

**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

**PLAINTIFF NEODRON LTD.'S ("NEODRON'S") RESPONSIVE CLAIM
CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

GROUP 1 – TOUCH SENSOR PATENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. DISPUTED TERMS FOR THE '502 PATENT** 1
 - A. “a substrate having a surface with an arrangement of electrodes mounted thereon” ('502 Patent, claims 1, 2, 5–8, 11–14, 16)1
 - B. “sensing area” ('502 Patent, claims 1, 2, 5–8, 11–14, 16).....4
 - 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)8
- II. DISPUTED TERM FOR THE '574 PATENT** 13
 - A. “mesh” ('574 Patent, claims 1, 8, 15)13
 - 1. Defendants’ Brief Confirms this Claim Term Should Not be Reworded or Redefined: All Parties Now Expressly Agree “Mesh” Had a Well-Known Plain Meaning and that the Patent Uses the “Mesh” According to Its Plain Meaning.....13
 - 2. Beyond This Confirmation, Defendants Only Present Legally and Factually Flawed Arguments for Construing the Term At All14
 - 3. In Any Event, Defendants’ Thirteen-Word Construction for the Well-Known Claim Term Finds Little Support in the Intrinsic Record and, Even Worse, Could Only Create Ambiguities and Tension with the Intrinsic Record16
- III. DISPUTED TERM FOR THE '960 PATENT** 18
 - A. “interconnecting mesh segments” ('960 Patent, claims 1, 9, 17)18
 - 1. Defendants’ Proposed Construction Incorrectly Strips “Mesh” of Having Key Aspects of Mesh Patterns Required by Any Reading of the Term18
 - B. Additionally, Defendants’ Flawed Arguments Overlook Another Improper Change They Import to the Claims: Inexplicably Changing the “Interconnect~~ing~~” Segments Recited in the Claims to Some Lines or Traces that Were “Interconnect~~ed~~”21
- IV. UNDISPUTED TERM FOR THE '770 PATENT** 22
 - A. “generally straight line” ('770 Patent, claim 7)22
- V. DISPUTED TERMS FOR THE '784 PATENT** 22
 - A. “wherein the plurality of drive electrodes are substantially area filling within the sensing region relative to the plurality of sense electrodes” ('784 Patent, claims 1, 2, 3)24
 - 1. The Specification Describes Drive Electrodes That Are Substantially Area Filling Both on Their Own And in Comparison to The Sense Electrodes.25
 - 2. Amazon Does Not Argue That the Phrase “Substantially Area Filling Within the Sensing Region” Is, On Its Own, Indefinite.28
 - 3. There Is No Dispute That “Relative To” In the Claims Has Its Ordinary Meaning And Imposes An Additional Comparative Limitation.29
 - 4. The Only Question Is Whether the Claims Require *Both* The Absolute Limitation And The Relative Limitation. The Only Answer Is “Yes.”30

- 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” (’784 Patent, claims 1, 2, 3).....34

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>BJ Servs. Co. v. Halliburton Energy Servs., Inc.</i> , 338 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	23
<i>Dow Chem. Co. v. Nova Chems. Corp. (Canada)</i> , 809 F.3d 1223 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	23
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Teva Parenteral Meds., Inc.</i> , 845 F.3d 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	23
<i>Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Applera Corp.</i> , 599 F.3d 1325 (2010).....	29
<i>Epistar Corp. v. ITC</i> , 566 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	14, 18
<i>KCJ Corp. v. Kinetic Concepts, Inc.</i> , 223 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	2
<i>Kroy IP Holdings, LLC, v. Safeway, Inc.</i> , No. 2:12-cv-800-WCB, 2014 WL 3735222 (E.D. Tex., July 28, 2014).....	1
<i>MeadWestVaco Corp. v. Rexam Beauty & Closures, Inc.</i> , 731 F.3d 1258 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	23
<i>Merck & Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.</i> , 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed.Cir.2005).....	7, 9
<i>Merck & Co., Inc. v. Teva Pharm, USA, Inc.</i> , 395 F3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	7
<i>O2 Micro Int'l v. Beyond Innovation Tech.</i> , 521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	9, 14
<i>Pause Tech., LLC v. Tivo, Inc.</i> , 419 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	6
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	5, 15, 32
<i>PPC Broadband, Inc. v. Corning Optical Commc'ns RF, LLC</i> , 815 F.3d 747(Fed. Cir. 2016).....	32

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.