

NOTE: This disposition is nonprecedential.

**United States Court of Appeals
for the Federal Circuit**

**JAMES L. DRIESSEN, MARGUERITE A.
DRIESSEN,**
Plaintiffs-Appellants

v.

**SONY MUSIC ENTERTAINMENT, AKA SONY BMG
MUSIC ENTERTAINMENT, BEST BUY STORES,
AKA BEST BUY COMPANY, FYE, AKA TRANS
WORLD ENTERTAINMENT, TARGET
CORPORATION,**
Defendants-Appellees

2015-2050

Appeal from the United States District Court for the
District of Utah in No. 2:09-cv-00140-CW-BCW, Judge
Clark Waddoups.

Decided: February 10, 2016

JAMES L. DRIESSEN, Lindon, UT, pro se.

MARGUERITE A. DRIESSEN, Lindon, UT, pro se.

JAMES CHARLES PISTORINO, Parrish Law Office, Menlo Park, CA, for defendants-appellees.

Before DYK, MAYER, and HUGHES, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM.

James L. Driessen is the named inventor on U.S. Patent Nos. 7,003,500 (“the ’500 patent”), 7,636,695 (“the ’695 patent”), and 7,742,993 (“the ’993 patent”). Mr. Driessen and his wife, Marguerite A. Driessen,¹ (collectively “the Driessens”) sued Sony Music Entertainment, Best Buy Stores, FYE, and Target (collectively “Sony”), alleging infringement of the ’500, ’695, and ’993 patents in the United States District Court for the District of Utah. The district court granted Sony’s motions for summary judgment, finding asserted claims 1–4 and 7 of the ’500 patent invalid as indefinite, and asserted claims 10–15 of the ’500 patent, all claims of the ’695 patent, and all claims of the ’993 patent invalid for lack of written description. The Driessens appeal. We affirm.

BACKGROUND

The ’500, ’695, and ’993 patents all have virtually the same specification and relate to systems and methods of purchasing downloadable content from the Internet. Rather than purchasing the content directly through the Internet, the buyer goes to a retail store to pay for the item in person. At the retail store, the buyer obtains a ticket or other “physical medium” proof of sale containing a web address specific to the item sold and a unique password that will enable its download. *Driessen v. Sony*

¹ The basis for Marguerite Driessen’s standing is not clear in the record.

Music Entm't, No. 2:09-CV-0140-CW, 2015 WL 1057845, at *2 (D. Utah Mar. 10, 2015) (“*D.C. Op.*”). The buyer can then anonymously download the media content from any computer with Internet access by going to the web address and inputting the unique password provided. The district court held claims 1–4 and 7 of the ’500 patent invalid as indefinite, and claims 10–15 of the ’500 patent and all asserted claims of the ’695 and ’993 patents invalid for lack of written description. *Id.* at *14. The DriesSENS appealed. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1295(a)(1).

DISCUSSION

We begin with the issue of indefiniteness. Indefiniteness is a question of law that we review de novo. *Teva Pharm. U.S.A., Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.*, 789 F.3d 1335, 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2015). We review the ultimate construction of a claim and intrinsic evidence de novo. *Teva Pharm. U.S.A., Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.*, 135 S. Ct. 831, 841 (2015). We review the grant of summary judgment de novo. *Vanmoor v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, 201 F.3d 1363, 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

Claim 1 of the ’500 patent, which contains several means-plus-function elements, provides,

A payment system for itemized Internet merchandise or itemized downloadable media material objects, comprising:

a retail point of sale establishment;

a customer access point at said retail point of sale establishment;

URL information that is an Internet transaction location of said itemized Internet merchandise or itemized downloadable media material objects;

means for accepting payment through an in person transaction with a customer wherein said payment is designated for purchase of said itemized Internet merchandise or itemized downloadable media material objects;

means for storing and retrieving a record on or in a physical medium corresponding to said URL information that is an Internet transaction location of said itemized Internet merchandise or itemized downloadable media material objects;

means for transfer of said physical medium from said retail point of sale establishment to said customer; and

means for Internet transaction authorization on, in, or actuated from said physical medium wherein ownership rights in said itemized Internet merchandise or itemized downloadable media material objects are preselected and transferred to said customer through said transfer of said physical medium.

'500 patent col. 10 ll. 18–42 (emphasis added).

Primarily at issue in the case is the “means for storing and retrieving a record on or in a physical medium” limitation. *Id.* at ll. 30–31. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112(f),² the district court found that the function of that element is “storing and retrieving a record on or in a physical medium.” *D.C. Op.*, at *6. The district court construed “storing” to mean “both putting into storage and holding in storage,” “retrieving” to mean “taking out of storage for the purpose of presenting authentication to

² Before the America Invents Act 35 U.S.C. § 112(f) was contained in § 112 paragraph 6.

prove purchase,” “record” to mean a “unique URL corresponding to specific web merchandise or content,” and “on or in a physical medium” to mean the location where “the record is stored and from where it may be retrieved.” *Id.*

A means-plus-function claim is indefinite unless structure to perform the function is identified in the specification. *E.g.*, *Cardiac Pacemakers, Inc. v. St. Jude Med., Inc.*, 296 F.3d 1106, 1113–14. The district court here rejected the Driessens’ contention that Figure 5—which depicts an “Admit One” ticket and a floppy disk—provides the necessary structure to correspond with the above function. *D.C. Op.*, at *7. The court explained that while Figure 5 perhaps discloses examples of “physical media,” it does not disclose a structure that “stor[es] and retriev[es] a record on or in a physical medium.” *Id.* (emphasis added). Because the specification failed to disclose any such associated structure for “storing” and “receiving” the record in a physical medium, the district court held that claim 1 and dependent claims 2–4 and 7 are invalid as indefinite.

The Driessens argue that the district court erred in construing “storing” in claim 1 of the ’500 patent to require “both putting into storage and holding in storage,” *D.C. Op.*, at *6, contending that “storing” should be understood to require only holding in storage, not the additional preliminary step of getting there. The word “storing” itself implies both putting into and holding in storage. *See Store*, MERRIAM-WEBSTER DICTIONARY (2015) (“to put . . . in a place where it is available, where it can be kept safely, etc.”). The Driessens point to no language in the claims or specification that would support their contrary construction. The Driessens’ argument by analogy, that “store rooms, filing cabinets, cans, bottles, and similar devices” are properly understood as “storage” devices despite their inability to “put things into themselves,” is inapposite. Claim terms must be construed in

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.