NOTE: This disposition is nonprecedential.

United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

IRONWORKS PATENTS LLC,
Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,
Defendants-Appellees

2020-1191

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of California in No. 4:17-cv-01958-HSG, Judge Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr.

Decided: February 21, 2020

ALISON AUBREY RICHARDS, Global IP Law Group, Chicago, IL, argued for plaintiff-appellant. Also represented by DAVID P. BERTEN, C. GRAHAM GERST, HANNAH L. SADLER.

ALLAN SOOBERT, Paul Hastings LLP, Washington, DC, argued for defendants-appellees. Also represented by STEPHEN BLAKE KINNAIRD; ELIZABETH BRANN, San Diego, CA.

_____

Before LOURIE, DYK, and MOORE, *Circuit Judges.*

MOORE, *Circuit Judge.*

MobileMedia Ideas, LLC sued Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. and Samsung Electronics America, Inc. (collectively, Samsung), alleging infringement of the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,427,078 and U.S. Patent No. 5,915,239.[1] In March 2017, MobileMedia assigned the patents-in-suit to Ironworks, which was then substituted as plaintiff in July 2017. In October 2018, the district court issued a claim construction order, construing claim terms of both the '078 patent and '239 patent. Following the claim construction order, the parties stipulated to noninfringement of the claims of the '078 patent and to noninfringement and invalidity of the claims of the '239 patent. The district court entered judgment based on its claim construction order and the parties' stipulation. Ironworks appeals the

_____

[1]   MobileMedia also asserted infringement of the claims of U.S. Patent No. 5,553,125. Samsung filed counterclaims alleging noninfringement and invalidity of the asserted claims of the '125 patent. The district court dismissed with prejudice the claim of infringement of the asserted claims of the '125 patent. Order Granting Motion to Dismiss Claim Regarding '125 Patent, *Ironworks Patents LLC v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., et al.*, No. 4:17-cv-01958-HSG (N.D. Cal. Nov. 16, 2017), ECF No. 140. It later dismissed without prejudice Samsung's counterclaims of noninfringement and invalidity of the asserted claims of the '125 patent. Order of Final Decision, *Ironworks Patents LLC v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., et al.*, No. 4:17-cv-01958-HSG (N.D. Cal. Nov. 22, 2019), ECF No. 178. The district court also dismissed without prejudice Samsung's counterclaim for invalidity of the asserted claims of the '078 patent. *Id.*

district court's judgment, arguing that the district court's claim constructions were erroneous. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1295(a)(1).

For the reasons discussed below, we *vacate* and *remand* the district court's judgment of noninfringement of the asserted claims of the '078 patent because the district court erred in its construction of the term "camera unit." We also *vacate* and *remand* the judgment of invalidity of the asserted claims of the '239 patent because the district court erred in its construction of the term "means for interpreting the received voice commands." Finally, we *affirm* the judgment of noninfringement of the asserted claims of the '239 patent because the district court did not err in its construction of the term "means for storing the sub-identifiers."

I. THE '078 PATENT

Ironworks asserted infringement of claims 1–3, 6, 18, 36, 38, 42, 46, 73, and 77 of the '078 patent. All three asserted independent claims—claims 1, 36, and 73— require a "camera unit." The district court construed "camera unit" as "camera arrangement comprising a camera, optics, microprocessor and memory, battery, and interface to external systems constituting an individual component of a whole personal communication device or whole portable mobile cellular phone." J.A. 40. Based on the district court's construction of "camera unit," the parties stipulated to noninfringement of the asserted claims of the '078 patent. The district court entered final judgment of noninfringement of those claims. Ironworks appeals from that decision, arguing that the district court erroneously construed the term "camera unit."

We review a district court's claim construction *de novo* except for underlying fact findings related to extrinsic evidence, which we review for clear error. *Teva Pharm. USA, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.*, 135 S. Ct. 831, 835 (2015). "The words of a claim are generally given their ordinary and customary

meaning as understood by a person of ordinary skill in the art when read in the context of the specification and prosecution history." *Thorner v. Sony Comput. Entm't Am. LLC*, 669 F.3d 1362, 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2012). We hold that the district court erred in its construction of "camera unit."

The '078 patent is directed to a device for personal communication, data collection and data processing. '078 patent at 1:10–12. The device is a "small-sized, portable and hand-held work station," such as a notebook computer, that includes a data processing unit, a display, a user interface, at least one memory unit, a power source, and application software. '078 patent at Abstract; *see also id.* at 1:12–17. In some embodiments, the device also includes a camera unit, which may be placed into the housing of the device or fitted on a PCMCIA card, e.g., an insertable camera card. *Id.*

The three independent claims in which the term "camera unit" appears differ in the elements the "camera unit" comprises. Claim 1 recites:

> 1. A portable cellular mobile phone for personal communication, data collection and data processing, which is a small-sized, portable and hand-held work station including a housing and comprising
>
> a data processing unit comprising a microprocessor,
>
> a display,
>
> a user interface,
>
> a number of peripheral device interfaces,
>
> at least one memory unit;
>
> a power source, and
>
> application software,

> wherein the device also comprises:
>
> a *camera unit* for obtaining and outputting image information comprising:
>
> a camera for receiving image information;
>
> optics connected to said camera for passing said image information to the camera;
>
> means for processing and for storing at least a portion of said image information obtained by said camera unit for later recall and processing;
>
> at least one memory unit for storing said image information; and
>
> an output coupled to said data processing unit for outputting image information from said memory unit to the processing unit; and
>
> wherein at least a portion of said camera unit is located within said housing, and said data processing unit processes image information output by said camera unit,
>
> wherein said display presents image information obtained by said camera unit, and
>
> wherein said device further comprises means for transmitting image information processed by said processing unit to another location using a radio frequency channel.

(emphasis added). Claim 36 recites:

> 36. A portable notebook computer having a housing, comprising:
>
> a *camera unit* for recording an image of a selected object, and having at least one memory unit for storing an image recorded by said camera unit;

DOCKET ALARM

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.