

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

JAWBONE INNOVATIONS, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

APPLE, INC.,

Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Case No. 6:21-cv-00984-ADA

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED



PUBLIC VERSION

**JAWBONE INNOVATIONS, LLC'S
RESPONSIVE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page(s)</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE PATENTS-IN- SUIT	1
A. The '091 Patent.....	1
B. The '058 Patent.....	2
C. The '072 Patent.....	2
D. The '543 Patent.....	2
E. The '213 and '611 Patents	3
F. The '691, '080, and '357 Patents	3
III. LEGAL STANDARD.....	3
IV. DISPUTED TERMS.....	5
A. “microphone” ('058 Patent, claim 1; '543 Patent, claims 1, 8, 19, 20, 20, 26) (proposed by Apple).....	5
B. “the acoustic signals ” / “the acoustic signal received at the one receiver” / “the acoustic signals received at each of the two receivers” ('058 Patent, claim 1) (proposed by Apple).....	9
C. “transfer function” ('091 Patent, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 11, 15; '357 Patent, claims 1, 15; '080 Patent, claims 1, 14) (proposed by Jawbone).....	13
D. “generating one transfer function of the at least two transfer functions . . . when the VAD indicates that user voice activity is present” ('091 Patent, claim 2) (proposed by Apple).....	16
E. “virtual microphone array” ('072 Patent, claim 1) (proposed by Apple).....	17
F. “acoustic noise” (proposed by Jawbone) and “less acoustic noise” (proposed by Apple) ('072 Patent, claims 1, 2, 9).....	19
G. “approximately similar” / “approximately, dissimilar” / “approximately dissimilar” ('213 Patent, claims 2, 37, 38; '611 Patent, claim 3, 4, 29) (proposed by Apple).....	20
H. “a relationship for speech” ('213 Patent claims 14, 42; '611 Patent claim 1) (proposed by Apple).....	25

I.	“ . . . substantially similar/dissimilar. . .” (’691 Patent, claims 1, 23, 27, 28, 29, 41; ’080 Patent, claims 1, 14; ’357 Patent, claims 1, 15) (proposed by Apple)	27
J.	“apply a varying linear transfer function between the first and second microphone signals” (’357 Patent, claims 1, 15) (proposed by Apple)	30
V.	CONCLUSION.....	31

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>3M Innovative Proprs. Co. v. Avery Dennison Corp.</i> , 350 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	19
<i>August Tech. Corp. v. Camtek, Ltd.</i> , 655 F.3d 1278 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	3
<i>Carnegie Steel Co. v. Cambria Iron Co.</i> , 185 U.S. 403 (1902).....	24
<i>Cohesive Techs., Inc. v. Waters Corp.</i> , 543 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Comark Commc'ns, Inc. v. Harris Corp.</i> , 156 F.3d 1182 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	7
<i>Cont'l Circuits LLC v. Intel Corp.</i> , 915 F.3d 788 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	8
<i>Deere & Co. v. Bush Hog, LLC</i> , 703 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	27
<i>Deering Precision Instruments, L.L.C. v. Vector Distr. Sys., Inc.</i> , 347 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	28
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Teva Pharms Int'l GmbH</i> , 8 F.4th 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	10
<i>Energizer Holdings, Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 435 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	12
<i>Ferring B.V. v. Watson Labs., Inc.-(FL)</i> , 2013 WL 499158 (D. Nev. Feb. 6, 2013), <i>aff'd</i> , 764 F.3d 1382 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	21
<i>Ferring B.V. v. Watson Labs., Inc-Fla.</i> , 764 F.3d 1382 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	21
<i>Geodynamics, Inc. v. Dynaenergetics US, Inc.</i> , No. 2:15-CV-1546-RSP, 2016 WL 6217181 (E.D. Tex. Oct. 25, 2016).....	29, 30
<i>Hill-Rom Servs., Inc. v. Stryker Corp.</i> , 755 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	4, 5, 31

<i>Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbot Labs.</i> , 512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	7, 9
<i>Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.</i> , 52 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	3
<i>Modine Mfg. Co. v. U.S. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 75 F.3d 1545 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	29
<i>N. Am. Vaccine, Inc. v. Am. Cyanamid Co.</i> , 7 F.3d 1571 (Fed. Cir. 1993).....	9
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instr., Inc.</i> , 572 U.S. 898 (2014).....	4
<i>Neodron, Ltd. v. Fujitsu Am., Inc.</i> , No. 2:20-cv-00239-JRG-RSP, 2021 WL 2646214 (E.D. Tex. Jun. 28, 2021)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Par Pharm., Inc. v. Hospira, Inc.</i> , 835 Fed. App'x 578 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (<i>en banc</i>)	4
<i>Playtex Prods., Inc. v. Proctor & Gamble Co.</i> , 400 F.3d 901 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	7
<i>SRI Int'l v. Matsushita Elec. Corp. of Am.</i> , 775 F.2d 1107 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (<i>en banc</i>)	18
<i>Superguide Corp. v. DirecTV Enters., Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 870 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	18
<i>Thorner v. Sony Comput. Ent. Am. LLC</i> , 669 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	4
<i>U.S. Well Servs., Inc. v. Halliburton Co.</i> , No. 6:21-CV-00367-ADA, 2022 WL 819548 (W.D. Tex. Jan. 17, 2022)	24, 30
<i>Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.</i> , 90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	4
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. §112.....	4

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.