

EXHIBIT 15

Hon. Richard A. Jones

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE**

ANCORA TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

Plaintiff,

v.

HTC AMERICA, INC., a Washington
corporation, HTC CORPORATION, a
Taiwanese corporation

Defendant.

Case No. 2:16-cv-01919-RAJ

**ANCORA TECHNOLOGIES, INC.'S
OPENING *MARKMAN* BRIEF**

Due Date: OCTOBER 7, 2019

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

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. THE ‘941 PATENT 1

III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION LAW 4

IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION DISPUTES 6

 A. “license” 6

 B. “BIOS” 8

 C. “using an agent to set up a verification structure in the erasable, non-volatile memory of the BIOS” 12

 1. “Agent” has a defined meaning in the art as a “Software Program or Routine” 12

 2. 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph 6 does not apply 14

 a. “Agent” Is Not A Nonce Word Substituting For “Means” 19

 b. A Simple Conventional Algorithm Is Clearly Disclosed In the ‘941 Patent For This Limitation 19

 D. “license record” 21

 E. “acting on the program according to the verification” 21

 F. “license authentication bureau” 22

IV. CONCLUSION..... 23

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

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

Advanced Commc’n. Design, Inc. v. Premier Retail Networks, Inc.,
 46 Fed. App’x 964 (Fed. Cir. 2002)..... 8

Ancora v. Apple,
 744 F.3d 732 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 1, 2, 9, 11

Ancora v. HTC,
 908 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2018)..... 1, 3, 11, 13, 20

Catalina Marketing Int’l v. Coolsavings.com,
 289 F.3d 801 (Fed. Cir. 2002)..... 7

CCS Fitness, Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.,
 288 F.3d 1359 (Fed.Cir.2002)..... 4

Collaborative Agreements, LLC v. Adobe Sys.,
 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 61786 (W.D. Tex. 2015)..... 18

Cox Communs., Inc. v. Sprint Commun. Co. LP,
 838 F.3d 1224 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 16, 17

Curtiss-Wright Flow Control Corp. v. Velan, Inc.,
 438 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2006)..... 22

Datamize, LLC v. Plumtree Software, Inc.,
 417 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 6

Epistar Corp. v. ITC,
 566 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2009)..... 17

Erfindergemeinschaft UroPep GbR v. Eli Lilly and Company,
 2016 WL 6138124 (E.D. Tex. 2016)..... 17

Finjan, Inc. v. Secure Computing Corp.,
 626 F.3d 1197 (Fed. Cir. 2011)..... 4, 6

Home Diagnostics, Inc. v. LifeScan, Inc.,
 381 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2004)..... 4

Karlin Tech., Inc. v. Surgical Dynamics, Inc.,
 177 F.3d 968 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 23

Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.,
 52 F.3d 967 (Fed.Cir. 1995)..... 5

McCarty v. Lehigh Val R.R.,
 160 U.S. 110, 16 S.Ct. 240 (1895)..... 7

1 *Media Rights Tech. Inc. v. Capital One Financial Corporation*,
 800 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... 19

2

3 *Mentor H/S, Inc. v. Med. Device Alliance, Inc.*,
 244 F.3d 1365 (Fed.Cir.2001)..... 6

4 *Nazomi Communs., Inc. v. Arm Holdings, PLC.*,
 403 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 20005)..... 22

5

6 *O.I. Corp. v. Tekmar Co.*,
 115 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1997)..... 16

7 *O2 Micro Intern. Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Technology Co., Ltd.*,
 521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... 6

8

9 *Omega Eng'g, Inc. v. Raytek Corp.*,
 334 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2003)..... 12

10 *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*,
 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 4, 5, 9, 21

11

12 *Purdue Pharma L.P. v. Endo Pharmaceuticals Inc.*,
 438 F.3d 1123 (Fed. Cir. 2006)..... 12

13 *Renishaw PLC v. Marposs Societa' Per Azioni*,
 158 F.3d 1243 (Fed.Cir. 1998)..... 7

14

15 *Seachange Int'l, Inc. v. C-COR Inc.*,
 413 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 12

16 *Silicon Graphics, Inc. v. ATI Tech., Inc.*,
 607 F.3d 784 (Fed. Cir. 2010)..... 6

17

18 *Southwall Technologies, Inc v. Cardinal IG Company*,
 54 F.3d 1570 (Fed. Cir. 1995)..... 5

19 *Spectra-Physics, Inc. v. Coherent, Inc.*,
 827 F.2d 1524 (Fed. Cir. 1987)..... 17

20

21 *Stragent, LLC. v. Amazon.com, Inc.*,
 2011 WL 13152568 (E.D. Tex. 2011) 18

22 *Techno View IP, Inc. v. Facebook Technologies, LLC*,
 2018 WL 6427874 (D. Del. 2018) 17

23

24 *Thorner v. Sony Computer Enter. Am. LLC*,
 669 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 4

25 *U.S. Surgical Corp. v. Ethicon, Inc.*,
 103 F.3d 1554 (Fed. Cir. 1997)..... 4

26

27 *Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.*,
 90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996)..... 4, 5, 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.