

The University of Texas School of Law

24th ANNUAL ADVANCED PATENT LAW INSTITUTE

**RECENT
DEVELOPMENTS IN
CLAIM CONSTRUCTION**

November 7-8, 2019

**Hotel ZaZa
Austin, Texas**

Kenneth R. Adamo*

Law Office of KR Adamo
360 W. Illinois, Apt 620
Chicago, IL 60654

E-mail: kradamo23@gmail.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 Law Office of KR Adamo or any of his or its former or present clients. © 2019 Kenneth R Adamo. All Rights Reserved.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BASICS	2
TIMING OF CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	4
§101	4
Preliminary Construction	6
Requests for Admission	7
Failure to State a Claim	8
Summary Judgement	9
Timeliness of Claim Construction and Revised / Amended Contentions	9
Delay of Markman Hearing; Request for Additional Claim Construction	11
EFFECT OF AN AGREED CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	12
PATENTEE AS OWN LEXICOGRAPHER CONCERNING CLAIM TERM	13
PTAB ADOPTION OF <i>PHILLIPS</i> CONSTRUCTION	15
CLAIM CONSTRUCTION – COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL / JUDICIAL ESTOPPEL	19
INTERLOCUTORY REVIEW OF CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	21
USE OF SPECIFICATION RE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	21
Improper to Read Limitations from Preferred Embodiment in Specification Even if it is only Embodiment	22
Specification Use of “Present Invention” May Limit Claim Scope	24
Broad Definition in Specification of Claim Term Precludes Narrower Construction	25
Construction That Results In Exclusion of an Embodiment Rarely, If Ever, Is Correct	25
PREAMBLES	25
Consisting essentially of	32
Comprising	34
WHEREBY / WHEREIN TERMS	36

CONSTRUCTION OF SPECIFIC CLAIM TERMS	42
“i.e.”	42
“100%”	42
“Upper”	43
“Etc.”	44
“About”	45
“A”/”An”	47
PROSECUTION HISTORY AS CLAIM CONSTRUCTION TOOL	49
EFFECT OF FOREIGN PROSECUTION HISTORY ON CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	50
PROSECUTION DISCLAIMER.....	50
Prosecution Disclaimer Basics	50
Prosecution History Disclaimer Does Not Bind Only A Patent Owner.....	58
EXPERT TESTIMONY AND CLAIM CONSTRUCITON.....	59
Expert Testimony as Claim Construction Evidence	59
Untimeliness of Expert Declarations.....	60
ED Texas Local Rules Amendments: Expert Witness (General Order GO-18-10).....	60
Expert Testimony Contradicting and/or Attempting to Alter Trial Court <i>Markman</i> Claim Construction	63
Waiver of Objections to Expert Presenting Claim Construction Testimony Before the Jury...	65
EXPERT TESTIMONY- EXTRINSIC EVIDENCE	67
MEANS PLUS FUNCTION CLAIM LIMITATIONS	69
STEPS IN PROCESS-REQUIRED ORDER.....	84
NEGATIVE CLAIM LIMITATIONS	85
PTAB CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	89
Introduction	90
Broadest Reasonable Interpretation	92
<i>Phillips</i> Interpretation.....	94

Relationship to Final U.S. District Court Proceeding Claim Constructions	101
POST GRANT PROCEEDINGS: NOTICE OF CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ISSUES / POSITIONS	103
Application of SAS and APA.....	103
No Requirement that PTAB Provide Claim Construction	109
Right of PTAB to Change Claim Construction Announced in Institution Decision	109
Advancing A Claim Construction With Which A Party Disagrees	110
DISTRICT COURT / PTAB; PTAB / DISTRICT COURT CONSTRUCTION EFFECTS	111
EFFECT OF PTAB DISCLAIMER ON DISTRICT COURT PROCEEDING.....	111
PRESERVATION OF CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ERROR FOR APPEAL	112
EXPOSURE TO A 35 USC § 285 ATTORNEY FEES AWARD SUBSEQUENT TO CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	113
VACATING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ORDER IN VIEW OF SETTLEMENT.....	115
CONCLUSION.....	115

Claim construction continues to provide 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 was 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 USPTO post grant IPR/PGR/CBMR proceedings, 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 changed, however, as of November 13, 2018, when all post-grant proceedings dropped BRI and adopted *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, (Fed. Cir 2005) (en banc), and its claim construction regime for all petitions filed on or after November 12, 2018.

And again, the latest decisions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (“Federal Circuit”), the trial courts and PTAB panels, while maintaining the *Phillips v. AWH Corp.* over-arching methodology, made major and minor changes in applicable precedent and procedure.¹

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://homedocketnavigator.com/terms-of-use> (5/22/13 rev.).

I. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BASICS

Several recent Federal Circuit and trial court decisions have contained detailed discussions of the *Phillips v. AWH Corp* claim regime and provide an excellent jumping-off place for a claim construction analysis.

For example, in *E.I. duPont de Nemours & Co V. Unifrax I LLC*, Appeal No. 2017-2575, slip op. (Fed. Cir. April 17, 2019), the Federal Circuit affirmed the trial court's determination that the claims of U.S. Patent No. 8,607,926 on a Composite Flame Barrier Laminate for a Thermal and Acoustic Insulation Blanket were not invalid and were infringed.

