1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
2 AUSTIN DIVISION

3 INGENIOSPEC, LLC * April 6, 2026
*
4 VS. * CIVIL ACTION NOS.
*
5 APPLE, INC. * 1:25-CV-867/1:25-CV-877

6 BEFORE THE HONORABLE ALAN D ALBRIGHT
MARKMAN HEARING (via Zoom)
7
APPEARANCES:
8
For the Plaintiff: Mark Siegmund, Esq.
9 Cherry Johnson Siegmund James, PLLC
7901 Fish Pond Road, Ste 2nd Floor
10 Waco, TX 76710

11 Nicole E. Glauser, Esq.
Kramer LLP
12 500 W 2nd Street, Suite 1900
Austin, TX 78701
13
Robert F. Kramer, Esq.
14 Courtney Sanbe Kasuboski, Esq.
Kramer LLP
15 1133 Broadway, Suite 1510
New York, NY 10010
16
Robert Stephen McArthur, Esq.
17 Kramer LLP
303 Twin Dolphin Drive, Suite 600
18 Redwood City, CA 94065

19 For the Defendant: Steven J. Wingard, Esq.
Scott, Douglass & McConnico, L.L.P.
20 303 Colorado Street, Suite 2400
Austin, TX 78701
21
Frank A. Decosta III, Esq.
22 Milan F. Feliciello, Esq.
Malcolm T. Meeks, Esq.
23 Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow,
Garrett & Dunner, LLP
24 901 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20001
25

1 Daniel C. Tucker, Esq.
Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow,
2 Garrett, and Dunner, LLP
1875 Explorer Street, Suite 800
3 Reston, VA 20190-6023

4 Kara A. Specht, Esq.
Finnegan, Henderson,
5 Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP
271 17th Street NW Suite 1400
6 Atlanta, GA 30363-6209

7 Court Reporter: Kristie M. Davis, CRR, RMR
PO Box 20994
8 Waco, Texas 76702-0994
(254) 666-0904
9

10 Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography,

11 transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

01:31 1 (Hearing begins.)

01:31 2 DEPUTY CLERK: The Court calls the

01:31 3 following Civil Actions: AU:25-CV-867 and

01:32 4 AU:25-CV-877, IngenioSpec versus Apple Incorporated for

01:32 5 a Markman hearing.

01:32 6 THE COURT: Announcements from counsel,

01:32 7 please.

01:32 8 MR. SIEGMUND: Good afternoon, Your

01:32 9 Honor. Mark Siegmund on behalf of plaintiff

01:32 10 IngenioSpec. With me this afternoon from the Kramer

01:32 11 LLP firm are Rob Kramer, Nikki Glauser, Rob McArthur

01:32 12 and Courtney Kasuboski. Also with us are client

01:32 13 representatives and the inventors of the patents, Peter

01:32 14 Tong and Doug Thomas. And we're ready to proceed.

01:32 15 THE COURT: And for defendant?

01:32 16 MR. WINGARD: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

01:32 17 Steve Wingard from Scott Douglass & McConnico on behalf

01:32 18 of Apple. With me today are Kara Specht, Daniel

01:32 19 Tucker, and Frank DeCosta, all from the Finnegan firm.

01:32 20 Also with me today is Aaron Huang, and he's from Apple.

01:32 21 And then we have additional representatives from the

01:32 22 Finnegan firm, James Barney, Erika Arner, Malcolm

01:32 23 Meeks, Kelly Horn, Jency Mathew, Milan Feliciello, and

01:33 24 Hani Salameh.

01:33 25 THE COURT: Okay. And thank you to the

01:33 1 clients who have taken the time to attend.
01:33 2 The first claim term we have is from the
01:33 3 '104 patent, provided that the wireless headset is
01:33 4 active, and goes on from there. I'll hear from Apple
01:33 5 to start with.
01:33 6 I'll let Apple know that we've looked at
01:33 7 and considered the issues that they have -- are making
01:33 8 with regard to written description. And I think that's
01:33 9 an issue that will have to be dealt with down the road.
01:33 10 I understand it. But I just wanted Apple's counsel to
01:33 11 understand it. We have looked at that.
01:33 12 So anything Apple wants to say, I'm happy
01:33 13 to hear it, please.
01:33 14 MR. DECOSTA: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
01:33 15 This is Frank DeCosta for Apple. May it please the
16 Court.
01:33 17 Regarding the '104 term, for this term,
01:34 18 both Apple and IngenioSpec have argued that a plain and
01:34 19 ordinary construction of the term should apply. But
01:34 20 the problem for us is that, as confirmed by the record
01:34 21 during briefing, there are many plain and ordinary
01:34 22 meanings for the relevant terms.
01:34 23 THE COURT: Counsel, I don't know if
01:34 24 I've -- I've stopped saying this because I'll say, I
01:34 25 don't know if you've been in my court before, and I'll

01:34 1 find out that someone's tried a case in front of me and
01:34 2 then I'm embarrassed. I don't know that you've been in
01:34 3 front of me before or not. I don't remember if you
01:34 4 have. I've had lots of really good lawyers from
5 Finnegan.
01:34 6 But I will tell you that ordinarily the
01:34 7 way I deal with an argument like yours that I find is
01:34 8 the most productive -- but again, I'm happy to hear
01:34 9 your arguments today -- is the plaintiff -- the
01:34 10 plaintiff really, in my opinion, carries the burden
01:35 11 here or the concern about me not doing more than plain
12 and ordinary meaning.
01:35 13 And what I mean by that is is that the
01:35 14 way I handle my cases where I give plain and ordinary
01:35 15 meaning and I'm advised by counsel, like you're doing,
01:35 16 that there may be an issue down the road is to let you
01:35 17 know -- now the burden is going to be on you for a
01:35 18 moment -- that when you get the plaintiff's expert
01:35 19 report and it says that the Apple accused products meet
01:35 20 the claim term propose that, ellipses, the wireless
01:35 21 headset is active, and goes on from there. If it's
01:35 22 your opinion on behalf of Apple that the position that
01:35 23 plaintiff is taking with regard to what the plain and
01:35 24 ordinary meaning is of that term is impossible, for
01:35 25 lack of a better word, if your opinion is that the

01:35 1 fight would between your expert on noninfringement and
01:36 2 theirs on noninfringement would devolve into a fight
01:36 3 over what the plain and ordinary meaning is, then you
01:36 4 just need to let me know and I can get a Markman
01:36 5 hearing done -- a mini Markman done on this claim term
01:36 6 and you can argue why the plaintiff's expert, why
01:36 7 that -- the construction he's using is inappropriate as
01:36 8 a matter of law.
01:36 9 I don't know that I've had anyone take me
01:36 10 up on this so far. I have had to do this during trial
01:36 11 which is a really bad time to have to do it. But
01:36 12 that's the way, generally speaking, I handle issues
01:36 13 where I think that plain and ordinary meaning is
01:36 14 appropriate but the lawyers are worried about the
01:36 15 impact it would have on trial.
01:36 16 So that is what I do in these cases. I
01:36 17 don't know if you've had a case with me before or not
01:36 18 where I've told you that. But that's what I do.
01:36 19 Knowing that, if there's anything else
01:37 20 you'd like to argue, of course I'm happy to hear it
01:37 21 now.
01:37 22 MR. DECOSTA: Well, Your Honor, I do
01:37 23 appreciate that because that's precisely what we're
01:37 24 trying to head off, if we can. We've not gotten yet
01:37 25 into discovery and we're in a situation now where if we

01:37 1 can get this resolved sooner rather than later, we'll
01:37 2 find ourselves probably with a lot of discovery saved,
01:37 3 a lot of depositions saved for sure, a lot of time and
01:37 4 dollars.
01:37 5 THE COURT: Well, I don't think it was
01:37 6 going to impact the -- I'm sorry. I didn't mean to
01:37 7 interrupt you. Keep going, please. That's a bad habit
01:37 8 of mine. Please finish up and then I'll...
01:37 9 MR. DECOSTA: Well, only that to make the
01:37 10 point as -- as crisp as possible. There are two
01:37 11 disputes that just applying a plain and ordinary
01:37 12 meaning at this time, it won't -- won't resolve, won't
01:37 13 narrow discovery. There are a number of claims and
01:37 14 patents at issue.
01:37 15 So with respect to the plain and ordinary
01:37 16 meaning, there's a what and a when. There's a whether
01:37 17 or not the language should be tied to the
01:37 18 communications environment of the claims and whether
01:37 19 there's a timing requirement. So these are two
01:37 20 specific disputes that we have with IngenioSpec that
01:38 21 should they -- could they be resolved sooner rather
01:38 22 than later, it would help in scoping the case and not
01:38 23 have to get a point, Your Honor, where we're down the
01:38 24 road and expert reports addressing this very same
01:38 25 issue.

01:38 1 So that's the 50,000-foot view where we
01:38 2 are. I appreciate the timing that you explained.
01:38 3 But the argument that we have prepared is
01:38 4 to explain to Your Honor what the two disputes are and
01:38 5 they're very narrow, they're very crisp, and they're
01:38 6 joined with respect to this claim.
01:38 7 THE COURT: I'm happy to hear them.
01:38 8 MR. DECOSTA: Okay. Great.
01:38 9 So again, the two disputes are whether
01:38 10 the plain meaning requires communication between the
01:38 11 wireless headset and the wireless communication system
01:38 12 and whether there's a timing condition imposed in the
01:38 13 limitation. So let's just start with --
01:38 14 THE COURT: I'm sorry. I just -- I was
01:38 15 thinking about the first thing you said and so I
01:38 16 stopped thinking as you said the second one. So if
01:38 17 you'll go ahead and repeat the second -- I'm sorry.
01:38 18 You -- if you could remind me what you said on the
01:38 19 second one. I missed it.
01:38 20 MR. DECOSTA: Absolutely. So there's the
01:38 21 what, and that's the communication concept we'll talk
01:39 22 about, and then the when. So t is there a timing
01:39 23 condition in the phrase being construed? Is there a
01:39 24 timing limitation? And that's where there are two
01:39 25 points of disagreement with IngenioSpec.

01:39 1 So we start to try to resolve those two
01:39 2 questions by looking first at the claims themselves.
01:39 3 So that's Slide 4, please.
01:39 4 And as we look at the claim, as the Court
01:39 5 knows, the claims at issue are directed to a wireless
01:39 6 communication system with a wireless communication
01:39 7 device and a wireless headset. And what's happening is
01:39 8 you have incoming text messages that are converted to
01:39 9 audio messages and replies are converted from text to
01:39 10 audio. So that's framework that we're operating under.
01:39 11 And then when you look at the claims, the
01:39 12 claim language for construction defines the what and
01:39 13 when for the condition and the claims that will trigger
01:39 14 text to audio conversion. So the phrase that we're
01:39 15 construing is a trigger for other action to happen in
01:39 16 the claim.
01:39 17 And that determination is seen here in
01:39 18 Claim 2, and the language we have highlighted says:
01:40 19 Provided that said determining determines that the
01:40 20 wireless headset is active. That's the condition.
01:40 21 So starting with that intrinsic evidence
01:40 22 provided by the claims itself, we have the specific
01:40 23 context for the phrase and how it interacts with the
01:40 24 other claim limitations.
01:40 25 Let's go to the next slide.

