The University of Texas School of Law

23rd ANNUAL ADVANCED PATENT LAW INSTITUTE

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN CLAIM CONSTRUCTION

November 1-2, 2018
Four Seasons Hotel
Austin, Texas

Kenneth R. Adamo*

Kirkland & Ellis LLP
300 N. LaSalle
Chicago, IL 60654
(312) 862-2671

E-mail: kradamo@kirkland.com

* Member, Illinois, New York, Ohio and Texas Bars. This paper reflects only the present considerations and views of the author, which should not be attributed to Kirkland & Ellis LLP or to any of his or its former or present clients. © 2018 Kenneth R Adamo. All Rights Reserved.

REVISED

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. GENERAL CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 17

1. Does the Court Have to Be Asked to Construe a Specific Claim Element? 17

2. Failure To Construe As An *O2 Micro* Violation 19

3. Mandatory PTAB Claim Construction 20

4. PTAB May Not Have to Construe Claim Element 22

III. TIMING OF CLAIM CONSTRUCTION; TIMING OF STATEMENT OF CLAIM ELEMENT MEANING 23

1. Construing Claim Limitation at Pleading Stage 23

2. Definitions for Claim Limitation Required 24

IV. WAIVER OF CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 25

V. EARLY CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 28

1. Disputed Claim Construction Should Not Ordinarily Be Decided on F. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) Motion. 29

VI. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION RELATING TO 35 USC § 101 MOTIONS 30

1. Deferral of Motion to Dismiss on 35 USC § 101 Grounds Because Claim Construction Has Not Occurred 30

2. Addressing 35 USC § 101 Without Claim Construction 32

VII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION RELATING TO SUMMARY JUDGMENT 32

1. No Summary Judgment Absent Claim Construction 32

2. Additional Construction Required Before Consideration of Summary Judgment 33

VIII. PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION & CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 34

IX. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION MAY EVOLVE 35

X. INTERLOCUTORY REVIEW, CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 36

XI. USE OF SPECIFICATION RE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 36

1. Claim Element Cannot be Uncoupled From the Specification. 36

2. Claim Construction That Excludes Structure Recited in Specification Likely Incorrect. 37

3. Reading-In Preferred Embodiments from the Specifications Leads to An Incorrect Claim Construction. 38

4. Broadest Reasonable Construction Must Be Gauged "In Light of the Speculation". 44

5. Construction Relying on Later-Added Claims is Likely to be Incorrect. 45

6. Incorporation By Reference. 46

XII. IPR PROCEEDINGS AS INTRINSIC EVIDENCE RE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 49

XIII. PREAMBLES 50

1. Preambles as Limitations 50

2. Preambles that Are not Limiting 51

XIV. FUNCTIONAL CLAIMING 58

1. Hybrid Claims 61

XV. CONFUSING STRUCTURAL LIMITATIONS WITH PROCESS LIMITATIONS 64

XVI. MEANS PLUS FUNCTION CLAIM LIMITATIONS 69

1. The Basics 69

2. "Means" Recited / Not Recited in Claim, Presumption of "Means Plus Function" Limitation 70

3. Interface of PTAB Rules and Means-Plus-Function Means 73

4. Extrinsic Evidence Is Not Necessary to Defeat a Means-Plus-Function Interpretation of a Claim Element 73

XVII. NEGATIVE LIMITATIONS 74

XVIII. MARKUSH GROUP LIMITATIONS 77

XIX. PRODUCT BY PROCESS LIMITATIONS 79

XX. PROCESS CLAIM - ORDER OF STEPS - PRODUCT BY PROCESS 80

XXI. FUNCTIONAL MISCELLANEOUS TERMS 81

1. A, An 81

2. About 82

3. At Least One of A and B 82

4. I.E. 84

5. Wherein 85

XXII. MEANING OF MISCELLANEOUS TERMS 86

XXIII. CLAIM DIFFERENTIATION 100

XXIV. PROSECUTION HISTORY AS CLAIM CONSTRUCTION TOOL 101

XXV. TRANSITIONAL TERMS ("COMPRISING", "CONSISTING ESSENTIALLY OF", "CONSISTING OF") AND "WHEREIN / WHEREBY" CLAUSES 104

1. "Comprising" 104

2. "Consists essentially of" 104

3. "Consisting Of" 105

XXVI. EXTRINSIC EVIDENCE - DICTIONARIES 105

1. Extrinsic Evidence 105

2. Dictionaries 105

XXVII. PROSECUTION DISCLAIMER 106

XXVIII. MARKMAN PROCEDURE 118

1. Additional Claim Construction After First *Markman* Proceeding 122

2. Handling Indefiniteness As Part of *Markman* Construction 123

XXIX. LIMITATIONS ON CLAIM CONSTRUCTION PROCEEDINGS 123

1. Use of Opposing Party's Claim Construction 123

2. Winning Patent Owner Cannot Challenge a "Too Restrictive" Claim Construction 124

3. Patent Owner's Claim Construction May Be Used to Find Patent Unpatentable 125

4. Alternative Claim Constructions 126

5. Construction Relying on Later-Added Claims is Likely to be Incorrect 126

XXX. ITC CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 127

XXXI. IPR/CBMR/PGR CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 129

1. Broadest Reasonable Interpretation Is Not *Per Se* Broadest Possible Interpretation 129

2. Present a Construction That You Believe Is Correct 132

XXXII. EFFECTS OF PTAB'S PRECEDENTAL DECISION 133

1. Background 133

XXXIII. IPR CLAIM CONSTRUCTION PROCEDURE 136

XXXIV. POPR AND CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 137

XXXV. CHANGES FOR CLAIM CONSTRUCTION STANDARD USED IN PTAB PROCEEDINGS - FROM BRI TO *PHILLIPS V. AWH* 138

1. Introduction 138

2. The Details, Concisely Stated 146

3. Key Portions Of The Federal Register Notice, May 9, 2018, Vol. 83, No 90 (Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0036) 147

