

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AUSTIN DIVISION**

**Intellectual Ventures I LLC and
Intellectual Ventures II LLC,**

Plaintiffs/Counter-Defendants,

v.

VMware, Inc.,

Defendant/Counter-Plaintiff.

Civil Action No. 1:19-CV-01075-ADA

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

DEFENDANT VMWARE, INC.'S REPLY CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|------|---|----|
| I. | DISPUTED TERMS FROM U.S. PATENT NO. RE44,686 | 1 |
| A. | “modif[y/ied] [a] resource allocation” / “modify[ing] [the] computer resources allocated to a virtual server” (’686 patent claims 5–7) | 1 |
| B. | “resource unavailable messages resulting from denied requests to modify a resource allocation” (’686 patent claims 5–7)..... | 3 |
| C. | “determination that a virtual server is overloaded” (’686 patent claims 5–7) | 4 |
| D. | “virtual server” (’686 patent claims 5–7)..... | 4 |
| E. | “determining that a second physical host can accommodate the requested modified resource allocation” (’686 patent claims 5–7) | 5 |
| F. | “component configured to” Means-Plus-Function Terms (’686 patent claim 7) | 6 |
| a. | “a component configured to receive an indication . . .” term (see Dkt. No. 53-2 clause 1) ⁵ | 6 |
| b. | “component configured to determine that a second physical host can accommodate the requested modified resource allocation” term (see Dkt. No. 53-2 clause 2) | 7 |
| c. | “component configured to generate a physical host transfer signal that indicates a second physical host and to transfer the virtual server . . .” term (see Dkt. No. 53-2 clause 3) | 7 |
| II. | DISPUTED TERMS FROM U.S. PATENT NO. RE42,726 | 8 |
| A. | “resource denials” (’726 patent claims 1, 4–5 and 8) | 8 |
| B. | “quality of service guarantee” (’726 patent claims 1 and 4)..... | 8 |
| C. | “virtual server overloaded signal” (’726 patent claims 1, 4-5 and 8) | 9 |
| D. | Mean-Plus-Function Elements (’726 Patent claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 7) (see Dkt. No. 53-2 Clauses 4-8) | 10 |
| III. | DISPUTED TERMS FROM U.S. PATENT NO. 7,949,752 | 11 |
| A. | “exhausted” (’752 patent claims 1, 9 and 24)..... | 11 |
| B. | “consumed” (recited in ’752 patent claims 1, 9 and 24)..... | 14 |
| C. | “service” (’752 patent claims 1, 3, 9 and 24)..... | 15 |
| D. | Means-Plus-Function Terms..... | 15 |
| IV. | DISPUTED TERMS FROM U.S. PATENT NO. RE43,051 | 16 |
| A. | “virtual server” (’051 patent claims 1, 3 and 6)..... | 16 |
| B. | “physical interface[s]” (’051 patent claims 1 and 3) | 18 |
| C. | physical interfaces and tunnel identifiers in the storing / receiving / determining / sending terms (’051 patent claims 1 and 3)..... | 18 |
| D. | “customer forwarding [table/information]” (’051 patent claims 1 and 3) | 19 |

V. DISPUTED TERMS FROM U.S. PATENT NO. RE44,818 20

A. “hierarchical token bucket resource allocation”/ “token” (recited in ’818 patent claims 1, 17, 30, 32-33 and 37–42) 20

B. “enforc[e/ing]”, “receiv[e/ing]”, “classify[ing]”, “compar[e/ing]”, “forward[ing]”, and “buffer[ing]” (’818 patent claims 1, 17, 30, 32-33, 37-39, 42)..... 22

C. “maintaining a connection over a network fabric” (’818 patent claims 1, 17, 30, 32 and 42) 23

D. “virtual storage network interface layer of an application server” / “virtual network interface layer of an application server”/ “virtual interface layer of an application server” (’818 patent claims 1, 17, 30, 32 and 42)..... 25

E. “one or more input/output virtualization modules comprising computer-readable instructions operative to cause the one or more processors to” performs functions terms (’818 patent claim 17)..... 25

VI. CONCLUSION..... 25

..

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| | Page(s) |
|--|----------------|
| Cases | |
| <i>Apple Inc. v. Andrea Elec. Corp.</i> , 949 F.3d 697 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 2020)..... | 24 |
| <i>Blackboard, Inc. v. Desire2Learn, Inc.</i> , 574 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2009)..... | 11 |
| <i>Fenner Investments, Ltd. v. Cellco Partnership</i> , 778 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... | 2 |
| <i>Hakim v. Cannon Avent Group PLC</i> , 479 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2007)..... | 13 |
| <i>High Tech Med. Instr., Inc. v. New Image Indus., Inc.</i> , 1997 WL 787052 (Fed. Cir. Dec. 24, 1997)..... | 21 |
| <i>Intellectual Ventures I, LLC v. Lenovo Group Ltd.</i> , 365 F.Supp.3d 200 (D. Mass. 2019)..... | 14 |
| <i>Laitram Corp. v. Morehouse Indus., Inc.</i> , 143 F.3d 1456 (Fed.Cir.1998)..... | 11 |
| <i>Meetrix IP, LLC v. Citrix Sys., Inc.</i> , No. 1:16-CV-1033-LY, 2017 WL 5986191 (W.D. Tex. Dec. 1, 2017) | 17, 18, 19, 21 |
| <i>Microsoft Corp. V. Multi-TechSystems, Inc.</i> , 357 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2004)..... | 22, 23 |
| <i>O2 Micro Int'l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co.</i> , 521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... | 16, 18 |
| <i>Pause Tech., LLC v. TiVo, Inc.</i> , 419 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... | 2 |
| <i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... | 4 |
| <i>SkinMedica, Inc. v. Histogen Inc.</i> , 727 F.3d 1187 (Fed. Cir. 2013)..... | 22, 23 |
| <i>Springs Window Fashions LP v. Novo Industries, L.P.</i> , 323 F.3d 989 (Fed. Cir. 2003)..... | 2, 11, 12 |

...

Uship Intellectual Properties, LLC v. United States,
714 F.3d 1311 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....13

Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.,
90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....4

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 112.....3, 8

35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 6.....11, 15, 16

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.