01:40 1 We look to the spec for help. And the
01:40 2 term "active," which is the trigger inside of that
01:40 3 condition that we're construing, the term "active" is
01:40 4 used in one spot, in that paragraph we have highlighted
01:40 5 there three times and once in the figure. And this is
01:40 6 an unclaimed embodiment because this talks about audio
01:40 7 to text, and the claims that we're focusing on are text
01:40 8 to audio.
01:40 9 But even though this is for an unclaimed
01:40 10 embodiment, it still provides some context because it
01:40 11 shows the use of active in the call flow and it shows
01:40 12 that active is being used to describe components of a
01:40 13 mobile communication system as opposed to some other
01:41 14 context.
01:41 15 So this is something, right? So this
01:41 16 doesn't resolve the dispute but this is something.
01:41 17 This gets you down the road in trying to understand
01:41 18 what's the context to select from a number of plain and
01:41 19 ordinary meanings that are available.
01:41 20 And then we go to the dictionary
01:41 21 definitions submitted by the parties.
01:41 22 Next slide, please.
01:41 23 Won't read through those, but you'll see
01:41 24 they're many and varied. And the idea is if there's
01:41 25 only an instruction to use the plain and ordinary

01:41 1 meaning, the jury's left with, well, which of these do
01:41 2 I use, if any of them?
01:41 3 So if you look at the examples that are
01:41 4 there, even if you limit them to electronics, you're
01:41 5 still going to have questions -- practical questions
01:41 6 that the jury may be in a position to debate where
01:41 7 you're asking questions like, well, if we're active,
01:41 8 does that mean that the headset in the claims is
01:41 9 powered on? And sitting on a table? Does it mean just
01:41 10 that the headset is charged? Does it mean that the
01:41 11 headset is playing music from some source other than
01:42 12 the claimed wireless device? Does it mean you detect
01:42 13 the headset is moving? The headset is connected to a
01:42 14 cloud? The headset is paired with a mobile device?
01:42 15 So you can understand, Your Honor, that
01:42 16 there are a litany of things that still, even if you
01:42 17 restrict this to an electronics communication space,
01:42 18 there's still many questions that would have to be
01:42 19 resolved if the jury's just left with the instruction
01:42 20 to use plain and ordinary meaning.
01:42 21 So the difference between the
01:42 22 construction that Apple has proposed and the
01:42 23 construction that IngenioSpec is proposing is that
01:42 24 the -- Apple's construction resolves these questions.
01:42 25 And while IngenioSpec doesn't say exactly

01:42 1 what its plain and ordinary meaning construction is, it
01:42 2 argues what it believes it is not. And that draws out
01:42 3 the significant points of contention that should be
01:42 4 resolved sooner rather than later.
01:42 5 And the two major points are as I said
01:42 6 before. So first, there's --
01:42 7 Next slide, Slide 8.
01:42 8 We have the most concise statement by
01:43 9 IngenioSpec of their issues with the construction. And
01:43 10 they're saying that: The inquiry concerns the status
01:43 11 of the headset itself, not the existence of a
01:43 12 connection or link with another device. The claims do
01:43 13 not require, or even mention, a communication link.
01:43 14 (Clarification by Reporter.)
01:43 15 MR. DECOSTA: So this is the what of the
01:43 16 dispute. And IngenioSpec claims that determining that
01:43 17 the wireless headset is active does not require a
01:43 18 communication link between the wireless headset and the
01:43 19 wireless device. And that's just wrong.
01:43 20 So if you look at Claim 1, again,
01:43 21 intrinsic evidence, if you look at Claim 1, the
01:43 22 independent claim from which all the claims that we're
01:43 23 discussing depend, and that's at Column 15, Lines 54,
01:43 24 55, that claim expressly recites: A wireless
01:43 25 communication device capable of wirelessly

01:43 1 communicating with the wireless headset. That's in the
01:43 2 claim.
01:44 3 And as seen in Claim 2, the wireless
01:44 4 communication device must determine whether the
01:44 5 wireless headset is active.
01:44 6 So you have the communication between the
01:44 7 devices in Claim 1, Independent Claim 1, and you have
01:44 8 Dependent Claim 2 that requires determining activity.
01:44 9 So how else would that happen if there's not a
01:44 10 communication link between the two?
01:44 11 And there's a lot of discussion about the
01:44 12 term "link" and whether it appears and doesn't appear.
01:44 13 Your Honor, we're not wed to the term "link." So if
01:44 14 there's some other word that you would like better that
01:44 15 communicates that there's -- the activity being
01:44 16 contemplated in the claims requires communication
01:44 17 between the two devices, that would be sufficient for
01:44 18 resolving this issue. So link is not a magical term,
01:44 19 it's just our best to try to get that notion across.
01:44 20 The second distinction is the when, so
01:44 21 that's the timing requirement.
01:44 22 So let's go to Slide 9.
01:44 23 So IngenioSpec argues that there's no
01:45 24 timing requirement imposed by the construed phrase, but
01:45 25 they do concede that this term defines a prerequisite.

01:45 1 And we're at a loss, Your Honor, as to how something
01:45 2 can be a prerequisite but it can't impose a timing
01:45 3 requirement.
01:45 4 So a prerequisite, it is a timing
01:45 5 limitation. It just means that the wireless headset is
01:45 6 active before the converting step happens. A
01:45 7 prerequisite is an active determination that happens
01:45 8 first and conversion happens afterwards.
01:45 9 We would have thought that the
01:45 10 ordinary -- plain and ordinary meaning of the term
01:45 11 "provided that" would connote clearly that -- that
01:45 12 meaning of something happening first before the other
01:45 13 thing happening but apparently there's a dispute over
01:45 14 that. So we looked for other words to try to make
01:45 15 clear exactly what we're talking about by the provided
01:45 16 that limitation with respect to timing.
01:46 17 And, Your Honor, there's also some
01:46 18 discussion in the briefing about automatic and whether
01:46 19 there's a dispute about something automatically
01:46 20 happening or immediately happening. And I don't think
01:46 21 those disputes are really germane for the Court's
01:46 22 consideration because neither party is trying to
01:46 23 construe automatic.
01:46 24 Automatic is there. The jury can figure
01:46 25 out what that means. And there are other timing

01:46 1 limitations in the claims. So this has nothing to do
01:46 2 with automatic. It really is the "provided that"
01:46 3 phrase and its interaction with the other elements of
01:46 4 the claim.
01:46 5 So Apple's recognized that there are many
01:46 6 possible plain and ordinary meanings and doesn't
01:46 7 believe it would be helpful to place the burden of
01:46 8 selecting from among many candidates with just an
01:46 9 instruction to use the plain and ordinary meaning.
01:46 10 And we want to equip the jury to resolve
01:46 11 the evidence and competing arguments that we know
01:46 12 already at this point, even before discovery is
01:46 13 started, are going to be presented by the parties.
01:46 14 So I'll stop there, Your Honor, and be
01:46 15 prepared to answer any questions that you have.
01:47 16 THE COURT: I don't have any questions
01:47 17 but I'll hear a response.
01:47 18 MS. GLAUSER: Thank you, Your Honor.
01:47 19 Nikki Glauser on behalf of IngenioSpec.
01:47 20 I'll hit share here.
01:47 21 The major problem with Apple's argument
01:47 22 on this point is that the parties are not in dispute
01:47 23 about the plain and ordinary meaning. The issue is
01:47 24 that Apple isn't seeking to construe or provide meaning
01:47 25 to the terms of the claim, but instead seeking to

01:47 1 entirely replace two plain condition terms, "provided
01:47 2 that" and the "headset is active" with "upon" and
01:47 3 "establishing a communication link." And that language
01:47 4 isn't in the claims, isn't in the spec, and there's no
01:47 5 lexicography or other disclaimer that would authorize
01:47 6 that kind of substitution. And we see that here in
01:48 7 their first substitution.
01:48 8 So provided that is, as Mr. DeCosta said,
01:48 9 a prerequisite, meaning something that happens before.
01:48 10 Once it's met, the question is whether it's met.
01:48 11 But Apple, in its construction,
01:48 12 particularly as understood by its briefing, is changing
01:48 13 or substituting that phrase for "upon," which it has
01:48 14 argued doesn't just mean before and after, as it said
01:48 15 "provided that" would mean, but instead means
01:48 16 immediately without any intervening steps.
01:48 17 And so in doing so, they've converted
01:48 18 what is effectively a prerequisite or a condition, an
01:48 19 if, only if, it is in this state, do you then do the
01:48 20 conversion into a timing trigger. Upon this state, you
01:48 21 then do the conversion. And that's the problem. And
01:49 22 it's not one of a difference in plain and ordinary
01:49 23 meaning. It's a difference in the claim scope.
01:49 24 Because the claims themselves talk about whether and
01:49 25 not when.

01:49 1 And this becomes particularly important
01:49 2 when we look at Apple's second replacement, which is to
01:49 3 remove the wireless headset is active and to replace
01:49 4 that with the language establishing a communication
01:49 5 link.
01:49 6 By the claims, the device that you're
01:49 7 looking at to determine its condition is the headset
01:49 8 and the condition that you're looking for is whether
01:49 9 that headset is active. By rewriting the claims to be
01:49 10 establishing a communication link, Apple wants the
01:49 11 claim to instead be looking at the link between the
01:49 12 device and another device or a system. But that
01:49 13 communication link could exist without the headset
01:49 14 itself being active.
01:50 15 And so the problem is when you read in
01:50 16 these two substitutions, you have that a communication
01:50 17 link could exist even without the headset being active.
01:50 18 But nevertheless, under Apple's
01:50 19 construction, upon that communication link existing,
01:50 20 the text is converted to audio signals. And that's not
01:50 21 what the patentee drafted. The patentee did not
01:50 22 establish that conversion happened simply because there
01:50 23 was a communication link. Instead, it required looking
01:50 24 at the status of the device on the other end of that
01:50 25 communication link.

01:50 1 Apple pointed to Figure 5 in the patents
01:50 2 but neither Figure 6 -- neither Figure 5 nor 6, which
01:50 3 it cited in its briefing, actually support the
01:50 4 arguments that it's making here.
01:50 5 Because while you do look to the status
01:50 6 of the headset, there is nothing in either of the
01:50 7 flowchart that is Figure 5 nor the flowchart that is
01:51 8 Figure 6 that suggests that upon determining is the
01:51 9 correct replacement for the claim language. There's no
01:51 10 immediacy indicated here. In fact, there's no timing
01:51 11 indicated here.
01:51 12 The question in Figure 5 at that 502
01:51 13 block is, is headset active? If yes, then you do Y.
01:51 14 It does not say when you do Y, that you do Y
01:51 15 immediately upon determination of yes. And so that --
01:51 16 these figures simply don't support Apple's argument nor
01:51 17 is there anything else in the specification that would
01:51 18 do so.
01:51 19 In fact, in addition to the claim
01:51 20 language itself for the disputed terms, the claim
01:51 21 structure of the '104 claims further reflects that this
01:51 22 "provided that" term is a conditional status check
01:51 23 determining whether conversion happens, not a timing
01:52 24 trigger. And it does that because Claim 5 asks the
01:52 25 question of whether or not the conversion should

01:52 1 happen, and Claim 6 adds the additional requirement
01:52 2 that you check to see that the headset is active.
01:52 3 Now, Mr. DeCosta pointed to Claim 1,
01:52 4 which refers to a wireless communications device that's
01:52 5 capable of wirelessly communicating with a wireless
01:52 6 headset to support Apple's rewrite here. But of course
01:52 7 Claim 1 doesn't support the rewrite. And that's
01:52 8 because Claim 1 is describing and addressing one
01:52 9 structural capability of the system. That is, that the
01:52 10 device is capable of wireless communication.
01:52 11 But the "active" term in Claim 2 and the
01:52 12 other terms that are at issue here, so 6 and 10, those
01:52 13 define a separate requirement, an additional condition
01:53 14 that for the specific operation to happen, for the
01:53 15 conversion to occur, that the headset be active.
01:53 16 So by Claim 1, the system can be capable
01:53 17 of the wireless communication and the headset still not
01:53 18 be active. Those are two different inquiries. And the
01:53 19 patentee, for the Claims 2, 6 and 10, was looking at
01:53 20 whether in fact the device on the other end of the
01:53 21 communication link was active for purposes of receiving
01:53 22 the converted text to audio signals.
01:53 23 Unless Your Honor has other specific
01:53 24 questions on this term, I'm happy to turn it back to
01:53 25 Mr. DeCosta.

01:53 1 THE COURT: I don't have any questions
01:53 2 for you. No.
01:53 3 MS. GLAUSER: Thank you, Your Honor.
01:53 4 MR. DECOSTA: Your Honor, I'm listening
01:53 5 for potential area of agreement, and I'll throw this
01:53 6 out there. Maybe there is an agreement. But it sounds
01:53 7 like there's agreement that the "provided that" phrase
01:53 8 means that something happens first and then other
01:54 9 things happen after that.
01:54 10 So if that's -- if we have agreement on
01:54 11 that point, then maybe that's something that we can
01:54 12 have made express in the Court's construction. If
01:54 13 there's not agreement on that, then I'm probably
01:54 14 misunderstanding IngenioSpec's argument. But it sounds
01:54 15 like they're agreeing that it is a condition that
01:54 16 happens first or a test that happens first, provided
01:54 17 that means first and the other things happen after
01:54 18 that.
01:54 19 So there's agreement there.
01:54 20 THE COURT: Let me ask opposing counsel
01:54 21 if they agree.
01:54 22 MS. GLAUSER: We don't, Your Honor. But
01:54 23 for this reason. It's a small reason.
01:54 24 THE COURT: I assumed you didn't. Okay.
01:54 25 We can go back to Apple's counsel.