4. The Specific Rules, As Amended. 150

5. Other Issues That May Arise 152

6. The Final Rule - Revised Rules Adopt *Phillips* 154

XXXVI. DISTRICT COURT / DISTRICT COURT CROSS EFFECTS OF CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 155

XXXVII. DISTRICT COURT / PTAB CROSS EFFECTS OF CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS 155

XXXVIII. NEW CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 156

XXXIX. PRESENTATION OF PTAB: NEW CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 157

XL. PTAB BOUND BY PRIOR FEDERAL CIRCUIT CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 159

XLI. COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL ISSUES INVOLVING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION DETERMINATION 166

1. Collateral Estoppel or issue preclusion 167

2. Judicial estoppel 168

XLII. *STARE DECISIS* 169

XLIII. TIMELY DISCLOSURE OF EXPERT TESTIMONY PARTICULARS 173

XLIV. DISCOVERY RE EXPERT SUPPORTING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 174

XLV. EXPERT TESTIMONY CONTRARY TO *MARKMAN* CONSTRUCTION 174

1. Expert Testimony Does Not Contradict Court's Claim Construction 174

2. Expert Testimony Contradicts Claim Construction 175

XLVI. SANCTIONS AFTER *MARKMAN* CONSTRUCTION 180

XLVII. VACATING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION FOLLOWING SETTLEMENT 183

XLVIII. LIMITATIONS ON EXPERT WITNESS TESTIMONY RE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 184

XLIX. HARMLESS ERROR RE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 186

L. CONCLUSION 187

Claim construction continues as the bedrock providing essential foundation to the two principal considerations in every litigation / contested matter involving U.S. patents: the infringement and the validity of the claims in issue. Claim construction is also part and parcel of every USPTO proceeding under its "broadest reasonable construction in view of the specification to one of ordinary skill in the art (BRI)," claim construction rubric, as had particularly been the case with the new USPTO post grant IPR/PGR/CBMR procedures, where the petitioner is required to provide (at least a limited) claim construction as part of its petition seeking PTAB review. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b). That has all changed, however, as of November 13, 2018, when all post-grant proceedings will drop BRI and instead adopt *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc), and its claim construction regime for all petitions filed on or after November 12, 2018.

Yet again, the latest jurisprudence of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit ("Federal Circuit") and its overseeing court, the United States Supreme Court has, while maintaining the *Phillips v. AWH Corp.* over-arching methodology intact, made major and minor changes in applicable precedent and procedure.[1]

I. INTRODUCTION

United States Letters Patent No. 10,000,000 issued on June 19, 2018, to Raytheon Company; it was entitled Coherent Ladar using Intra-Pixel Quadrature Detection, and the named investor was Joseph Marron, of Manhattan Beach, CA. It had just over six (6) pages of specifications and twenty (20) claims, ten (10) system claims, ten (10) LADAR method claims. Nothing terribly unique there (other than the claimed subject matter, of course).

Yet, Professor Crouch, in his always educational and often enjoyable Patenty-O Daily Review: Boiler Plate Language in Patents (June 24, 2018), blog posting had just this to say about U.S. 10,000,000:

The Specification of U.S. Patent No. 10,000,000 is short - only about three pages long. However, the patentee made room for the following boilerplate:

- Although specific advantages have been enumerated above, various embodiments may include some, none, or all of the enumerated advantages.
- [O]ther technical advantages may become readily apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art after review of the following figures and description.
- It should be understood at the outset that, although exemplary embodiments are illustrated in the figures and described below, the principles of the present disclosure may be implemented using any number of techniques, whether currently known or not.

[1] USITC, District Court and PTAB materials, not otherwise attributed, which are sources / quoted in this paper, were physically sourced / excerpted from author - reviewed *Docket Report* daily published documents, in accordance with License and Permitted Uses for *Docket Report*, http://home.docketnavigator.com/terms-of-use (5/22/13 rev.).

The present disclosure should in no way be limited to the exemplary implementations and techniques illustrated in the drawings and described below.

- Unless otherwise specifically noted, articles depicted in the drawings are not necessarily drawn to scale.

- Modifications, additions, or omissions may be made to the systems, apparatuses, and methods described herein without departing from the scope of the disclosure. For example, the components of the systems and apparatuses may be integrated or separated. Moreover, the operations of the systems and apparatuses disclosed herein may be performed by more, fewer, or other components and the methods described may include more, fewer, or other steps. Additionally, steps may be performed in any suitable order. As used in this document, "each" refers to each member of a set or each member of a subset of a set.

- To aid the Patent Office and any readers of any patent issued on this application in interpreting the claims appended hereto, applicants wish to note that they do not intend any of the appended claims or claim elements to invoke 35 U.S.C. 112(f) unless the words "means for" or "step for" are explicitly used in the particular claim.

Not sure what the specific point he was reaching for was but I suggest - if you let a civilian or a grammar school child read this out loud and watch their faces - you may appreciate how jurors in a patent case may feel.

Now, onto the joys of U.S. claim construction.

UT LAW CLE THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS TEXASLAW

Find the full text of this and thousands of other resources from leading experts in dozens of legal practice areas in the UT Law CLE eLibrary (utcle.org/elibrary)

Title search: Recent Developments in Claim Construction

Also available as part of the eCourse
2018 Advanced Patent Law (Austin) eConference

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the
23rd Annual Advanced Patent Law Institute session
"Recent Developments in Claims Construction"