

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

JAWBONE INNOVATIONS, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

META PLATFORMS, INC.,
D/B/A META,

Defendant.

Case No. 6:23-cv-00158-ADA-DTG

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

META'S OPENING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	2
A. Asserted Patents	2
B. Litigation History.....	3
III. DISPUTED TERMS.....	3
A. “approximately similar”/ “approximately, dissimilar” / “approximately dissimilar” (’213 patent, claims 2, 37, 38; ’611 patent, claims 3, 4, 30)	3
1. Jawbone’s shifting proposals confirms these terms are indefinite.....	5
2. The patents provide no objective standard or boundaries for “approximately similar” or “approximately dissimilar”	7
a. The patents use “very similar” and “very dissimilar” instead of “approximately similar” and “approximately dissimilar.”	9
b. The patents’ 10 dB teachings do not refer to “approximately similar” or “approximately dissimilar” responses.	10
3. The extrinsic evidence confirms these terms are indefinite.....	11
B. “substantially similar” / “substantially dissimilar” (’691 patent, claims 1, 23, 27, 28, 29, 41; ’080 patent, claims 1, 14; ’357 patent, claims 1, 15).....	12
1. Jawbone’s shifting proposals only confirms these terms are indefinite	14
2. The patents provide no objective standard or boundaries for “substantially similar” or “substantially dissimilar.”	14
a. The patents use “very similar” and “very dissimilar” instead of “substantially similar” and “substantially dissimilar.”	15
b. The patents’ 10 dB teachings do not refer to “substantially similar” or “substantially dissimilar” responses.	17
3. The extrinsic evidence confirms these terms are indefinite.....	17
C. “the processing component” (’080 patent, claims 10, 11).....	18
1. The other claims confirm the element referenced is uncertain.	19
2. The specification discloses multiple, alternative embodiments of the processing component.....	20

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	<u>Page</u>
3. A POSITA does not know what “the processing component” is with reasonable certainty.	23
IV. OTHER DISPUTED TERMS.....	25
V. CONCLUSION.....	26

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Biosig Instruments, Inc. v. Nautilus, Inc.</i> , 783 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	7, 15
<i>Bushnell Hawthorne, LLC v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , 813 F. App'x 522 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	24, 25
<i>CA, Inc. v. Netflix, Inc.</i> , No. 2:21-CV-00080-JRG, 2021 WL 5323413 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 16, 2021).....	9, 10
<i>CardWare Inc. v. Samsung Elec. Co. Ltd.</i> , Case No. 2:22-cv-00141-JRG-RSP, 2023 WL 5434763 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 23, 2023)	24
<i>Geodynamics, Inc. v. Dynaenergetics US, Inc.</i> , No. 2:15-CV-1546-RSP, 2016 WL 6217181 (E.D. Tex. Oct. 25, 2016).....	15, 16
<i>Halliburton Energy Servs., Inc. v. M-I LLC</i> , 514 F.3d 1244 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	24
<i>Interval Licensing LLC v. AOL, Inc.</i> , 766 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	7
<i>Jawbone Innovations, LLC v. Apple Inc.</i> , 6:21-cv-00984 (W.D. Tex.)	3
<i>Jawbone Innovations, LLC v. Google, LLC</i> , 6:21-cv-00985 (W.D. Tex.)	3
<i>Jawbone v. Google</i> , 2:21-cv-00985 (W.D.Tex. Sep. 23, 2021)	26
<i>Jawbone v. Samsung</i> , 2:21-cv-00186 (E.D.Tex. May 27, 2021)	25
<i>KLA-Tencor Corp. v. Xitronix Corp.</i> , No. A-08-CA-723-SS, 2011 WL 318123 (W.D. Tex. Jan. 31, 2011)	7, 8
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.</i> , 572 U.S. 898 (2014).....	24

...

Regeneron Pharms., Inc. v. Merus B.V.,
C.A. No. 14-1650 (KBF), 2014 WL 6611510 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 21, 2014).....6, 14

Seattle Box Co. v. Indus. Crate & Packing, Inc.,
731 F.2d 818 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....11, 17

SIMO Holdings, Inc. v. H.K. uCloudlink Network Tech., Ltd.,
983 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2021).....18

U.S. Well Servs. Inc. v. Halliburton Co.,
No. 6:21-cv-00367, 2022 WL 819548 (W.D. Tex. Jan. 17, 2022).....8

Vaxcel Int’l Co., Ltd. v. HeathCo LLC,
C.A. No. 20-224-LPS, 2022 WL 611067 (D. Del. Feb. 3, 2022).....7, 14

In re Walter,
698 F. App’x 1022 (Fed. Cir. 2017)6, 14

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.