01:54 1 MR. DECOSTA: Okay. And then with
01:54 2 respect to the statement that the system can be capable
01:54 3 of wireless communication but still not be active, that
01:54 4 illustrates our point exactly. If that's the case,
01:54 5 then what does "active" mean?
01:55 6 So if active is not connected somehow to
01:55 7 communication, if the device can be -- the wireless
01:55 8 headset can be active but there's no connection, then
01:55 9 what does "active" mean in that sense? It still opens
01:55 10 the array of possibilities that I listed at the
01:55 11 beginning. So, you know, there's no specificity to how
01:55 12 the jury can understand what "active" means in the
01:55 13 context of the claim.
01:55 14 So that's our response. Looked for
01:55 15 compromise. Looks like we don't have it on the
01:55 16 provided that language.
01:55 17 With respect to active, we need a working
01:55 18 definition of what "active" means among the many. It
01:55 19 sounds like, as counsel's argued, we're still going to
01:55 20 be left with that range of things that are complete
01:55 21 possibilities that need to be debated within the
01:55 22 context and application of the claim, that you need to
01:55 23 determine whether or not you have an active wireless
01:55 24 headset before you invoke conversion.
01:55 25 So if active can be some state that has

01:55 1 nothing to do with communication, then clearly the spec
01:56 2 doesn't answer this question. But the jury's going to
01:56 3 be left to debate what the word "active" is going to
01:56 4 mean in that context.
01:56 5 THE COURT: I'll be back in a second.
01:56 6 (Pause in proceedings.)
01:59 7 THE COURT: If we could go back on the
8 record.
01:59 9 The Court is going to maintain its
01:59 10 preliminary construction of plain and ordinary meaning,
01:59 11 and for the record, is going to reject the proposals
02:00 12 that Apple suggested during the hearing.
02:00 13 Next up, I have from the '789 patent
02:00 14 preamble, including input signals.
02:00 15 Give me one second.
02:00 16 I'll hear from the plaintiff first on
02:00 17 this, please.
02:00 18 MR. TUCKER: Thank you, Your Honor. Good
02:00 19 afternoon. Dan Tucker on behalf of -- I'm sorry. You
02:00 20 said plaintiff. I apologize.
02:00 21 THE COURT: I did. It's okay.
02:00 22 (Clarification by Reporter.)
02:00 23 MR. MCARTHUR: Good afternoon, Your
02:01 24 Honor. Rob McArthur for plaintiff IngenioSpec.
02:01 25 THE COURT: Okay.

02:01 1 MR. MCARTHUR: Share my screen here, Your
02:01 2 Honor.
02:01 3 Apologize. I'm having difficulty with my
02:01 4 screen sharing.
02:01 5 THE COURT: I don't know how to do it.
02:01 6 So it's okay.
02:01 7 MR. MCARTHUR: Perhaps one of my
02:01 8 co-counsel could share Slide 12, please.
02:01 9 MS. GLAUSER: I'll do it.
02:01 10 MR. MCARTHUR: Slide 12.
02:02 11 Thank you.
02:02 12 Your Honor, let's just start with the
02:02 13 idea that there's no disavowal and no lexicography with
02:02 14 respect to the term "input signals" here. Absent that,
02:02 15 plain and ordinary meaning should apply.
02:02 16 Now, we have the claim itself we can go
02:02 17 to --
02:02 18 THE COURT: What I'd like to hear from
02:02 19 you on is whether or not the preamble should be
02:02 20 limiting or not.
02:02 21 MR. MCARTHUR: Absolutely, Your Honor.
02:02 22 I'm happy to address that.
02:02 23 The -- we would like the preamble to be
02:02 24 limiting for a number of reasons, but for -- this
02:02 25 preamble in particular sets the table for the claim.

02:02 1 The claim's structural. You have a
02:02 2 wireless receiver, a down-converter configured to down
02:02 3 convert, a modifier and a speaker. That is the
02:03 4 structure of the claim.
02:03 5 If you look at the preamble, you have a
02:03 6 single enhancement apparatus for the user. That
02:03 7 apparatus is being connected to an audio system that's
02:03 8 not claimed in the body of Claim 13 and which is
02:03 9 configured to up-convert those signals to be wirelessly
02:03 10 transmitted.
02:03 11 So the claim itself relates to this
02:03 12 wireless hearing enhancement apparatus that has these
02:03 13 four components to it. And so you have a classic
02:03 14 situation where you have an environment of use for the
02:03 15 intended claimed body of the claim.
02:03 16 That's why we believe the preamble itself
02:03 17 is not limiting in this case.
02:03 18 THE COURT: Okay. You started by saying
02:03 19 it is limiting and now you're saying it's not.
02:03 20 MR. MCARTHUR: I'm sorry.
02:03 21 THE COURT: Which surprised me at first
02:03 22 when you said you wanted it to be limiting. I'd never
02:03 23 heard that from a plaintiff before. I thought I was on
02:03 24 a different planet.
02:03 25 So just to be clear, you -- the plaintiff

02:04 1 does not believe the preamble should be limiting,
02:04 2 correct?
02:04 3 MR. MCARTHUR: That's correct, Your
02:04 4 Honor. I'm sorry if I misspoke there. We believe the
02:04 5 preamble is not limiting. And is directed to an
02:04 6 environment of use only.
02:04 7 THE COURT: Okay. Did you have anything
02:04 8 else to add?
02:04 9 MR. MCARTHUR: No. I think our briefing
02:04 10 sets it forward. But the --
02:04 11 THE COURT: No. I'm just giving you an
02:04 12 opportunity.
02:04 13 MR. MCARTHUR: No. We have nothing
02:04 14 further to add on that point, Your Honor.
02:04 15 THE COURT: Okay. A response from Apple?
02:04 16 MR. TUCKER: Thank you, Your Honor. Dan
02:04 17 Tucker on behalf of Apple.
02:04 18 If we could just skip to Slide 12,
02:04 19 please.
02:04 20 So, Your Honor, the preamble is limiting
02:04 21 for at least the two reasons that we stated in the
02:05 22 briefs.
02:05 23 The first is that it establishes
02:05 24 antecedent basis for four different terms that appear
02:05 25 in the body of the claim: For the hearing apparatus,

02:05 1 for the user of that apparatus, for the audio system
02:05 2 that is wirelessly coupled to that apparatus, and for
02:05 3 the upconverted signals that the system generates in
02:05 4 the apparatus processes.
02:05 5 Those are four terms that span the entire
02:05 6 body of this preamble -- or the entire portion of this
02:05 7 preamble and cannot be divided up in any way.
02:05 8 The Federal Circuit, obviously as Your
02:05 9 Honor knows, has repeatedly held that a preamble is
02:05 10 limiting when it serves as antecedent basis for a term
02:05 11 appearing in the body of the claim. But here, we have
02:05 12 four that span the preamble from beginning to end. So
02:05 13 that's one reason why the preamble is limiting.
02:06 14 The other is that it provides essential
02:06 15 structure necessary to understand the claims. And it
02:06 16 really does this in two ways, as we've shown on Slide
02:06 17 13.
02:06 18 First, as shown in red, it defines the
02:06 19 structural relationship between the apparatus and the
02:06 20 audio system. It requires that those two components
02:06 21 are wirelessly coupled. That structure is invoked
02:06 22 later in the preamble and in the body because the
02:06 23 wireless coupling is needed to transmit and receive
02:06 24 those upconverted input signals between the wirelessly
02:06 25 coupled apparatus and system. So it's not just setting

02:06 1 up the environment, it's actually using that structural
02:06 2 limitation.
02:06 3 The other structure is shown in blue on
02:06 4 Slide 13 of our demonstratives. The preamble explains
02:06 5 where these upconverted signals come from. They start
02:07 6 as the input signals and they're upconverted by the
02:07 7 audio system that receives them. So the audio system
02:07 8 receives the input signals, upconverts them, and
02:07 9 generates the upconverted signals that are later
02:07 10 recited in the body of the claim.
02:07 11 This altogether is more than sufficient
02:07 12 under the law. Providing antecedent basis for four
02:07 13 terms defining the structural relationship between the
02:07 14 apparatus and the system that enables the wireless
02:07 15 transfer and being required to understand where the
02:07 16 signals come from all render this preamble limiting.
02:07 17 THE COURT: Response?
02:07 18 MR. MCARTHUR: Yes, Your Honor.
02:07 19 I think with respect to the antecedent
02:07 20 basis, there's no per se rule that says if there's an
02:07 21 antecedent basis in the preamble for the claim terms
02:07 22 that appear in the body, that necessarily forces the
02:08 23 preamble to be limiting.
02:08 24 I think what you need to do is you need
02:08 25 to look at structure of the preamble and what does the

02:08 1 preamble teach one of skill in the art? And in this
02:08 2 case the preamble sets the table for the remainder of
02:08 3 the structural body of the claim.
02:08 4 If you look at the other claims,
02:08 5 particularly Claim 1 in the patent, you've got an audio
02:08 6 system and a wireless receiver. Claim 13, on the other
02:08 7 hand, is just directed to the enhanced apparatus, in
02:08 8 this case, the wireless receiver and the other
02:08 9 structure that's delineated in the body of the claim.
02:08 10 So you have the distinction there between
02:08 11 a system claim and a claim that's limited to one
02:08 12 apparatus. So that, I believe, when you read all the
02:08 13 intrinsic evidence together, it suggests that the
02:08 14 preamble in Claim 13 is not limiting.
02:08 15 THE COURT: Anything else from Apple?
02:08 16 MR. TUCKER: Just, Your Honor, obviously
02:08 17 to note that claim differentiation between two
02:08 18 independent claims is a pretty weak doctrine.
02:09 19 And second, just because the Claim 13
02:09 20 recites a device, it also recites that device in the
02:09 21 way it is coupled, wirelessly coupled to the system.
02:09 22 And that is a requirement of the device in this claim.
02:09 23 That's what makes it different from Claim 1 but still
02:09 24 have meaning.
02:09 25 THE COURT: And anything Apple wants to

02:09 1 add about the construction of input signal?
02:09 2 MR. TUCKER: Yes, Your Honor. We would
02:09 3 like to talk about input signal --
02:09 4 THE COURT: Please.
02:09 5 MR. TUCKER: -- in some detail, if that's
02:09 6 okay.
02:09 7 THE COURT: No. It's why we're here.
02:09 8 MR. TUCKER: Okay. So if we can go
02:09 9 straight to Slide 14 of our demonstratives.
02:09 10 So in terms of the actual construction of
02:09 11 the phrase "input signal," our construction, as shown
02:09 12 on this slide, is input -- signals input to the audio
02:09 13 system, whereas IngenioSpec is arguing for plain
02:09 14 meaning. And the dispute here is really whether those
02:10 15 input signals need to be input to the audio system.
02:10 16 The audio system that in this claim processes those
02:10 17 input signals.
02:10 18 And so both the plain meaning --
02:10 19 THE COURT: Do you have -- I'm sorry,
02:10 20 counsel. Do you have the ability to put up the entire
02:10 21 claim from which signal inputs comes?
02:10 22 MR. TUCKER: Yes. Of course, Your Honor.
02:10 23 THE COURT: You say of course. I
02:10 24 wouldn't know how to do it.
02:10 25 MR. TUCKER: Slide 12 has the entire --

02:10 1 THE COURT: Okay.
02:10 2 MR. TUCKER: -- Claim 13 on the left-hand
02:10 3 side.
02:10 4 So within that preamble, input signals
02:10 5 appears in the third line of the preamble.
02:10 6 Unfortunately we were trying to prove a different point
02:10 7 on this slide, so it doesn't highlight input signals.
02:10 8 THE COURT: No. I just -- so what it's
02:10 9 saying -- what I'm -- configured to up-convert input
02:11 10 signals into upconverted signals. It seems to me that
02:11 11 this is written -- and this is what I'd like you to
02:11 12 address.
02:11 13 It seems to me that this is written in a
02:11 14 way that indicates that the author who's drafting this
02:11 15 is just assuming that a POSITA would understand this
02:11 16 like if you -- someone said you remove a lug nut and
02:11 17 replace the wheel. I mean, that's probably a terrible
02:11 18 analogy.
02:11 19 All I'm saying is that here, it seems to
02:11 20 me that input signal is used in a way that, it seems to
02:11 21 me, the author just assumes everyone is going to have a
02:11 22 understanding of what that means. What is your
02:11 23 response to that?
02:11 24 MR. TUCKER: I think that that's correct,
02:11 25 Your Honor. And I think that is precisely what our

