

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

Washington, D.C.

In the Matter of

**CERTAIN ELECTRONIC DEVICES,
INCLUDING MOBILE PHONES,
TABLETS, LAPTOPS, COMPONENTS
THEREOF, AND PRODUCTS
CONTAINING THE SAME**

Inv. No. 337-TA-1376

ORDER NO. 25: CONSTRUING TERMS OF THE ASSERTED CLAIMS

(March 13, 2024)

the body of the claim that the device be operative to “issue requests to a license server.” And in claim 1 the content information logically cannot be “pars[ed]” until after the “playback request response” is received, which results from “initiating a media playback request,” so the “parsing” step must occur after the “initiating” step. Similarly, “applying the second key” for decryption can only occur if the second key has been “retrieve[d],” which results from “issuing requests” for such a key, so the “applying” step must occur after the “issuing” step.

For the 313 patent, the analyses of the preambles are the same, except that the preamble of claim 11 gives meaning to the requirement that the device be operative to “receive [data] from a content delivery server.” And in claim 1 the “live media playback request response” logically cannot be “receive[d]” without first “sending a request for live media playback,” so those two steps must be performed in the recited order. Similarly, the “second content encryption key” cannot be “appl[ied]” until that key is first “obtain[ed],” which must happen “prior to reaching” the claimed boundary, so the second “applying” step must occur after the “prior to reaching” step.

For the 273 patent, the preambles of claims 1, 7, and 12 provide antecedent basis for the term “transformer filter arrangement,” and for the 430 patent, the preamble of claim 11 provides antecedent basis for the term “first inductor.” It is not clear, however, that the preambles of these claims are otherwise limiting; for instance, it is not clear that the recitation of “on a semiconductor die” in claim 11 of the 430 patent is properly understood as a limitation, or that claims 1, 7, and 12 of the 273 patent are properly limited to “radio communication” devices. And it is entirely unclear why the preamble of claim 1 of the 430 patent is limiting.

The same is true, in fact, of the claims of the 178 and 313 patents; for instance, nothing in the body of claim 16 of the 178 patent or claim 11 of the 313 patent even references “handling secure distribution” of content, as opposed to some other use for the content. So the parties’ agreement

that the preamble of claim 1 of the 430 patent is limiting is not accepted, the parties' agreement on the other preambles is accepted only to the extent needed to provide antecedent basis or to give meaning to the claims as explained above, and the parties' agreement on the ordering of steps is accepted.

B. Disputed Terms

The parties' Joint Claim Construction Chart summarizes the disputed claim terms. *See* JC. They are discussed individually below.

1. “content encryption key(s)” – 178 Patent & 313 Patent

Complainants (Ericsson)	Respondents (Lenovo)
“a key used to encrypt and/or decrypt content”	“a cryptographic key used to encrypt a media content segment”

JC at 3.

The parties agree that “content encryption key(s)” should be given its plain and ordinary meaning, and that the meaning is the same in both the 178 patent and the 313 patent. They dispute that meaning, however, with Ericsson proposing a broad construction, “a key used to encrypt and/or decrypt content,” and Lenovo proposing a narrow construction, “a cryptographic key used to encrypt a media content segment.”

Two of the disputes over this term are easily resolved. First, the nature of the secure content is broad and is specified (or not) in other claim language. For example, claims 1 and 16 of the 178 patent require initiation of a “media playback request,” but the encryption key is applied simply to “content” or “content information” that has been “pars[ed]” from the response to the media playback request, without limitation to a “media content segment.” 178 patent at cls. 1, 16. Similarly, claims 1 and 11 of the 313 patent require application of the encryption key to “live media content,” but not necessarily a “media content segment.” 313 patent at cls. 1, 11. And while the specification does refer to “segments” and “segment boundaries,” such segmentation is already required by the claim

SO ORDERED.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "C. Elliot", written in black ink.

Cameron Elliot
Administrative Law Judge