

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

RFCYBER CORP.,

Plaintiff,

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Case No. 6:21-cv-00916-ADA

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

**PLAINTIFF RFCYBER CORP.'S  
RESPONSIVE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page(s)</u></b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. THE PATENTS-IN-SUIT .....	2
A. The '218, '855, and '787 Patents .....	2
B. The '009 Patent .....	3
C. The '046 Patent .....	4
D. The '724 Patent .....	5
III. PRIOR LITIGATION .....	5
IV. LEGAL STANDARD .....	6
V. DISPUTED TERMS .....	6
A. “e-purse” / “electronic purse” (identified by both parties) .....	6
1. RFCyber’s position in <i>Google</i> is consistent with its position here .....	7
2. The claims and other intrinsic evidence support RFCyber’s construction .....	8
3. Extrinsic evidence does not compel Apple’s construction .....	10
4. Prosecution history disclaimer does not exclude RFCyber’s construction .....	10
B. “e-purse applet” (identified by Apple) .....	11
C. “payment server” (identified by Apple) .....	12
D. “security authentication module” / “SAM” (identified by both) .....	14
E. “application” (identified by Apple) .....	16
VI. CONCLUSION .....	19

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Amgen Inc. v. Hoechst Marion Roussel, Inc.</i> , 314 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	18
<i>Apple Inc. v. RFCyber Corp.</i> , IPR2022-00412, Paper No. 1 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 14, 2022).....	17
<i>August Tech. Corp. v. Camtek, Ltd.</i> , 655 F.3d 1278 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	6
<i>Cordis Corp. v. Boston Sci. Corp.</i> , 561 F.3d 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	9
<i>Core Wireless Licensing S.A.R.L. v. LG Elecs., Inc.</i> 880 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	11
<i>Hill-Rom Servs., Inc. v. Stryker Corp.</i> , 755 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	6
<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.</i> , 52 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	6
<i>Omega Eng'g, Inc. v. Raytek Corp.</i> , 334 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	9
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) ( <i>en banc</i> ) .....	6
<i>RFCyber Corp. v. Google LLC</i> , No. 2:20-cv-00274-JRG, 2021 WL 5357465 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 17, 2021) .....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Superguide Corp. v. DirecTV Enters., Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 870 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	10
<i>Thorner v. Sony Comput. Ent. Am. LLC</i> , 669 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	6
<i>U.S. Surgical Corp. v. Ethicon, Inc.</i> , 103 F.3d 1554 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	19
<i>Vitronics Corp. v. Conception, Inc.</i> , 90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	6, 17

Pursuant to the Court’s Scheduling Order (Dkt. 29), Plaintiff RFCyber Corp. (“RFCyber”) hereby submits its Responsive Claim Construction Brief. The asserted patents are U.S. Patent Nos. 8,118,218 (the “’218 Patent”), 8,448,855 (the “’855 Patent”), 9,189,787 (the “’787 Patent”), 9,240,009 (the “’009 Patent”), 10,600,046 (the “’046 Patent”), and 11,018,724 (the “’724 Patent”) (together, the “Asserted Patents”).

## I. INTRODUCTION

RFCyber is a pioneer in mobile and electronic payment technology. The Asserted Patents embody RFCyber’s technology and are directed to various aspects of a mobile payment system.

The Parties have met and conferred and reached agreement on most terms. The only terms in dispute are:

- “e-purse” / “electronic purse”;
- “e-purse applet”;
- “payment server”;
- “security authentication module” / “SAM”; and
- “application.”

For “e-purse” and “electronic purse,” Apple misconstrues the intrinsic record to suggest there was a clear and unmistakable disclaimer that would limit these terms to electronic value. However, a correct reading of the prosecution history shows that no such disclaimer was made; the applicants distinguished the patented invention, which stores information locally, from “an e-wallet system [that] has a user credit-card and personal info at the backend. . .” Ex. 1 at 9. Indeed, in the *Google* case, Judge Gilstrap considered precisely the same argument and evidence on which Apple relies and found that there was no disclaimer. Apple further seeks to confuse matters by

proposing the same construction for e-purse applet. But the patents use “e-purse” and “e-purse applet” differently. An “e-purse applet” is an applet that is a component of an e-purse.

For “security authentication module” / “SAM,” Apple seeks to introduce the requirement that the SAM “authenticate transactions of funds or transfers of funds.” Nothing in the intrinsic record imposes such a requirement.

Finally, Apple seeks to construe the commonplace terms “application” and “payment server.” Apple’s requested limitations are presumably intended to manufacture a non-infringement defense. A jury can apply these terms without construction.

Accordingly, the Court should adopt RFCyber’s constructions for e-purse, e-purse applet, and SAM, and reject Apple’s unsupported constructions.

## **II. THE PATENTS-IN-SUIT**

### **A. The ’218, ’855, and ’787 Patents**

The ’218, ’855, and ’787 Patents share a common specification and are directed to various aspects of a mobile payment system focusing, in particular, on inventions for “portable devices, functioning as an electronic purse.” (’218 Patent, 1:34-38.)

In exemplary embodiments, the invention provides a portable device, such as a cell phone with a smart card module, configured to conduct e-commerce transactions over contactless interfaces and m-commerce transactions over wireless interfaces. (*Id.* 1:42-2:46.) Figure 2 of the ’218 Patent shows an exemplary embodiment of the system:

# 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.