02:12 1 argument is in the brief, which is that both the way
02:12 2 that this is written and the plain meaning of input
02:12 3 signals means the signals that are input into the
02:12 4 system. For two reasons really.
02:12 5 The first goes to what does input signal
02:12 6 mean and what does input mean to a person of skill in
02:12 7 the art?
02:12 8 And if we look to Slide 15, we started
02:12 9 with, okay, what does the plain meaning of "input"
02:12 10 mean. And we had technical dictionaries. We had
02:12 11 technical definitions from general dictionaries. All
02:12 12 confirming that the plain meaning of input is input --
02:12 13 information put into a system.
02:12 14 THE COURT: Let me -- I understand what
02:12 15 you're saying. Let me bounce over to opposing counsel
02:12 16 for just a second, if I could, and I'll come back to
02:12 17 you.
02:12 18 If I could hear from the plaintiff. It
02:12 19 seems to me here -- I understand plaintiff's argument
02:13 20 which is -- if someone could put the claim language
02:13 21 back up for just a second.
02:13 22 Okay. So.
02:13 23 MR. TUCKER: Slide 12.
02:13 24 THE COURT: There we go. Thanks.
02:13 25 So for the -- this is a question for the

02:13 1 plaintiff. I understand that you are arguing -- or I
02:13 2 think you're arguing -- you can tell me if I'm wrong,
02:13 3 but I think you're arguing is that input signals is --
02:13 4 the way it's drafted here was simply so the reader
02:13 5 would know which signals are the ones that are being
02:13 6 upconverted. I get that argument.
02:13 7 What I don't understand is if I -- if my
02:13 8 understanding of Apple's argument is correct, that
02:14 9 input signals are signals which have to be input, how
02:14 10 could an input signal be anything other than a signal
02:14 11 which is to be input? I'm not -- I don't know what
02:14 12 your resistance to Apple's construction is.
02:14 13 MR. MCARTHUR: Well, I think that the --
02:14 14 you're absolutely correct, Your Honor, that the claim
02:14 15 as drafted instructs exactly what input signals are.
02:14 16 Those signals that are to be upconverted. And if you
02:14 17 have upconverted signals, the origin of those signals
02:14 18 are input signals.
02:14 19 I think Apple's construction does two
02:14 20 things. One, it doesn't advance the ball. Input
02:14 21 signals are signals that are input. Just flips the
02:14 22 adjective and the noun.
02:14 23 But what they do add is this extra piece.
02:14 24 Input to the audio system. This is a new pathway
02:14 25 limitation that the drafter never intended to be part

02:14 1 of the claim.

02:14 2 THE COURT: So let me -- I'm sorry. So

02:15 3 plaintiff isn't opposed -- isn't arguing that an input

02:15 4 signal isn't a signal that needs to be input, it's the

02:15 5 additional language that it cares about, right?

02:15 6 MR. MCARTHUR: That's correct, Your

02:15 7 Honor.

02:15 8 THE COURT: Okay. Let me flip back --

02:15 9 that's what I was getting stuck on.

02:15 10 So let me flip back to Apple's counsel

02:15 11 and hear -- you may have been arguing this and I just

02:15 12 wasn't catching up to you. If you would argue why the

02:15 13 language plaintiffs are objecting to, why that would be

02:15 14 appropriate, that'd be good.

02:15 15 MR. TUCKER: Sure, Your Honor.

02:15 16 I think because what Mr. McArthur just

02:15 17 agreed to kind of begs the question, right? We agree

02:15 18 that the signals have to be input. Input to where?

02:15 19 The only natural understanding is that they are input

02:15 20 into this system that, by definition or by the claim

02:15 21 language themselves, is the one that is upconverting

02:16 22 those input signals.

02:16 23 So it only makes sense that the input

02:16 24 signals be input into the system that is -- that is

02:16 25 converting them. Again, that is clear from the plain

02:16 1 meaning, the dictionary definitions of the term.
02:16 2 One distinction that IngenioSpec makes in
02:16 3 the brief when trying to argue against this plain
02:16 4 meaning is that the input is used to distinguish input
02:16 5 signals from what it says, quote, are signals output by
02:16 6 the system.
02:16 7 And in their demonstratives at Slide 17,
02:16 8 they say that even more clearly: Input is
02:16 9 distinguished from output. Well, we agree. That's the
02:16 10 whole point of this construction is that the input
02:16 11 signals are the signals that are input into the system
02:16 12 as opposed to signals that are output from the system.
02:17 13 It -- if "input" didn't mean signals
02:17 14 input into the system, they could have used any other
02:17 15 descriptor. They could have used red signals or blue
02:17 16 signals or first signals. It wouldn't have mattered.
02:17 17 But that's not the word that the patentee used. The
02:17 18 patentee used the word "input signals."
02:17 19 So on just the plain meaning and the
02:17 20 structure of the claims, that's where we think we
02:17 21 stand. There are other reasons why the specification
02:17 22 supports that construction, but I understand that Your
02:17 23 Honor may have additional questions, so I'll pause
02:17 24 there for a second.
02:17 25 THE COURT: A response to that from

02:17 1 plaintiffs?
02:17 2 MR. MCARTHUR: Yes, Your Honor.
02:17 3 I think this is a perfect example of the
02:17 4 mischief that gets created when you try and construe
02:17 5 terms that don't need construction. I think you're
02:17 6 right initially to see that the --a person of skill in
02:17 7 the art, the jury would understand what an input signal
8 is.
02:18 9 There's no additional requirement to go
02:18 10 back and say, well, that's being input into the system.
02:18 11 Because when you look at the specification, the
02:18 12 specification has embodiments that talk about
02:18 13 filtering. They talk about amplifying.
02:18 14 So now you have signals that are coming
02:18 15 into the system in Apple's construction, things that
02:18 16 are happening to those signals within the audio system,
02:18 17 and then they're being upconverted.
02:18 18 Now, did they cease to become input
02:18 19 signals because they were filtered and amplified,
02:18 20 therefore, those input signals are no longer being the
02:18 21 signals that are being upconverted? So I think that
02:18 22 you create more mischief when you start injecting new
02:18 23 limitations into the claim.
02:18 24 And I'd like to go back to the first
02:18 25 thing that Mr. Tucker said. He said input signals are

02:18 1 here in the claim, it's clear. And then instead of
02:18 2 looking at the intrinsic evidence which teaches that
02:18 3 input signals are those signals that upconverted, he
02:18 4 went straight to extrinsic evidence and started talking
02:18 5 about, well, what does "input" mean in the context of
02:19 6 dictionaries and all this extrinsic evidence.
02:19 7 I think the starting point is always the
02:19 8 claim language and the intrinsic evidence. And here,
02:19 9 it's exactly what it teaches. Input signals are
02:19 10 upconverted. And that's the meaning of the claim. So
02:19 11 if we have to ascribe a meaning to the term "input
02:19 12 signals," it's those that are upconverted. Plain
02:19 13 meaning right in the claim language, teaches everyone.
02:19 14 THE COURT: Anything else from Apple's
02:19 15 counsel?
02:19 16 MR. TUCKER: Yes, Your Honor.
02:19 17 I would like to speak to the
02:19 18 specification because we agree that obviously the
02:19 19 specification is critically important to understanding
02:19 20 the meaning of the term. The point of using the
02:19 21 dictionaries was to show both, like I said with
02:19 22 technical dictionaries, which Phillips said can be
02:19 23 important for technical terms, helps to understand the
02:19 24 plain meaning.
02:19 25 But the crux of our argument in our

02:19 1 briefing is that the specification uniformly supports
02:20 2 interpreting input signals as signals input into the
02:20 3 system because in every embodiment, they explain that
02:20 4 the signals that are upconverted -- and we've been
02:20 5 talking about this in the claim, that the input signals
02:20 6 are upconverted. The signals that are upconverted in
02:20 7 every embodiment are the same as the signals that are
02:20 8 input into the system.
02:20 9 And if we can turn to Slide 16, I'd like
02:20 10 to just walk through the different parts of the
02:20 11 specification that each party cited.
02:20 12 So in our opening claim construction
02:20 13 brief, we cited to these two portions that are on Slide
02:20 14 16 of the specification and explain that in both of
02:20 15 these instances, the audio signals that are being
02:20 16 converted, so those that correspond to the input
02:20 17 signals in the claims, are the ones that are
02:20 18 transmitted to the system from other instruments like
02:21 19 home entertainment systems, phones, or microphones.
02:21 20 And so the only two embodiments that
02:21 21 actually talk about converting or upconverting signals
02:21 22 and use that term consistently describe them as signals
02:21 23 being input into the system.
02:21 24 When we did this, IngenioSpec responded
02:21 25 in its response brief --

02:21 1 If we go to Slide 17.

02:21 2 -- with two different citations. To

02:21 3 Figure 10 and Column 12 and then to Column 5. And we

02:21 4 explained in our reply brief how all of those new

02:21 5 examples supported our construction. Because in all of

02:21 6 them, just like we said in our opening brief, the

02:21 7 signals being described are input into the system. And

02:21 8 so all of these were consistent with our proposed

02:21 9 construction.

02:21 10 In its surreply, IngenioSpec did not

02:21 11 defend those positions. It didn't cite back to them

02:21 12 again. It didn't try to prove us wrong because it

02:21 13 couldn't. Instead, it cited to an entirely new

02:22 14 portion, and that is the portion I believe Mr. McArthur

02:22 15 was talking about today, in Columns 6 and Column 7 that

02:22 16 it said supported its position.

02:22 17 There are two problems with this newly

02:22 18 cited portion in the surreply. The first is it never

02:22 19 describes upconverting signals. Which is again a

02:22 20 requirement of the claims. The signals need to be

02:22 21 upconverted. So it is not relevant to the claim

02:22 22 language. It says it's transmitted to a user but it

02:22 23 never says that those signals are upconverted.

02:22 24 Second, in that embodiment, the

02:22 25 systems -- the signals that are being processed are

02:22 1 also input into the system. And so a portion of those
02:22 2 signals are being filtered out before they're
02:22 3 processed, but a subset of those signals, the ones that
02:22 4 are not filtered out, are both put into the system,
02:22 5 they were received by the system, and then they were
02:22 6 processed.
02:22 7 Again, that processing is not described
02:23 8 as up-conversion from this column of the specification,
02:23 9 but a portion of the signals that were input into the
02:23 10 system are also the ones being processed.
02:23 11 And so that newly cited portion in no way
02:23 12 undermines our construction. In fact, it just confirms
02:23 13 that any relevant embodiment shows that the signals
02:23 14 that were being processed are the signals that are
02:23 15 being input into the system.
02:23 16 THE COURT: A response?
02:23 17 MR. MCARTHUR: Yes, Your Honor.
02:23 18 I think that we're focusing on this idea
02:23 19 that input signals aren't necessarily input into the
02:23 20 audio system, and that's not our position at
02:23 21 IngenioSpec. I think input signals is clear without
02:23 22 the additional language of into the audio system.
02:23 23 What creates the mischief here and what
02:23 24 we're not okay with is the fact that there could be
02:23 25 this exclusion of input signals within the system

02:23 1 before they are upconverted.

02:23 2 If you do something, you modify a signal,

02:23 3 you change it, you filter it, you amplify it, then it

02:24 4 no longer has the character of an input signal and then

02:24 5 the claim is not met if that signal is then upconverted

02:24 6 because it's just -- it's a little vague as to what

02:24 7 Apple's actually asking the entering system. Is it to

02:24 8 stop being an input signal as soon as it enters the

02:24 9 system? You know, we don't know.

02:24 10 And my point of the specification

02:24 11 citation is that it does contemplate other actions in

02:24 12 processing of the signals. You have an analog signal

02:24 13 being put in. There could be an analog to digital

02:24 14 converter of this nature. Does it change the character

02:24 15 as an input signal at that point? We don't know. And

02:24 16 this is the mischief I was referring to when you take

02:24 17 something that doesn't need construction and you start

02:24 18 construing it.

