

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS**

E-NUMERATE SOLUTIONS, INC. and  
E-NUMERATE, LLC,

Plaintiffs,

v.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendant.

C.A. No. 19-859-RTH

**PLAINTIFFS' REPLY CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF ON INDEFINITENESS**

Dated: June 1, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Sean T. O'Kelly

Sean T. O'Kelly

Gerard M. O'Rourke

O'KELLY & O'ROURKE, LLC

824 N. Market Street, Suite 1001A

Wilmington, DE 19801

302-778-4000

[sokelly@okorlaw.com](mailto:sokelly@okorlaw.com)

[gorourke@okorlaw.com](mailto:gorourke@okorlaw.com)

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

**Table of Contents**

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

II. ARGUMENT..... 3

A. The ‘355 Patent..... 3

    ‘355 Patent, Term 6: “the step of receiving”..... 3

B. The ‘816 Patent..... 4

    ‘816 Patent, Term 5: “the markup language.”..... 4

    ‘816 Patent, Term 6: “means for receiving...”..... 5

    ‘816 patent, Term 7: “means for automatically transforming...”..... 5

    ‘816 Patent, Term 8: “means for combining...”..... 6

    ‘816 Patent, Term 9: “means for displaying...”..... 7

C. The ‘383 Patent..... 7

    ‘383 Patent, Term 13: “means for identifying...”..... 7

    ‘383 Patent, Term 14: “means for automatically transforming...”..... 8

    ‘383 Patent, Term 15: “means for processing...”..... 9

    ‘383 Patent, Term 16: “means for causing a display”..... 10

D. The ‘748 Patent..... 10

    ‘748 Patent Terms 7 – 16..... 10

    ‘748 Patent, Term 7: “code for storing a plurality”..... 12

'748 Patent, Term 8: "code for processing at least..." ..... 12

'748 Patent, Term 9: "code for receiving a user selection..." ..... 12

'748 Patent, Term 10: "code for receiving a user selection..." ..... 12

'748 Patent, Term 11: "code for mapping..." ..... 12

'748 Patent, Term 12: "code for outputting a presentation..." ..... 13

'748 Patent, Term 14: "code for outputting a report..." ..... 13

'748 Patent, Term 16: "code for outputting at least one..." ..... 13

III. CONCLUSION..... 13

**Table of Authorities****Cases**

<i>BBA Nonwovens Simpsonville, Inc. v. Superior Nonwovens, LLC</i> , 303 F.3d 1332, 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	2, 5, 6, 8, 9
<i>CBT Flint Partners, LLC v. Return Path, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1353, 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	7
<i>Cellcast Tech., LLC v. United States</i> , 150 Fed. Cl. 353 (2020)	2, 6, 9
<i>Competitive Techs. v. Fujitsu Ltd.</i> , 286 F. Supp. 2d 1161, 1174 (N.D. Cal. 2003)	5, 9
<i>Competitive Techs., Inc. v. Fujitsu Ltd.</i> , 185 F. Appx. 958 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	5, 9
<i>Cypress Lake Software, Inc. v. Samsung Electronics America, Inc.</i> , 382 F. Supp. 3d 586 (E.D. Tex. 2019)	12
<i>Cypress Lake Software, Inc. v. ZTE (USA), Inc.</i> , 2018 WL 4035968 (E.D. Tex. August 23, 2018)	12
<i>Egenera, Inc. v. Cisco Sys.</i> , 972 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	11
<i>I.T.S. Rubber Co. v. Essex Rubber Co.</i> , 272 U.S. 429, 442, 47 S. Ct. 136, 71 L. Ed. 335, 1927 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 228 (1926)	7
<i>In re Katz Interactive Call Processing Patent Litigation</i> , 639 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	2, 7, 8, 9
<i>Innova/Pure Water, Inc. v. Safari Water Filtration Sys., Inc.</i> , 381 F.3d 1111, 1116 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	4
<i>Lockheed Martin Corp. v. Space Systems/Loral, Inc.</i> , 324 F.3d 1308, 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	2, 5, 6, 8, 9
<i>Mediatek, Inc. v. Sanyo Elec. Co.</i> , 513 F. Supp. 2d 778, 788 (E.D. Tex. 2007)	5, 9
<i>Novo Indus., L.P. v. Micro Molds Corp.</i> , 350 F.3d 1348, 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	7
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303, 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9
<i>UUSI, LLC v. United States</i> , 131 Fed. Cl. 244, 263 (C.F.C. 2017)	7
<i>Zeroclick, LLC v. Apple Inc.</i> , 891 F.3d 1003 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	2, 10, 11, 12

...

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Government's arguments based on alleged ambiguity and/or lack of antecedent basis are insufficient to establish indefiniteness under controlling Federal Circuit precedent.

With regard to the '355 patent, the natural and logical reading of "the step of receiving" in claims 15 and 42 makes clear that the step referred to is the step of receiving the tags in independent claims 1 and 28. Claims 15 and 42 both add limitations relating to the "tags" and, as a result, are referring to the step of receiving the tags in the independent claims. In arguing for an indefiniteness finding, the Government ignores the canon of claim construction that claims are to be construed from the perspective of a person of ordinary skill in the art ("POSITA"). In short, there is no reason for a POSITA to read the claim as the Government suggests. The Government's position should be rejected.

Similarly, with regard to the "markup language" limitation in the '816 patent, the Government again ignores the mandate that claims are to be construed from the perspective of a POSITA. Here, the Government and its expert concoct hypotheticals that claim 10 of the '816 patent (from which challenged claim 12 depends) should somehow be read as permitting the first and second markup documents to potentially be in different markup languages. Such an assertion is contrary to the '816 patent specification and common sense. The Government's position should be rejected here as well.

e-Numerate's position on the "means-plus-function" claims at issue is quite clear. The patents disclose use of conversion factors to transform numbers. As a result, the "means for transforming" limitations in the '816 and '383 patents satisfy the algorithm requirement set forth in the relevant case law. At most, the Government is disputing the adequacy of the disclosure,

# 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.