

**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' RESPONSIVE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF ON
THE DISPUTED TERMS OF THE TOUCH SENSOR PATENTS**

(U.S. PATENT NOS. 8,946,574; 9,086,770; 9,823,784; 10,088,960; and 7,821,502)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE DISPUTED TERM OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,946,574 (“MESH”)	1
III. THE DISPUTED TERM OF U.S. PATENT NO. 9,086,770 (“GENERALLY STRAIGHT LINE”)	5
IV. THE DISPUTED TERMS OF U.S. PATENT NO. 9,823,784.....	5
A. “wherein the plurality of drive electrodes are substantially area filling within the sensing region relative to the plurality of sense electrodes” (claims 1-3).....	5
B. “together, the plurality of sense electrodes and the plurality of isolated conductive elements are substantially area filling within the sensing region relative to the plurality of sense electrodes” (claims 1-3).....	8
V. THE DISPUTED TERM OF U.S. PATENT NO. 10,088,960 (“INTERCONNECTING MESH SEGMENTS”).....	8
VI. THE DISPUTED TERMS OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,821,502.....	11
A. “a substrate having a surface with an arrangement of electrodes mounted thereon” (’502 patent, claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-14, 16).	12
B. “sensing area” (’502 patent, claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-14, 16).	15
C. “wherein row sensing electrodes of sensing cells at opposing ends of at least one of the rows are electrically coupled to one another by respective row wrap-around connections made outside of the sensing area” (’502 patent, claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-14, 16).....	24
VII. CONCLUSION	30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

CASES

<i>AquaTex Indus. v. Techniche Solutions</i> , 419 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	3
<i>Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Group, LP</i> , 616 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	10
<i>Berkheimer v. HP Inc.</i> , 881 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	7
<i>Eon Corp. IP Holdings LLC v. Silver Spring Networks, Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	2
<i>Helmsderfer v. Bobrick Washroom Equipment, Inc.</i> , 527 F.3d 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	15
<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.</i> , 52 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (en banc), <i>aff'd</i> , 517 U.S. 370, 116 S. Ct. 1384, 134 L. Ed. 2d 577 (1996).....	15
<i>Multiform Desiccants, Inc. v. Medzam Ltd.</i> , 133 F.3d 1473 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	2
<i>O2 Micro Int'l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co., Ltd.</i> , 521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	12
<i>Omega Eng'g, Inc. v. Raytek Corp.</i> , 334 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	29
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc)	3, 13, 14, 15
<i>Power Mosfet Techs., L.L.C. v. Siemens AG</i> , 378 F.3d 1396 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	25
<i>PPC Broadband, Inc. v. Corning Optical Commc'ns RF, LLC</i> , 815 F.3d 747 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	13
<i>Texas Digital Systems, Inc. v. Telegenix, Inc.</i> , 308 F.3d 1193 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	14

Defendants respectfully submit their responsive claim construction brief for the disputed terms of U.S. Patent Nos. 8,946,574; 9,086,770; 9,823,784; 10,088,960; and 7,821,502 (collectively the “touch sensor patents”).

I. INTRODUCTION

Neodron’s opening claim construction brief confirms that Neodron largely wants to sit out the claim construction process. For most terms, Neodron continues to argue that no construction is necessary and simply parrots the claim language while refusing to agree with Defendants’ plain-meaning constructions, or Neodron plucks out dictionary definitions that are at odds with the intrinsic record. As Defendants predicted, Neodron’s goal is flexibility and malleability, as Neodron is faced with stretching its patent claims to try to cover the accused products while simultaneously casting the claims narrowly to avoid spot-on prior art. But at the end of the day, Neodron cannot legitimately dispute that Defendants’ constructions, with few exceptions, reflect the plain and ordinary meaning in light of the patent specification and file history. For those exceptions, Defendants have established there is no accepted plain and ordinary meaning, or the applicants acted as their own lexicographer in defining a term. In every instance, Defendants’ constructions are the correct ones, while Neodron’s reflect its desire to avoid certainty in the claim construction process.

II. THE DISPUTED TERM OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,946,574 (“MESH”)

The parties agree that the scope of the term “mesh” within the context of the ’574 patent claims would not include electrodes made of indium tin oxide (“ITO”). *See* Flasck Decl. ¶ 67 (“[T]he intrinsic record does not support the notion that a metal mesh could be made of the widely used [ITO]. It is also my opinion that a POSITA would also not find that ITO electrodes would not be considered metal mesh electrodes.”); *see also* Neodron Br. at 27 (“[A] POSITA would not consider the widely used [ITO] as a metal ‘mesh.’”). Indeed, Neodron recognizes the

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.