

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

TECHNO VIEW IP, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

OCULUS VR, LLC, and

FACEBOOK, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. 17-cv-386-VAC-CJB

PLAINTIFF'S OPENING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF

O'KELLY ERNST & JOYCE, LLC

Sean T. O'Kelly (No. 4349)

Daniel P. Murray (No. 5785)

901 N. Market Street, Suite 1000

Wilmington, DE 19801

(302) 778-4000

(302) 295-2873 (facsimile)

sokelly@oelegal.com

dmurray@oelegal.com

HARRY JERNIGAN CPA ATTORNEY, P.C.

Michael K. Botts (Pro Hac Vice)

5101 Cleveland Street, Suite 200

Virginia Beach, VA 23462

mbotts@hjlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Techno View IP, Inc.

Dated: April 20, 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ARGUMENT 1

1. “backbuffer” (‘096 Patent Claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, and 13; ‘218 Patent Claims 1 and 6) 1

2. “videogame” (‘096 Patent Claims 1, 5, 8, 12, and 16; ‘218 Patent 1, 2, 7, and 8) 2

3. “left backbuffer” and “right backbuffer” (‘096 Patent Claims: 1, 2, 3, 6, and 7; ‘218 Patent Claims 1 and 6) 4

4. “storing an image into the left backbuffer; determining if the image is in a two-dimensional format or a three-dimensional format” (‘096 Patent Claim 1), and “storing a videogame image in the first buffer; determining when the videogame image is a two-dimensional or a three-dimensional image” (‘096 Patent Claims 8 and 16) 6

5. “storing a[n] . . . image into the . . . [back]buffer” (‘096 Patent Claims 1, 8, and 16; ‘218 Patent Claims 1, 7, and 12) 7

6. “spatial coordinates;” “spatial coordinates (x,y,z);” “position coordinates;” and, “coordinates of [a/the] . . . view position” (‘096 Patent Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 12, and 16; ‘218 Patent Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 13, and 14) 10

7. “buffer” (‘096 Patent Claims 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, and 19; ‘218 Patent Claims 7, 8, 11, 12, and 13) 13

8. “frontbuffer” (‘096 Patent Claim 14) 15

9. “calculating, with a processor of the videogame system, second position coordinates of a second eye view of the object in three dimensional space using the calculated first position coordinates of the first eye view” (‘218 Patent Claim 1) and “calculating, with a processor of the videogame system, second spatial coordinates of a second eye view of the virtual object in the videogame in three dimensional space by coordinate transformation equations using the calculated first position coordinates of the first eye view and the position of the virtual object in the dimensional space by coordinate transformation equations using the calculated first position coordinates of the first eye view and the position of the virtual object in the videogame” (‘218 Patent Claim 7) 16

CONCLUSION 20

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Free Motion Fitness, Inc. v. Cybex Int’l, Inc.,
423 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 12

Function Media, LLC v. Google, Inc.,
708 F.3d 1310 (Fed. Cir. 2013)..... 7

Interactive Gift Express, Inc. v. Compuserve Inc.,
256 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2001)..... 6

Mformation Techs., Inc., v. Research In Motion Limited,
764 F.3d 1392 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 6, 7

TALtech Ltd. v. Esquel Apparel, Inc.,
279 F. App’x 974 (Fed. Cir. 2008) 7

Watts v. XL Sys., Inc.,
232 F.3d 877 (Fed. Cir. 2000)..... 18

Williamson v. Citrix Online, LLC,
792 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... 18

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 112..... 18

35 U.S.C. § 122..... 18

Other Authorities

Merriam-Webster’s Online Dictionary, April 24, 2009..... 19

Microsoft Computer Dictionary, Fifth Ed., Microsoft Press, 2002 14, 16

Microsoft Computer Dictionary, Microsoft Press, 2000 19, 20

In its Complaint, Plaintiff Techno View IP, Inc. (“Techno View”) alleges that Defendants infringe Claims 1-19 of U.S. Patent No. 7,666,096 (the ‘096 Patent”) and Claims 1-19 of Patent No. 8,206,218 (the “’218 Patent”). Defendants identified nine terms for construction in this case. For the reasons below, Plaintiff argues that the Court should adopt its proposed constructions.

ARGUMENT

1. “backbuffer” (’096 Patent Claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, and 13; ’218 Patent Claims 1 and 6)

Term	Parties’ Agreed-Upon Construction
“backbuffer”	<p>A memory location where the image to be displayed is temporarily “drawn” without outputting it to the video card.</p> <p><u>Newly Proposed:</u></p> <p>A memory location for the temporary storage of an image.</p>

The term “back buffer” is specifically defined in the patent specifications and the Parties agree that the definition in the specification should be used to construe the term. See ‘096 Patent, col. 6: 40-45, and ‘218 Patent, col. 6: 40-45. It should be noted, however, that the agreed upon construction above pertains only in the case where the backbuffer is not already located on the video card. Indeed, in the same definitional paragraph cited in support of this construction, the Specification cites the situation where the backbuffer is already located on the video card: “This backbuffer is usually located within the physical RAM memory of the video or graphics acceleration card.”¹ So the term backbuffer can also be defined as a memory location where an image is temporarily stored on a video or graphics acceleration card.

Based on a recent conversation between parties concerning the terms “buffer” and “backbuffer,” it is apparent that although the parties had previously agreed on words that define

¹ See ‘096 Patent: col 6, 45-47.

“backbuffer,” there is a fundamental disagreement as to the actual meaning of those words. In order to clarify that distinction, Plaintiff offers the following construction of “backbuffer” as follows: “A memory location for the temporary storage of an image.” This construction, which identifies that the “backbuffers” pertain to the temporary storage of “images,” distinguishes the “backbuffers” (and “frontbuffers” as discussed later) from the “buffers” which temporarily store “data.” This newly proposed construction is offered in the interest of seeking an agreement between the parties.²

2. “videogame” (‘096 Patent Claims 1, 5, 8, 12, and 16; ‘218 Patent 1, 2, 7, and 8)

Term	Plaintiff Techno View Construction	Defendants’ Constructions
“videogame”	<p>A software program written in some computer language, with its objective to simulate a non-existent world and take a player or user into this world.</p> <p>Alternatively, Plaintiff respectfully asserts that the term, in context in the claim language, is readily understood by laypersons so no construction is necessary.</p>	<p>a process which starts by providing a plurality of independently related logical states which include a set of programming options, where each programming option corresponds to different image characteristics</p>

Techno View respectfully submits that construction of the term “videogame,” by itself, misrepresents key claim limitations. All Independent claims of both the ‘096 and ‘218 Patents specify a “videogame system,”³ which element is then inherited by all dependent claims in both

² For purposes of clarity, Plaintiff will refer to constructions offered in the interest of seeking agreement as “Newly Proposed” constructions.

³ See ‘096 Patent Claim 1: “A method of displaying images in a videogame system ...”; Claim 8: “A method in a videogame system ...”; Claim 15: “A videogame system for displaying videogame images ...”; and, Claim 16: “A videogame system comprising a processor configured to run instructions ...”. See also ‘218 Patent Claims 1 and 7: “A method in a videogame system

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.