

## EXHIBIT A

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

**PARKERVISION, INC.,**

Plaintiff,

v. v.

**LG ELECTRONICS, INC.,**

Defendant.

**Case No. 6:21-cv-00520-ADA**

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

**DEFENDANT'S SUR-SUR-REPLY CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

**I. “CABLE MODEM” IN DEPENDENT CLAIMS 16 AND 17 DOES NOT RENDER THE PREAMBLE’S “CABLE MODEM” LIMITING**

ParkerVision argues—belatedly and incorrectly—that “cable modem” in the preamble of claim 1 must be limiting because it serves as antecedent basis for “cable modem” in dependent claims 16 and 17 and improperly concludes that this “end[s] the inquiry.” Dkt. 40 (PV Sur-Reply) at 6. ParkerVision is incorrect.

“[A] preamble of an independent claim need not be found limiting merely because it appears in the body of a dependent claim.” *SEVEN Networks, LLC v. Apple Inc.*, No. 2:19-CV-00115-JRG, 2020 WL 1536152, at \*32 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 31, 2020). Indeed, courts have consistently rejected any attempt to impose a “bright-line rule that antecedent basis for a dependent claim is always sufficient to render a preamble limiting.” *TQ Delta, LLC v. 2WIRE, Inc.*, No. 1:13-CV-01835-RGA, 2018 WL 4062617, at \*4 (D. Del. Aug. 24, 2018) (cleaned up; distinguishing *Pacing Technologies, LLC v. Garmin Int’l, Inc.*, which found a preamble limiting where the preamble provided antecedent basis for a limitation in a dependent claim, 778 F.3d 1021, 1024 (Fed. Cir. 2015)); *see also CreAgri, Inc. v. Pinnacliffe Inc.*, No. 11:CV-06635-LHK, 2013 WL 1663611, at \*8 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 16, 2013) (“[T]he Court is not persuaded that the preamble ‘a dietary supplement’ should be construed as limiting Claims 1 and 5 (or the Patent as a whole) simply because it appears in the preamble and the body of dependent Claim 3.”); *Enpat, Inc. v. Shannon*, No. 6:11-CV-00084-GAP, 2011 WL 6010441, at \*8 (M.D. Fla. Nov. 30, 2011) (finding preamble of independent claim limiting only as to dependent claim). “[S]uch a bright-line rule would create tension with the Federal Circuit’s earlier observation that ‘[n]o litmus test defines when a preamble limits claim scope.’” *PersonalWeb Techs. LLC v. Int’l Bus. Machs. Corp.*, No. 16-CV-01266-EJD, 2017 WL 2180980, at \*13 n.15 (N.D. Cal. May 18, 2017) (quoting *Catalina Mktg. Int’l, Inc. v. Coolsavings.com, Inc.*, 289 F.3d 801, 808 (Fed. Cir. 2002)).

Here, the mere fact that independent claim 1's preamble term "cable modem" appears in the body of two dependent claims does not render the preamble of claim 1 limiting. ParkerVision's new argument, predicated only on a misunderstanding of law, does not change the conclusion that the "cable modem" portion of the preamble is not limiting, for the reasons explained in LGE's Opening Claim Construction Brief (Dkt. 31 at 8-11) and Reply Construction Brief (Dkt. 37 at 5-7).

Dated: April 20, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Melissa R. Smith  
Melissa R. Smith  
**GILLAM & SMITH, LLP**  
TX State Bar No. 24001351  
303 S. Washington Avenue  
Marshall, Texas 75670  
Telephone: (903) 934-8450  
Facsimile: (903) 934-9257  
[melissa@gillamsmithlaw.com](mailto:melissa@gillamsmithlaw.com)

Steven Pepe  
Matthew Shapiro  
James Stevens  
Michael Morales  
**ROPES & GRAY LLP**  
1211 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036-8704  
Tel: 212.596.9000  
Fax: 212.596.9090  
[Steven.Pepe@ropesgray.com](mailto:Steven.Pepe@ropesgray.com)  
[Matthew.Shapiro@ropesgray.com](mailto:Matthew.Shapiro@ropesgray.com)  
[James.Stevens@ropesgray.com](mailto:James.Stevens@ropesgray.com)  
[Michael.Morales@ropesgray.com](mailto:Michael.Morales@ropesgray.com)

David S. Chun  
Stepan Starchenko  
**ROPES & GRAY LLP**  
1900 University Ave., 6th Floor  
East Palo Alto, CA 94303-2284  
Tel: 650.617.4000

Fax: 650.617.4090

[David.Chun@ropesgray.com](mailto:David.Chun@ropesgray.com)

[Stepan.Starchenko@ropesgray.com](mailto:Stepan.Starchenko@ropesgray.com)

Scott Taylor

(Admission application forthcoming)

**ROPES & GRAY LLP**

Prudential Tower

800 Boylston Street

Boston, MA 02199-3600

Tel: 617.951.7000

Fax: 617.951.7050

[Scott.Taylor@ropesgray.com](mailto:Scott.Taylor@ropesgray.com)

*Attorneys for Defendant LG Electronics Inc.*

# 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.