02:24 19 So I think the claims are very clear.

02:24 20 You have an input signal and they're to be upconverted.

02:24 21 If you have upconverted signals, then those are the

02:24 22 input signals that are there. It doesn't need

02:24 23 construction and we don't need to go to the extrinsic

02:24 24 evidence to support that. I think just the reference

02:25 25 to the claim language itself is sufficient.

02:25 1 THE COURT: I'll be back in a second.
02:25 2 (Pause in proceedings.)
02:29 3 THE COURT: The Court is going to find
02:29 4 that the preamble is limiting but is going to reject
02:29 5 Apple's suggestion that the signal has to be input to
02:29 6 the audio system in the language that they proposed.
02:29 7 Next up, we have head-worn personal
02:29 8 electronic apparatus, head-worn wearable electric
02:29 9 device, et cetera. And my understanding is that,
02:29 10 generally speaking, the fight here is over whether or
02:29 11 not this would include or exclude -- whether this is
02:29 12 limited in some way to eyewear which -- and I know I'm
02:30 13 not going to take into consideration the actual
02:30 14 products that are involved, but clearly the fight here,
02:30 15 in my opinion, is over whether or not this claim would
02:30 16 extend to the Apple products that are, for lack of a
02:30 17 better word, audio only, like the ear pods. So I
02:30 18 understand what the fight is over.
02:30 19 I'll start with the defendant and have
02:30 20 you argue as to why -- I don't want Apple to focus on
02:30 21 pushing against plain and ordinary meaning in the sense
02:30 22 that if I accept what Apple is arguing, my construction
02:30 23 probably would be plain and ordinary meaning in
02:30 24 which -- and then I would adopt Apple's construction as
02:31 25 the plain and ordinary meaning. So I get what the

02:31 1 fight's over.

02:31 2 So if, however Apple wants to argue this,

02:31 3 including anything that was in the prosecution history

02:31 4 that indicated that this related to -- either

02:31 5 affirmatively related to eyewear or affirmatively said

02:31 6 it did not relate to non-eyewear or only audio or

02:31 7 however you want to put it. So.

02:31 8 But I understand what the fight is over.

02:31 9 So I'll start with Apple and we'll just go till we get

02:31 10 finished.

02:31 11 MR. TUCKER: Sure. Thank you, Your

02:31 12 Honor. Dan Tucker again on behalf of Apple.

02:31 13 And I think we can just jump right in and

02:31 14 start with Slide 20.

02:31 15 And Apple's position here for really --

02:31 16 and I may just phrase it a little differently than Your

02:31 17 Honor for --

02:31 18 THE COURT: No, no. You're -- I just --

02:31 19 your phraseology is -- I just -- I get what the fight

02:32 20 is over.

02:32 21 MR. TUCKER: Yeah. And just to recap,

02:32 22 you know, we had proposed a construction of electronic

02:32 23 eyewear or headwear based on disclaimer that is really

02:32 24 prevalent in the patent specification itself. And to

02:32 25 us, the fight is whether or not that excludes

02:32 1 standalone in-ear devices. And that's what we think
02:32 2 that IngenioSpec is trying to capture with their plain
02:32 3 meaning.
02:32 4 THE COURT: I think so too.
02:32 5 MR. TUCKER: Yeah. But the key to us is
02:32 6 that not only are there these disclaimed statements
02:32 7 where the inventors, where in the background of their
02:32 8 patent, describing their problem as eyewear related,
02:32 9 then characterizing their invention as related to
02:32 10 eyewear, they went a step further and then they
02:32 11 disparaged standalone in-ear devices like hearing aids.
02:33 12 They said people don't want to wear them.
02:33 13 There's a stigma associated with them.
02:33 14 And the problem to us is that Apple's
02:33 15 plain meaning interpretation, which it says encompasses
02:33 16 devices worn anywhere on the head, including at or in
02:33 17 the ear, would encompass those devices that the
02:33 18 patentees disparaged.
02:33 19 And so --
02:33 20 THE COURT: Let me ask you this also.
02:33 21 I'm not sure why headwear makes it any better for any
02:33 22 of us in terms of the fight that you're identifying
02:33 23 because headwear, it seems to me -- I get eyewear. I
02:33 24 get that. But I don't know that headwear -- if the
02:33 25 effort is to limit the coverage of the patent in a way

02:34 1 that would not include the ear pods, for example, I
02:34 2 don't know that having the word "headwear" would
02:34 3 exclude the ear pods. And it certainly would not be an
02:34 4 appropriate construction to say headwear other than
02:34 5 what are the accused products here.
02:34 6 So again, I get the fight, which is
02:34 7 whether or not -- in my opinion, whether or not there
02:34 8 is something in the patent, in this claim term, it says
02:34 9 head-worn personal -- in fact, that may be the problem.
02:34 10 Head-worn personal electronic apparatus, one of you
02:34 11 wants it to include -- may want to include glasses and
02:34 12 one of you may want to make it more expansive.
02:34 13 So I don't think -- I'm just saying I
02:34 14 don't think headwear gets you very far in what Apple's
02:34 15 trying to accomplish.
02:34 16 MR. TUCKER: Yeah. Understood, Your
02:34 17 Honor.
02:34 18 And what we were trying to do, and maybe
02:35 19 I can walk through the evidence. I mean, we think that
02:35 20 the background and the disclaimer clearly tied, like I
02:35 21 said, the --
02:35 22 THE COURT: No. I get what you're trying
02:35 23 to do. What I'm saying is headwear I think is -- for
02:35 24 example, if you took out the word "or." If you said
02:35 25 the patents disclaim any scope beyond eyewear headwear,

02:35 1 then that would make more sense to me than, for your
02:35 2 purposes, than eyewear or headwear.
02:35 3 Because right now it says head-worn
02:35 4 personal electronic apparatus, which I think all of you
02:35 5 would agree is headwear. The question is what is the
02:35 6 limitation of that head-worn personal electronic
02:35 7 apparatus, right?
02:35 8 MR. TUCKER: I'm sorry. I'm not sure I
02:35 9 follow your question.
02:35 10 THE COURT: Well, I don't think y'all are
02:35 11 fighting over whether or not -- I mean, the patent says
02:35 12 head-worn personal electronic apparatus which means
02:35 13 headwear. But I think y'all -- Apple wants it to be
02:36 14 limited to electronic eyewear. The headwear to be
02:36 15 limited to electronic eyewear. So it seems to me that
02:36 16 what you all would want me to say is electronic eyewear
02:36 17 headwear and leave out the word "or."
02:36 18 MR. TUCKER: So I think under our
02:36 19 interpretation of what headwear is, just to be clear, I
02:36 20 don't think things like an ear bud would be headwear.
02:36 21 THE COURT: Where is your
02:36 22 interpretation -- what I'm saying?
02:36 23 MR. TUCKER: Sure. So our inclusion of
02:36 24 headwear and the reason why we included it in the
02:36 25 construction is really because almost every single

02:36 1 embodiment is eyewear. It's eyeglasses. Except there
02:36 2 are a couple embodiments that describe a nightcap.
02:36 3 And if we go to Slide --
02:37 4 THE COURT: So for you, headwear --
02:37 5 framing it this way doesn't exclude an embodiment?
02:37 6 MR. TUCKER: Right. So to us, we were
02:37 7 trying to stay true to two principles: One,
02:37 8 disclaimer, and two --
02:37 9 THE COURT: I got it.
02:37 10 MR. TUCKER: -- that we move to exclude
02:37 11 embodiments. And we didn't want to exclude this
02:37 12 embodiment of Figure 39 which shows a nightcap. That
02:37 13 while it shows it --
02:37 14 THE COURT: No.
02:37 15 MR. TUCKER: -- over the eyes here, it's
02:37 16 not necessarily so. So that's the origin of it.
02:37 17 THE COURT: Okay.
02:37 18 MR. TUCKER: So if it's okay, I would
02:37 19 like to just kind of walk through some of the evidence
02:37 20 and why we do think there -- this is a case really
02:37 21 about disclaimer.
02:37 22 THE COURT: No. Sure.
02:37 23 MR. TUCKER: If we start on Slide 21.
02:37 24 So as I mentioned a few minutes ago, it's
02:37 25 really like a four-step combination. The first is that

02:38 1 all these patents, the backgrounds of every single one
02:38 2 of them describe the problem that the inventors were
02:38 3 trying to solve, and it was an eyewear specific
02:38 4 problem. They were trying to incorporate electronic
02:38 5 components into eyeglasses.
02:38 6 Slide 21 shows it, an example from the
02:38 7 '693 patent but all of them include similar
02:38 8 disclosures. And then they back that up after
02:38 9 describing that problem --
02:38 10 If we go to Slide 22.
02:38 11 -- by then describing the, quote,
02:38 12 invention as pertaining to eyewear. Specifically to
02:38 13 providing eyewear with electrical components. The '693
02:38 14 patent says the invention pertains to techniques for
02:38 15 providing eyewear. The '355 patent describes the
02:38 16 present invention regarding glasses. The parent
02:38 17 application to the '901 patent, which is incorporated
02:38 18 by reference, explains that the invention pertains to
02:39 19 techniques for providing eyewear with electrical
02:39 20 components.
02:39 21 These weren't just isolated sentences.
02:39 22 They were repeated throughout 13 different priority
02:39 23 applications that are incorporated by reference into
02:39 24 these patents.
02:39 25 And so again, this kind of one-two punch

02:39 1 of describing the problem in the background as putting
02:39 2 electronic components into eyeglasses and then
02:39 3 describing the inventions as incorporating electronic
02:39 4 components into eyeglasses, that puts this case
02:39 5 squarely in line with cases like SciMed and Trustees of
02:39 6 Columbia from the Federal Circuit that found disclaimer
02:39 7 in similar circumstances.
02:39 8 And so instead of confronting this
02:39 9 language, IngenioSpec points to other language in the
02:39 10 specification that is broader than these statements.
02:39 11 They weren't in the parent applications, they weren't
02:39 12 added until these continuation applications were filed,
02:40 13 but they say things like head-worn electronic devices
02:40 14 such as eyewear.
02:40 15 Well, our point here is that those later
02:40 16 added sentence can't -- they can't unring the
02:40 17 disclaimer bell. They can't take away from the
02:40 18 otherwise clear statements about the invention that are
02:40 19 in these patents.
02:40 20 And that's what the Federal Circuit said
02:40 21 in Trustees of Columbia versus Symantec when it said
02:40 22 that the patentee can't rely on its own use of
02:40 23 inconsistent and confusing language to support a broad
02:40 24 construction which is otherwise foreclosed. That's the
02:40 25 case here.

02:40 1 And like I said, the other main point is,
02:40 2 in addition to this kind of background and then
02:40 3 identifying the invention, the real reason why
02:40 4 IngenioSpec's construction can't be right is on Slide
02:40 5 23, is because it would capture disparaged embodiments.
02:40 6 So if we go to Slide 23.
02:40 7 The patents disparage standalone in-ear
02:41 8 devices like hearing aids.
02:41 9 Again, IngenioSpec's interpretation or
02:41 10 its proposed plain meaning would encompass devices worn
02:41 11 including at or in the ear. Anywhere on the head,
02:41 12 including at or in the ear. That would include hearing
02:41 13 aids.
02:41 14 But hearing aids are disparaged. The
02:41 15 patents explain people don't want to wear them. They
02:41 16 don't want to be perceived as being old. This '898
02:41 17 patent that's incorporated says that even if the
02:41 18 government gives them away for free, people don't want
02:41 19 to use them.
02:41 20 And then after disparaging these hearing
02:41 21 aids, the patents contrast those devices with their
02:41 22 invention to it, which is, again, to incorporate
02:41 23 electronics into eyewear or headwear.
02:41 24 I have a few other slides but I think
02:41 25 we've touched on this other main point that they make

02:41 1 which is that all of the other embodiments describe --
02:41 2 they all exclusively describe eyeglasses or eyewear or
02:42 3 headwear.
02:42 4 There's one other point that I would just
02:42 5 like to make because I think IngenioSpec will probably
02:42 6 address this.
02:42 7 If we go to Slide 25.
02:42 8 This is an example embodiment of
02:42 9 eyeglasses that are shown in the patent. They include
02:42 10 an extension of the tube that also goes into the ear.
02:42 11 And IngenioSpec made a point in its brief that this
02:42 12 would be excluded under Apple's construction.
02:42 13 I just want to make clear that it
02:42 14 wouldn't be because this is also eyewear. This is the
02:42 15 side view of a frame of eyeglasses. Apple's
02:42 16 construction doesn't exclude connections to those
02:42 17 eyewear that also go in the ear. It's just excluding
02:42 18 the type of standalone in-ear devices that the patents
02:42 19 disparaged.
02:42 20 THE COURT: All right. Let me get over
02:42 21 to the other side and then I'll come back to you if I
02:43 22 need to.
02:43 23 For plaintiff?
02:43 24 MS. GLAUSER: Thank you, Your Honor.
02:43 25 Nikki Glauser again.