The '926 patent claims composite laminates that are incorporated into thermal-acoustic blankets installed on the interior of airline fuselages to shield passengers from flames and reduce noise. **At issue was the term "100% by weight" in the claims. Unifrax argued that the "100% by weight" term does not allow for any amount of organic additives in the refractory layer. According to Unifrax, "'100%' means one hundred percent." The Federal Circuit considered whether the context of the entire patent and other intrinsic evidence supported such an interpretation and concluded it did not.**

The Federal Circuit began with the language of the claims:

That claim 1 recites a residual moisture content of up to "[10%] by weight" in addition to "100% by weight" platelets in the refractory layer undercuts Unifrax's plain meaning argument that "'100%' means one hundred percent." Unifrax's position would require that the term "100% by weight" be considered alone, without reference to the surrounding claim language. The claim's reference to both "100% by weight" platelets and 10% residual moisture, however, supports the conclusion that "100% by weight" is relative to carrier material. It would be nonsensical if the total percentage of components comprising the inorganic refractory layer exceeded 100%.

The Federal Circuit then turned to the specification, which described "preferably at least 85% of the layer comprises platelets" with the remainder being "some residual dispersant." The Federal Circuit found that this language supports the trial court's conclusion that the disclosed embodiments, including the 100% platelet embodiment, allow for some amount of residual dispersant.

Unifrax argued that all 24 of the examples had 100% by weight inorganic platelets with no residual dispersant, but the Federal Circuit noted that the specification also listed other "suitable materials" that contain a residual dispersant, and thus, less than 100% inorganic material for the refractory layer. The Federal Circuit also rejected Unifrax's argument that it was improper to use the specification of the patent's parent in construing the claims in the continuation-in-part patent at issue, noting that the subject matter in the parent was common to the continuation-in-part application.

Finally the Federal Circuit rejected the argument that the patent owner limited the scope of the claims during prosecution. During prosecution the patentees amended the claims to

add the 100% limitation to distinguish prior art with a 70% concentration. The Federal Circuit found that in making the amendment, the patent owner did not disclaim the presence of non-carrier materials such as dispersants.

Based upon the claim language itself, the specification, the specification of the related cases, and a careful examination of the prosecution history, the Federal Circuit concluded that the trial court's interpretation of "100% by weight" was not erroneous.

Having affirmed the trial court's claim construction, the Federal Circuit went on to affirm the finding of infringement.

The case was a tutorial in claim construction, giving a practical example of how claim terms are construed in light of the surrounding language; how the entire specification and not just the examples are used in determining the meaning of claim terms; how the specifications of related applications are used in determining the meaning of claims terms; and even how the prosecution history is used in determining the meaning of claim terms.

Wheelock, "Federal Circuit Gives a Masters Class in Claim Construction," Lexology <https://www.lexology.com/library/april17,2019> See also *Choon's Design LLC v. Idea Village Products Corp.*, Appeal No. 2018-1934, slip op (Fed Cir. June 24, 2019) at 6-9 and n. 3 ("Choon's criticizes the district court for "select[ing] which terms to construe with an eye towards the [] infringement issues and the accused device." Appellant's Br. 37 **As we have previously explained, however "although the claims are construed objectively and without reference to the accused device, only those terms need to be construed that are in controversy, and only to the extent necessary to resolve the controversy."** *Vivid Techs., v. Am. Sci. & Eng'g, Inc.*, 200 F. 3d 795, 803 (Fed. Cir. 1999). The district court did not err in considering the accused product in order to identify the claim terms material to infringement.")

Judge Mazzant's claim construction decision in *E-System Design Inc v. Mentor Graphics Corp.* Civil Action No. 4: 17-cv-682 (ED Tex 2017), Claim Construction Memorandum Opinion and Order (Dec 17, 2018), also sets out an excellent summary of the key *Phillips v. AWH Corp's* analysis concepts. See, e.g., Slip op. 2-5, 10-11, 16-17 ("Idiosyncratic language, highly technical terms, or terms coined by the inventors are best understood by reference to the specification"), 19-20, 22 (In general, 'only those terms need to be constructed that are in controversy, and only to the extent necessary to resolve the controversy'), 30-31.

Analysis of the "plain and ordinary meaning" of claim terms was the focus of *Wis. Alumni Research Found. v. Apple Inc.*, Appeal Nos. 17-2265, -2380 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 28, 2018), which involved hotly contested disputes as to the plain and ordinary meaning of key claim terms.

The Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation (WARF) owns a patent directed to a data speculation decision circuit that uses predictions to help increase the efficiency of computer processing functions running in parallel. The claims require that a prediction be associated with a "particular" load instruction. WARF filed a patent infringement complaint against Apple asserting the patent.

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 \(utcle.org/elibrary\)](https://utcle.org/elibrary)

Title search: Recent Developments in Claims Construction

Also available as part of the eCourse

[2019 Advanced Patent Law \(Austin\) eConference](#)

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the

24th Annual Advanced Patent Law Institute session

"Recent Developments in Claims Construction"