lexicographer in defining a term, or (c) the claim term is indefinite. For the reasons demonstrated below, the Court should adopt Defendants’ correct constructions.

Neodron’s proposed constructions—and its positions during the meet-and-confer process leading up to claim construction briefing—are a different story. Neodron frequently claims that no construction is necessary and merely parrots the claim language in its “constructions,” while refusing to agree with Defendants’ constructions or, worse yet, refusing to confirm why and how it disagrees with Defendants’ positions. In the rare instance where Neodron provides an actual construction, its proposals contradict the intrinsic evidence, inject ambiguity, and consist primarily or solely of attorney argument. Neodron’s goal is obvious—it wants to keep the

¹ The “touch processing patents” also include U.S. Patent No. 8,451,237, for which there are no disputed terms. Defendants are filing a separate opening claim construction brief to cover the disputed terms of the touch sensor patents, which include U.S. Patent Nos. 8,946,574; 9,086,770; 9,823,784; 10,088,960; and 7,821,502.)

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.