02:43 1 Let me see if I can get my Screen Share
02:43 2 proper here. Courtney, can you confirm, is that in
02:43 3 presentation mode the way it should be?
02:43 4 MS. KASUBOSKI: This is right, yes.
02:43 5 MS. GLAUSER: Thanks so much.
02:43 6 As Your Honor very correctly noted in its
02:43 7 questioning, "head-worn" is a term that's easily
02:43 8 understandable by the jury. It goes to the position of
02:43 9 the device. Is it worn on the head? Apple wants to,
02:43 10 again, rewrite that to be something else. A limited
02:43 11 class of certain forms of eyewear.
02:43 12 And those two forms in Apple's
02:43 13 construction are either eyewear or headwear, but
02:43 14 there's an asterisk there which is only certain
02:43 15 headwear, meaning it needs to be either on the eyes or
02:43 16 on the crown of the head, such as a cap, and if it has
02:44 17 any in or at the ear component, that ear component has
02:44 18 to be attached by a frame or some other structural
02:44 19 piece to the eyewear or the limited set of headwear.
02:44 20 Now, of course there's nothing in the
02:44 21 claims that supports that. It's three different
02:44 22 patents across dozens of claims that all use the word
02:44 23 "head-worn." They don't use eyewear. They don't use
02:44 24 headwear. They don't refer to an earpiece that is
02:44 25 attached exclusively to a frame of eyewear or crown

02:44 1 headwear.

02:44 2 In addition, the specification

02:44 3 specifically describes that it isn't limited to

02:44 4 eyewear. It in multiple instances across the patents

02:44 5 uses "such as eyewear" to describe embodiments here.

02:44 6 And of course that means that it's illustrative or

02:45 7 eyewear is illustrative, but it incorporates beyond

02:45 8 just eyewear.

02:45 9 And the '901 patent makes this explicit

02:45 10 when it says -- when it refers to providing eyewear or

02:45 11 other head-worn personal electronic apparatus. And as

02:45 12 a result, Apple wants to take the other head-worn and

02:45 13 limit it to particular types of devices that might be

02:45 14 worn on the head.

02:45 15 Now, of course the plain and ordinary

02:45 16 meaning of head-worn would include anywhere on the

02:45 17 head. The top of the head, the eyes, in or at the ear.

02:45 18 And there's nothing that supports Apple's construction

02:45 19 that instead limits it to this particular positions.

02:45 20 And in fact, if we go to Apple's briefing

02:45 21 here in their reply, they acknowledge that the issue

02:45 22 here is not whether or not the claimed device or

02:46 23 apparatus can operate at or in the ear. Instead, they

02:46 24 want to read in that somehow that at or in the ear

02:46 25 apparatus only satisfies the claims if it's attached to

02:46 1 eyewear or headwear. But there's nothing in the claims
02:46 2 that suggest that.
02:46 3 With regard to Apple's description that
02:46 4 the background addresses a problem in terms of eyewear
02:46 5 and labels or describes the invention by that example,
02:46 6 nothing about that is equal to a surrender of all other
02:46 7 head-worn devices other than eyewear and this subset of
02:46 8 headwear.
02:46 9 And in fact, the Federal Circuit's cases
02:46 10 with Apple versus WiLAN and a number of others
02:46 11 precludes that. The background description is not the
02:46 12 definition of the claims absent some manifest
02:46 13 restriction or exclusion, none of which exists here.
02:47 14 Nor did Mr. Tucker point to any. He
02:47 15 pointed to illustrative examples of what exists in the
02:47 16 specification, none of which constitute any manifest
02:47 17 disclaimer or attempt to restrict or exclude what would
02:47 18 otherwise be the normal meaning of head-worn. Worn on
02:47 19 the head.
02:47 20 Mr. Tucker also suggested that the
02:47 21 paragraph in the -- or the portion of the specification
02:47 22 that disparaged hearing aids somehow constituted a
02:47 23 disclaimer but it doesn't. That portion of the
02:47 24 specification criticizes the stigma that exists with
02:47 25 regard to traditional hearing aids. But nothing about

02:47 1 it disclaims the idea that head-worn includes devices
02:47 2 worn in the ear.
02:47 3 And in fact, the Continental Circuits
02:47 4 versus Intel case, it's a Fed Circuit case that
02:48 5 specifically forecloses a disparagement as equaling
02:48 6 disclaimer.
02:48 7 So here, what you have is a specification
02:48 8 that broadly speaks to eyewear as a mere example of
02:48 9 head-worn. It broadly refers to head-worn as a
02:48 10 positional description of where the device is, not what
02:48 11 the device is. And as a result, the term should be
02:48 12 given its plain and ordinary meaning of worn on the
02:48 13 head.
02:48 14 Unless Your Honor has specific questions,
02:48 15 that's all I have for now.
02:48 16 THE COURT: Are there any figures in the
02:48 17 specification that indicate something that is headwear
02:48 18 and not eyewear?
02:48 19 MS. GLAUSER: There are figures in the
02:48 20 specification that Mr. Tucker directed you to that are,
02:49 21 for example, the cap. There are not figures in the
02:49 22 specification that illustrate a standalone in-the-ear
02:49 23 device. But of course, what the patentee decided to
02:49 24 illustrate is not coextensive.
02:49 25 THE COURT: No. I got it.

02:49 1 But other -- he pointed out that -- the
02:49 2 hat and explained why he thought that that did not --
02:49 3 did not count for supporting ear wear. Do you have
02:49 4 anything -- is there anything else -- are there any
02:49 5 other -- is there anything else you can point to in the
02:49 6 spec that supports you?
02:49 7 MS. GLAUSER: I don't have a figure in
02:49 8 the spec that would suggest that the -- that
02:49 9 illustrates that -- it does suggest. I don't have a
02:49 10 figure in spec that illustrates a standalone in-the-ear
02:49 11 piece.
02:49 12 THE COURT: No, no. I get that.
02:50 13 Something that's not eyeglasses.
02:50 14 MS. GLAUSER: I think the only other
02:50 15 illustration in there, Your Honor, is the night cap. I
02:50 16 think it's Figure 8.
02:50 17 THE COURT: Okay. Anything else you
02:50 18 wanted to argue?
02:50 19 MS. GLAUSER: No. Of course, other than
02:50 20 the fact that the illustrations are not the definition
02:50 21 of the claim scope. But nothing else for now, Your
02:50 22 Honor.
02:50 23 THE COURT: Okay. And any short response
02:50 24 from Apple?
02:50 25 MR. TUCKER: Yes, Your Honor. Just

02:50 1 hopefully one minute or less.
02:50 2 I just wanted to level set and say, you
02:50 3 know, Apple is not -- is not trying to rewrite the
02:50 4 claim.
02:50 5 THE COURT: No.
02:50 6 MR. TUCKER: We are trying to hold the
02:50 7 patentee to his words. The patentee set forth the
02:50 8 problem in the background. It defined the invention
02:50 9 after that, and then it disparaged in-ear devices.
02:50 10 And to couple that, it did not disclose
02:50 11 any embodiment in figures or text of an in-ear -- a
02:50 12 standalone in-ear device. And that's why we think the
02:51 13 claim should be so limited.
02:51 14 THE COURT: I'll be back in a few
02:51 15 seconds.
02:51 16 (Pause in proceedings.)
02:53 17 THE COURT: The Court is going to go with
02:53 18 Apple's construction on this. Electronic eyewear or
02:53 19 headwear.
02:53 20 Next up, we have -- sorry. I have too
02:53 21 many devices here to run through.
02:53 22 And actually I have a/the speakers,
02:53 23 ellipses, proximate to an ear or the user.
02:53 24 MR. DECOSTA: Yes, Your Honor. Frank
02:53 25 DeCosta for Apple again.

02:53 1 THE COURT: I'm not sure -- I've said
02:54 2 this before. You're going to feel like just -- you
02:54 3 came here just for me to beat you up. But -- and I
02:54 4 promise that's not true.
02:54 5 But I find, generally speaking, when I
02:54 6 have a hard time accepting when someone takes proximate
02:54 7 to an ear and tells me they want near an ear. Because
02:54 8 I always feel like if the lawyer writing this had said
02:54 9 a/the speakers near the ear, then you would have come
02:54 10 in here and said, we want proximate.
02:54 11 I don't get the issue here. I don't get
02:54 12 what's the difference between proximate and near.
02:54 13 MR. DECOSTA: I appreciate that. So
02:54 14 would you have heartburn, Your Honor, if I came in
02:54 15 saying that "proximate to" means in the ear? And
02:54 16 that's the debate.
02:54 17 So the construction that IngenioSpec is
02:55 18 proposing is that proximate to includes in the ear.
02:55 19 And --
02:55 20 THE COURT: Well, no, no. What they're
02:55 21 saying is plain and ordinary meaning.
02:55 22 MR. DECOSTA: That's correct. But if you
02:55 23 read their briefing and you read their disparagement or
02:55 24 their problems against our construction, they're saying
02:55 25 that proximate to should include embodiments that are

02:55 1 in the ear or at least partially inserted into the ear.
02:55 2 So that's the debate. We've got a sort
02:55 3 of a triangle where we think proximate to should be
02:55 4 clear --
02:55 5 THE COURT: Well, let me say that
02:55 6 given -- I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt. I
02:55 7 apologize. I was reading and I interrupted you.
02:55 8 But let me ask you this. It seems to me,
02:55 9 given what I just did with regard to the last
02:55 10 construction, I don't know how you would get in the ear
02:55 11 out of proximate.
02:55 12 MR. DECOSTA: Well, Your Honor, thank
02:55 13 you.
02:55 14 THE COURT: I mean, I'm -- again, I can't
02:55 15 rule at this point about, you know, practical
02:56 16 commercial embodiments of what it is. But it's clear
02:56 17 to me that the patent was designed to go after
02:56 18 something that one wore like head glasses, leaving the
02:56 19 hat example aside. And it would -- it'd be very
02:56 20 difficult to persuade at least me that this included
02:56 21 devices of Apple's that went inside the ear.
02:56 22 MR. DECOSTA: And that's our argument,
02:56 23 Your Honor.
02:56 24 And just to make it clear why we would
02:56 25 like a construction that makes what you just said

02:56 1 explicit now is because, you know, there's six patents.
02:56 2 This impacts three of the patents. There are 300 plus
02:56 3 claims. This impacts half of those claims and the vast
02:56 4 majority of products. So if we can have --
02:56 5 THE COURT: Well, you --
02:56 6 (Simultaneous conversation.)
02:56 7 MR. DECOSTA: -- that'll get us pretty
02:56 8 far along.
02:56 9 THE COURT: You have me saying on the
02:56 10 record, I think I'm pretty clear.
02:56 11 Anything from plaintiff?
02:56 12 MS. KASUBOSKI: Yes, Your Honor. Just a
02:57 13 moment, if I could share my screen.
02:57 14 Mr. DeCosta, I think I need you to stop
02:57 15 sharing your screen.
02:57 16 Thanks.
02:57 17 Okay. So, Your Honor, I think you're
02:57 18 correct that the main dispute here is whether or not
02:57 19 proximate to includes something that's in the ear of
02:57 20 the user. And Apple's attempting to add that negative
02:57 21 limitation there, defining "proximate" to exclude
02:57 22 speaker that are located within the ear.
02:57 23 There's two main arguments here as to why
02:57 24 we think that doesn't quite work with the patents. The
02:57 25 first is if you look at the claims.

