

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

BANDSPEED, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

REALTEK SEMICONDUCTOR  
CORPORATION,

Defendant.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Case No. 1:20-cv-00765-LY

**DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S  
OPENING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF (ECF NO. 40)**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**I. BANDSPEED WAS NOT PREJUDICED BY THE SLIGHT DELAY IN REALTEK’S DISCLOSURE OF ITS INDEFINITENESS POSITIONS FOR CERTAIN CLAIMS..... 1**

**II. CONTESTED CLAIM TERMS..... 3**

A. “Selection Kernel” ..... 3

B. “Hopping Sequence” ..... 5

C. “[First/Second/Third] Performance [Criterion/Criteria]” ..... 7

D. “A [first/second] time” ..... 8

E. “Channel Index” and “Apply[ing] an Index to a Channel Index of the Identified Communications Channel” ..... 9

F. “Distinct Channels” and “the Number of Distinct Channels in the First Set of Two or More Communications Channels Varies from the Number of Distinct Channels in the Second Set of Two or More Communications Channels” ..... 11

G. “Rescanning [the Default Channels]” ..... 12

H. “Bad” and “Good” ..... 13

I. “Instruction” Terms ..... 14

    1. Claims 1, 3, and 5, of the ’608 Patent and Claim 11 of the ’643 Patent Are Not Written as *Beauregard* Claims..... 14

    2. The Element That Performs the Claimed Functions Is the “Instructions,” Not the “Processor” or the “Memory” ..... 15

    3. The Patents’ Specifications Do Not Disclose a Sufficient Algorithm of the Scope of the Claims Should Be Limited to the Algorithm Disclosed in the Specification..... 16

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>AFG Indus., Inc. v. Cardinal IG Co.</i> , 239 F.3d 1239 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	5
<i>Allen Eng’g Corp. v. Bartell Indus., Inc.</i> , 299 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	13
<i>Bicon, Inc. v. Straumann Co.</i> , 441 F.3d 945 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	12
<i>Datamize, LLC v. Plumtree Software, Inc.</i> , 417 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	13, 14
<i>Digital-Vending Servs. Int’l, LLC v. Univ. of Phoenix, Inc.</i> , 672 F.3d 1270 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	14
<i>Eon Corp. IP Holdings v. Silver Springs Networks</i> , 815 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	8
<i>Exxon Chem. Pats., Inc. v. Lubrizol Corp.</i> , 64 F.3d 1553 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	3
<i>Greenberg v. Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc.</i> , 91 F.3d 1580 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	3
<i>Horizon Pharma, Inc. v. Dr. Reddy’s Labs. Inc.</i> , 839 F. App’x 500 (Fed. Cir. 2021) .....	13
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. BlueSky Med. Corp.</i> , No. SA-08-CV-102-RF, 2009 WL 10664413 (W.D. Tex. Dec. 21, 2009).....	2
<i>Merck &amp; Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	12
<i>Merck &amp; Co., Inc. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	8
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.</i> , 572 U.S. 898 (2014).....	11, 12
<i>Noah Sys., Inc. v. Intuit Inc.</i> , 675 F.3d 1302 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	3, 16
<i>O2 Micro Int’l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co.</i> , 521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	9

*PACid Grp. LLC v. Apple, Inc.*,  
 No. 6:09cv143-LED-JDL, 2010 WL 2813654 (E.D. Tex. July 15, 2010) ..... 10

*Personal Audio, LLC v. Apple, Inc.*,  
 No. 9:09CV111, 2011 WL 11757163 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 31, 2011) ..... 15

*Pfizer, Inc. v. Ranbaxy Labs. Ltd.*,  
 457 F.3d 1284 (Fed. Cir. 2006)..... 5, 11

*Rexnord Corp. v. Laitram Corp.*,  
 274 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2001)..... 6

*Sensor Elec. Tech., Inc. v. Bolb, Inc.*,  
 No. 18-CV-5194-LHK, 2019 WL 4645338 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 24, 2019)..... 5

*Smartflash LLC v. Apple, Inc.*,  
 77 F. Supp. 3d 535 (E.D. Tex. 2014)..... 15

*St. Isidore Rsch., LLC v. Comerica Inc.*,  
 No. 2:15-cv-1390-JRG-RSP, 2016 WL 4988246 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 19, 2016)..... 15

*Triton Tech of Tex., LLC v. Nintendo of Am., Inc.*,  
 753 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 17

*Trs. of Columbia Univ. v. Symantec Corp.*,  
 811 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 13

*Williamson v. Citrix Online, LLC*,  
 792 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... 4, 15

**Other Authorities**

MERRIAM-WEBSTER DICTIONARY (available online)..... 7

MERRIAM-WEBSTER DICTIONARY [2011 ed.] ..... 8, 12

Realtek respectfully requests that the Court adopt its proposed claim constructions or find the claims indefinite (as appropriate) and reject Bandspeed’s proposed constructions.

**I. Bandspeed Was Not Prejudiced by the Slight Delay in Realtek’s Disclosure of Its Indefiniteness Positions for Certain Claims**

Realtek served its Invalidity Contentions on Bandspeed on July 12, 2022. Although Realtek’s Invalidity Contentions did not contain its indefiniteness position for some terms,<sup>1</sup> all of Realtek’s positions were disclosed just days later in its mandatory Disclosure of Claim Terms (Ex. A) identifying claim terms to be construed or found indefinite. Over the next eight weeks leading up to the Joint Claim Construction Statement (“JCCS”), the parties had no less than ten email exchanges, meet-and-confers, and phone conversations related to claim construction issues, including efforts to narrow disputes. *See* Decl. of Jeffrey Johnson ¶¶ 4-8 (Ex. B). Counsel for Bandspeed never indicated that Realtek’s assertion of indefiniteness was untimely or that Realtek needed to amend its contentions. In addition, the parties filed their JCCS, on September 13, 2022, which contained all of Realtek’s invalidity contentions. Moreover, the parties’ Opening Claim Construction Briefs were filed a month later, on October 17, 2022, over which time the parties had another no less than six email or phone call exchanges—again, with no mention of untimeliness. *See id.* ¶¶ 6-9. Bandspeed never requested an extension of the deadline for filing its Opening Claim Construction Brief because some of Realtek’s indefiniteness positions were not disclosed in its Invalidity Contentions. The first time that Realtek was made aware Bandspeed had any issue with its disclosures was when Bandspeed filed its opening brief on October 17, 2022, over 12 weeks after Realtek identified its indefiniteness terms on July 22, 2022.

This Court has considered four factors in addressing untimely requests to amend a defendant’s invalidity contentions: “(1) the explanation for the failure to meet the deadline; (2) the importance of the thing that would be excluded; (3) potential prejudice in allowing the thing that would be excluded; and (4) the availability of a continuance to cure such prejudice.” *Kinetic*

---

<sup>1</sup> Realtek did not raise indefiniteness in its Invalidity Contentions for the following terms: “selection kernel,” “hopping sequence,” “channel index” and “apply[ing] an index to a channel index of the identified communications channel,” “bad” and “good,” and the “instructions” terms.

# 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.