02:57 1 So we have two dependent claims here that
02:58 2 further define speakers that are wearable proximate to
02:58 3 the ear of the user as being at least partially
02:58 4 inserted into an ear of the user. And we know that an
02:58 5 independent claim has to -- a dependent claim has to
02:58 6 fall under the scope of the independent claim.
02:58 7 So here we have on the left Claim 75,
02:58 8 which is from the '693 patent. It's an independent
02:58 9 claim that describes speakers that are configured to be
02:58 10 wearable proximate to an ear of the user. And
02:58 11 depending from that claim, giving an example of
02:58 12 speakers that are wearable proximate to the ear of a
02:58 13 user, we have speakers that are configured to be at
02:58 14 least partially inserted into an ear of the user.
02:58 15 We see the same thing here for the '355
02:58 16 patent, Claim 17, where the independent claim describes
02:58 17 a speaker being configured to be wearable proximate to
02:58 18 an ear of the user, and the dependent claim gives an
02:58 19 example of that, where the speaker's configured to be
02:58 20 at least partially inserted into the ear of the user.
02:58 21 And if we try putting in Apple's
02:59 22 construction, we say near but not touching, near but
02:59 23 not within, you can see here on Slide 32 that the
02:59 24 dependent claims actually are rendered nonsensical.
02:59 25 You can't have something that's partially inserted into

02:59 1 the ear but not touching the ear of the user.
02:59 2 And then our second reason why we think
02:59 3 that actually proximate does include things that are
02:59 4 partially inserted within an ear is because of the
02:59 5 specification.
02:59 6 So the specification actually
02:59 7 describes -- at the top, you can see a quote which
02:59 8 talks about the speaker pointing toward and inserted
02:59 9 into the corresponding ear of the user. That quote's
02:59 10 in all three patents that use the term "proximate to."
02:59 11 And below, you see a quote that's
02:59 12 described in Figure 9D on the right here which
02:59 13 describes an ear bud 974, that's that circle piece you
02:59 14 can see, and the ear bud can be placed in or near the
02:59 15 user's ear canal. So proximate to could be in or near.
03:00 16 And that ear bud 974 contains a speaker.
03:00 17 THE COURT: Anything else from Apple?
03:00 18 MR. DECOSTA: Your Honor, I learned a
03:00 19 long time ago when the Court sides with you to stop
03:00 20 arguing. But if you heard anything from counsel that
03:00 21 you'd like me to address, I will. Otherwise we have
03:00 22 nothing further.
03:00 23 THE COURT: I have not.
03:00 24 Anything else from plaintiff?
03:00 25 MS. KASUBOSKI: Nothing further, Your

03:00 1 Honor.
03:00 2 THE COURT: Then the Court is going to go
03:00 3 with its plain and ordinary meaning.
03:00 4 Next up, I have -- and I think this is
03:00 5 the last one. I'm just going to make sure I have this.
03:00 6 Yeah.
03:00 7 The last claim term I have is the
03:01 8 preamble from the '599 patent, which has to at least
03:01 9 help, and goes on from there. I'll hear first from
03:01 10 Apple on this.
03:01 11 And I have another -- we bumped back
03:01 12 another hearing from 3:00 to 3:30 but I really do have
03:01 13 to get to that one by 3:30, so just if everyone can
03:01 14 keep that in mind. Thanks.
03:01 15 MS. SPECHT: Yes, Your Honor. Kara
03:01 16 Specht from Finnegan on behalf of Apple, and I will
03:01 17 quickly share my slides and get straight to the point.
03:01 18 Okay. Okay. And I'm going to jump ahead
03:01 19 a few and begin on Slide 43, Your Honor.
03:01 20 So just a bit of brief background here.
03:01 21 We're talking about two issues for all independent
03:01 22 claims of the '599 patent. The threshold issue is
03:02 23 whether the preambles are limiting in their entirety.
03:02 24 And IngenioSpec has agreed that the preambles are at
03:02 25 least partially limiting.

03:02 1 Now, I want to start with Claim 1 here on
03:02 2 Slide 40 -- I'm sorry. I want to start with Slide 42.
03:02 3 I jumped a little too far ahead.
03:02 4 Okay. So starting on Slide 42, I want to
03:02 5 begin by noting that IngenioSpec focuses in its
03:02 6 briefing on Claim 1. And argues extensively that
03:02 7 Claim 1 is not supplying antecedent basis for the user
03:02 8 as it appears in the portions of the spec that we
03:02 9 dispute are limiting.
03:02 10 But Claim -- this did not go backwards.
03:02 11 But Claims 20, 22, and 24 have the exact opposite
03:02 12 issue.
03:02 13 So we know from the Federal Circuit, and
03:02 14 I believe that Mr. Tucker addressed this earlier for a
03:03 15 different term, to determine if a preamble is limiting,
03:03 16 the Federal Circuit has indicated that a strong
03:03 17 indication that a preamble is limiting is when terms
03:03 18 within the preamble provide antecedent basis for terms
03:03 19 that appear later in the claim body. This comes out of
03:03 20 the Bio-Rad case.
03:03 21 So I want to look at the specific claims
03:03 22 and I put Claim 20 on the board. Claims 22 and 24 have
03:03 23 the identical preamble. But the red portion is what is
03:03 24 disputed in this case, Your Honor. The blue portion is
03:03 25 what IngenioSpec has already acknowledged is limiting

03:03 1 and was recognized as such in Your Honor's tentative
03:03 2 constructions as well.
03:03 3 Now, unlike Claim 1 that IngenioSpec
03:03 4 focuses on, in Claims 20, 22, and 24, the red portion
03:03 5 is supplying antecedent basis for the term "the user."
03:03 6 You can see on the screen in the preamble, a user
03:03 7 appears in the red disputed portion. It appears later
03:03 8 in the blue portion that IngenioSpec has admitted is
03:04 9 limiting. And then it appears later on down in the
03:04 10 claim, and it's quite a long claim so I've excerpted it
03:04 11 down. It's Limitation G, where again, the user appears
03:04 12 in two different places, deriving its antecedent basis
03:04 13 from the disputed portion of the preamble.
03:04 14 These are strong indications that at
03:04 15 least the red portion of the preamble but likely the
03:04 16 preamble in its entirety should be limiting.
03:04 17 Now, I want to jump ahead a slide here to
03:04 18 Slide 43 and address Claim 1 as well. And this is
03:04 19 where IngenioSpec spends most of its time in the
03:04 20 briefing.
03:04 21 But the Federal Circuit has instructed
03:04 22 that antecedent basis is not the only indicator of when
03:04 23 a preamble is limiting. Instead, the
03:04 24 interconnectedness of the limitations within the
03:04 25 preamble, especially here, where part of it is already

03:04 1 admittedly limiting, is also an indication of when the
03:04 2 preamble is limiting.
03:04 3 So I want to focus here for Claim 1, not
03:04 4 just on antecedent basis, although, as we address in
03:04 5 our briefing, the red underlined audio outputs is
03:05 6 supplying antecedent basis for Claim 3. But the fact
03:05 7 that here, the blue portion is supplying antecedent
03:05 8 basis to the red portion.
03:05 9 So I've put the user within the red
03:05 10 portion actually in blue. This is an indication that
03:05 11 these two phrases, the blue and the red disputed
03:05 12 portion, are interconnected.
03:05 13 And it's not just that these are
03:05 14 interconnected just functionally within the claim but
03:05 15 they also provide structural components.
03:05 16 So IngenioSpec spends quite a bit of time
03:05 17 talking about how the red disputed portion to at least
03:05 18 help the user hear audio outputs produced by the device
03:05 19 is nothing more than an intended use. It's not
03:05 20 providing any structure.
03:05 21 But the phrase "outputs produced by the
03:05 22 device" surely is a structural component. It's
03:05 23 indicating that the device, the claimed wireless
03:06 24 wearable device is generating and producing audio
03:06 25 outputs.

03:06 1 That appears for the first time in the
03:06 2 disputed portion. It's supplying a structural
03:06 3 component. It's central to the -- it's central to the
03:06 4 claim itself and that appears in all four of the claims
03:06 5 at issue here.
03:06 6 Also want to note -- and I skipped my
03:06 7 slide with the case law, Your Honor, to be brief, but
03:06 8 we address in our briefing quite extensively the
03:06 9 Xencore case.
03:06 10 The Xencore case handles a phrase -- it's
03:06 11 parallel to this one, so I want to make sure that I say
03:06 12 it correctly. "Treating a patient" was the disputed
03:06 13 portion in the Xencore case. And the Federal Circuit
03:06 14 focused in quite closely on the article that connected
03:06 15 treating a patient with the second portion of the
03:06 16 preamble that was admittedly limiting, just like here.
03:07 17 The word in that case was "by." So the
03:07 18 full phrase was "treating a patient by administering a
03:07 19 particular antibody." Here, we have a similar article.
03:07 20 It's "to" this time, where the blue portion is
03:07 21 connected to the disputed red portion by the word "to."
03:07 22 So again, this is not just the necessary
03:07 23 structure of the claim, although it is audio outputs
03:07 24 produced by the device. But these are interconnected
03:07 25 and we have antecedent basis coming both out of the

03:07 1 blue portion that's acknowledged to be limiting and the
03:07 2 red portion that is disputed here.
03:07 3 And I want to make one particular note,
03:07 4 harkening back to one of the earlier limitations from a
03:07 5 different patent that was argued, and I believe
03:07 6 Mr. McArthur referenced the fact that it was for the
03:07 7 input signals term. But if the user -- if the patentee
03:07 8 wanted to claim something more than input signals, they
03:07 9 certainly could have used additional language.
03:07 10 Well, here the patentee did use
03:07 11 additional language. If the red portion was truly
03:08 12 functional and not intended to be limiting, the
03:08 13 patentee was well within their rights and abilities and
03:08 14 know-how to leave it out. Just as Mr. McArthur pointed
03:08 15 out earlier, here, the patentee did speak exactly how
03:08 16 they wanted their claim to be phrased. We need to
03:08 17 provide meaning to that and the user here is a
03:08 18 particular component that the patentee chose to
03:08 19 include.
03:08 20 So I'm going to pause there, Your Honor,
03:08 21 because the next portion of my argument is on the
03:08 22 indefiniteness of the term, but I want to pause for any
03:08 23 questions.
03:08 24 THE COURT: I'm good. You can deal with
03:08 25 the indefiniteness as well.

03:08 1 MS. SPECHT: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
03:08 2 So I'm going to jump -- my slides are
03:08 3 very touchy today -- to Slide 46 in the demonstratives.
03:08 4 And I am going to start with the
03:08 5 extrinsic evidence but I know that the intrinsic is
03:08 6 most important here. It's just the first way to start
03:08 7 here that gives us the clearest picture of where the
03:08 8 dispute lies.
03:09 9 And here, both parties refer to the same
03:09 10 Webster dictionary in the briefing. And IngenioSpec
03:09 11 focuses almost entirely on the first definition for
03:09 12 "help": Assist or support. And they claim this is not
03:09 13 a term of degree, criticizing Apple for instead
03:09 14 pointing out the make more pleasant or bearable
03:09 15 definition. But both definitions for "help," the first
03:09 16 one on the slide and the second one on the slide, are
03:09 17 both terms of degree.
03:09 18 The question is what assistance or
03:09 19 support is necessary to make audio outputs produced by
03:09 20 the device more pleasant or bearable? Or if we want to
03:09 21 throw away the more pleasant or bearable definition
03:09 22 entirely, what assistance or support is necessary to
03:09 23 allow a user to adequately hear audio outputs produced
03:09 24 by the device? And this is not an objective metric,
03:09 25 which is what we're looking for for the claim to be

03:09 1 definite.

03:09 2 So I want to turn now to the intrinsic

03:10 3 record and the specification of the '599 patent, which

03:10 4 does not use the phrase "to help a user hear audio

03:10 5 outputs" at all. That phrase doesn't appear.

03:10 6 So we've combed through the rest of the

03:10 7 record and there is one place in the family where the

03:10 8 phrase appears. It's in a related application that was

03:10 9 incorporated into the '599 specification. That

03:10 10 application confirms the indefiniteness nature of the

03:10 11 term.

03:10 12 And in this application, the patentee

03:10 13 stated that a user's ability to hear and the need for

03:10 14 help hearing audio is generally dependent on age,

03:10 15 subjective criteria, and it acknowledges the person

03:10 16 with mildly impaired hearing does not need the same

03:10 17 degree of hearing assistance or help as one with

03:10 18 severely impaired hearing.

03:10 19 This creates what I call the sliding

03:10 20 scale of degrees of enhancement or degrees of help that

03:10 21 a user would need. And the goal here of course is to

03:10 22 achieve the optimal hearing experience for the user

03:11 23 without overcompensating to the point of harming the

03:11 24 user's ability to hear. This, again, is not an

03:11 25 objective measure. There's not an objective measure in

03:11 1 the specification.

03:11 2 Turning to the last slide and this is --

03:11 3 second to last slide.

03:11 4 In its briefing, IngenioSpec provides

03:11 5 examples -- two categories of examples for why they

03:11 6 think the specification provides a metric to measure

03:11 7 the meaning of the term "help." The first is sound

03:11 8 delivery mechanisms. The second is noise cancellation.

03:11 9 They allege both provide some sort of metric by which

03:11 10 to measure the meaning of the term.

03:11 11 So starting with the sound delivery

03:11 12 examples, these are completely divorced from the claim

03:11 13 language. And through the whole presentation on the

03:11 14 preambles and why they are limiting, the term "user" is

03:11 15 an important limitation in this claim.

03:11 16 The patentee chose to claim helping a

03:11 17 user here. The term "user" appears elsewhere in the

03:12 18 bodies of the claims.

03:12 19 IngenioSpec focuses in its briefing on

03:12 20 how the user is not a claimed structure. And as true

03:12 21 as that may be, of course the user's not a separate

03:12 22 standalone limitation, but the claim is centered on

03:12 23 helping a user. On providing audio outputs to a user.

03:12 24 And so we can't just ignore the user's existence within

03:12 25 the claim. And that's exactly what IngenioSpec's

03:12 1 examples of sound delivery do, ignore the importance to
03:12 2 a user.
03:12 3 Turning to the second example, noise
03:12 4 cancellation certainly could be an example that helps
03:12 5 users hear audio signals, particularly if they're in a
03:12 6 noisy environment. But this single example doesn't
03:12 7 offer us any guidance on how much help or assistance is
03:12 8 needed to meet the claims.
03:12 9 And this is akin to another case that we
03:12 10 cite in our briefing, the Interval Licensing case. And
03:12 11 the Court in that case found the claim language in an
03:12 12 unobtrusive manner that does not distract the user. It
03:12 13 was about displaying icons on a screen, notifications
03:12 14 to a user, graphical user interface, displaying those
03:13 15 in an unobtrusive manner.
03:13 16 Now, the Court found that to be
03:13 17 indefinite, even though, as you can imagine, there are
03:13 18 examples that universally would be unobtrusive,
03:13 19 something minimized in the task bar, a flashing alert,
03:13 20 something like that surely is unobtrusive. Just as
03:13 21 here, noise cancellation may be one example, that can't
03:13 22 save these claims from the indefinite nature.
03:13 23 Moreover -- and I'm going to go to my
03:13 24 last slide now -- noise cancellation is almost
03:13 25 identical to the concept that was rejected as

03:13 1 indefinite by the examiner in the '599's parent
03:13 2 application. The examiner of the '599's parent
03:13 3 application rejected a similar, arguably more concrete
03:13 4 term than what we're dealing with here. There, the
03:13 5 term was "to help cancel at least some noise." Like
03:13 6 IngenioSpec's example from its briefing.
03:13 7 Now, that term in the parent does not
03:13 8 depend on the user's specific ability and, yet, the
03:14 9 examiner still rejected it as providing -- as not
03:14 10 providing a standard for ascertaining the requisite
03:14 11 degree. That was the language the examiner used in the
03:14 12 rejection.
03:14 13 Here, help a user here suffers from that
03:14 14 same fatal flaw but even more so because now we're
03:14 15 injecting the user's ability and how much help -- how
03:14 16 much assistance that user needs into the claim
03:14 17 limitations.
03:14 18 So to conclude briefly, Your Honor,
03:14 19 Apple's position is that the preamble is limiting in
03:14 20 its entirety and help a user here is a subjective term
03:14 21 of degree without an objective measure and, therefore,
03:14 22 is indefinite.
03:14 23 THE COURT: Response?
03:14 24 MR. MCARTHUR: Yes, Your Honor.
03:14 25 Apple starts out their briefing by saying

03:14 1 the preamble cannot be neatly packaged into two
03:14 2 separate portions.
03:14 3 Now, if we could share our slide here at
03:14 4 Slide 36, please.
03:15 5 (Off-the-record discussion.)
03:15 6 MR. MCARTHUR: So here's the claim
03:15 7 language, Your Honor. And I submit this is a preamble
03:15 8 that couldn't be more neatly packaged to be parsed into
03:15 9 two separate portions. You've got commas separating
03:15 10 the two.
03:16 11 In each of the independent claims,
03:16 12 there's an intended use. And what's that intended use?
03:16 13 The claim tells us: To at least help the user hear
03:16 14 some audio outputs produced by the device. This falls
03:16 15 squarely within the TomTom case and its grant of
03:16 16 parsing preambles.
03:16 17 Now, Apple would like to focus you away
03:16 18 from TomTom and into Bio-Rad and Xencore. But if you
03:16 19 look at the preambles in those cases, they are single
03:16 20 part preambles. Counsel made a point about how the
03:16 21 Federal Circuit focused on the interconnection of the
03:16 22 terms within the preamble. They were single part
03:16 23 preambles. All those terms were interconnected.
03:16 24 If you look at TomTom, we are actually
03:16 25 even better situated for a parsing of a preamble. And

03:16 1 even beyond that, if you actually look at what the
03:16 2 preamble here, the words that are highlighted on the
03:16 3 screen, to at least help a user hear audio outputs to
03:16 4 produce by the device, that is an intended use. It
03:16 5 couldn't be more clear.
03:16 6 So you've got an intended use and a
03:17 7 structural portion of the claim which we made -- is
03:17 8 limiting.
03:17 9 Now, moving on to antecedent basis angle.
03:17 10 I think counsel overstates the importance of antecedent
03:17 11 basis here to bootstrap in a preamble as limiting.
03:17 12 You've got two terms. The user, antecedent basis
03:17 13 provided by admittedly the structural part of the
03:17 14 preamble, and audio outputs, a term that doesn't show
03:17 15 up into a dependent claim.
03:17 16 Now, Apple cites no case and none that
03:17 17 I'm aware of that says an independent preamble should
03:17 18 be limiting simply because a term appears in the
03:17 19 preamble of the independent claim and the body of a
03:17 20 later dependent claim.
03:17 21 In fact, there's at least one court from
03:17 22 the Northern District of California which has rejected
03:17 23 that idea, and that's the Creagri/Pinnaclife case at
03:17 24 2013 Westlaw 1663611. So this is a very, very weak
03:18 25 antecedent basis argument to, you know, bootstrap that

03:18 1 limiting argument.
03:18 2 If you have any questions with the
03:18 3 limiting aspect of the claim, otherwise, I'll continue
03:18 4 on with the...
03:18 5 THE COURT: You can go on, please.
03:18 6 MR. MCARTHUR: Okay. So with respect to
03:18 7 Apple's argument that the term is indefinite, I think
03:18 8 we're coming about it all backwards here. The point of
03:18 9 view is not the listener. The point of view is the
03:18 10 structure of the claim. This is a structural claim. A
03:18 11 wireless wearable device. What does that wireless
03:18 12 wearable device have? It has a portion of -- to be
03:18 13 worn in at least one ear of a user. It's got a
03:18 14 speaker, electrical connectors, conductive areas and so
03:18 15 forth. So this is a structural claim.
03:18 16 And so what the preamble here does is it
03:18 17 tells you the structure of the claim is designed to
03:19 18 help the user hear the audio outputs. The
03:19 19 specification itself gives you multiple examples -- and
03:19 20 counsel went over this and I'll be respectful of the
03:19 21 Court's time here -- but the multiple examples of how
03:19 22 the structure disclosed in the specification and
03:19 23 claimed by this claim help the user hear audio outputs.
03:19 24 I think there's a lot to be said for, oh,
03:19 25 you know, here's the hearing impaired spectrum and

03:19 1 things like that. But when you focus it from the
03:19 2 position of the structure of the claim and not the
03:19 3 position of the intended listener, it becomes clear
03:19 4 this claim isn't indefinite.
03:19 5 Now, one last point. I believe counsel
03:19 6 was referring to -- this is not a standalone claim and
03:19 7 you have to think about it in terms of the intended
03:19 8 listener. That's exactly what we're saying, Your
03:19 9 Honor. This is an intended -- this claim is intended
03:19 10 to help a listener. It is a preamble that is -- the
03:20 11 environment of use for the listener. And the listener
03:20 12 is not part of the claim. Therefore -- the structure
03:20 13 is. So we have to look at the structure of the
03:20 14 specification and how it is -- satisfies that intent.
03:20 15 So we'll submit on that, Your Honor. I
03:20 16 know -- respectful of the Court's time -- that this is
03:20 17 not an indefinite claim and the preamble is certainly
03:20 18 not limiting and can be parsed according to the Federal
03:20 19 Circuit law in TomTom.
03:20 20 THE COURT: Anything else from Apple?
03:20 21 MS. SPECHT: A brief response, Your
03:20 22 Honor. And I'm going to take them in reverse order.
03:20 23 So on the last point about how this a
03:20 24 structural claim to the indefiniteness point, it
03:20 25 certainly is. None of the structural examples from

03:20 1 IngenioSpec's briefing or from Mr. McArthur appear in
03:20 2 the claim at all.
03:20 3 And I want to take that idea and go back
03:20 4 to the language of the TomTom case that Mr. McArthur
03:20 5 mentioned was very akin to the situation here. But he
03:20 6 didn't read it to you, and I would argue that it
03:20 7 actually is completely dissimilar from the situation
03:21 8 here.
03:21 9 In that case, the language was a method
03:21 10 for generating and updating data, that was deemed to be
03:21 11 intended use. The next phrase is what the Court found
03:21 12 to be structural, and notice what words it begins with:
03:21 13 For use in a destination tracking system of at least
03:21 14 one mobile unit.
03:21 15 In that case, despite the words "for
03:21 16 use," which in my -- if I were not a patent attorney
03:21 17 and I was giving you my uneducated opinion could not be
03:21 18 clearer that it was trying to indicate intended use.
03:21 19 That's the portion that the Federal Circuit found to be
03:21 20 limiting as a structural component in that case.
03:21 21 Now, to the beginning portion that the
03:21 22 Court in TomTom did say was intended use, generating
03:21 23 and updating, the reason why the Federal Circuit
03:21 24 indicated that that language was intended use and not a
03:21 25 structural limitation is because they were later

03:21 1 defined in greater detail within the body of the claim.
03:21 2 There are three portions of the claim,
03:22 3 each separate limitation that begins with the phrase
03:22 4 "generating" and further defines what generating means.
03:22 5 It does not need to be limiting there.
03:22 6 Here, like Mr. McArthur just pointed out,
03:22 7 we have not even the method claim. A device claim and
03:22 8 the structures that he referenced about how to help a
03:22 9 user here are not later defined in the claim. That is
03:22 10 dissimilar to the Federal Circuit's finding in the
03:22 11 TomTom case and we are unlike the Court's decision
03:22 12 there.
03:22 13 Last point on antecedent basis, I just
03:22 14 want to level set briefly on the dependent claim
03:22 15 antecedent basis. That is from Claim 1. IngenioSpec
03:22 16 provided no response really at all specific to Claims
03:22 17 20, 22, and 24 which do not have that problem where
03:22 18 we're not focusing on dependent claims.
03:22 19 And Apple's position has never been that
03:22 20 antecedent basis being derived by a dependent claim is
03:22 21 dispositive. It is simply another indication that
03:22 22 shows the importance of the preamble, the structural
03:23 23 components of the preamble, and the interconnectedness
03:23 24 of the preamble with the body of the claims.
03:23 25 And with that, I have nothing further,

03:23 1 Your Honor.

03:23 2 THE COURT: Anything else from plaintiff?

03:23 3 MR. MCARTHUR: Just one point, Your

03:23 4 Honor, and I'll be brief.

03:23 5 I think if you read the TomTom case in

03:23 6 detail and understand what the Federal Circuit's trying

03:23 7 to say there, they weren't focused on the for use

03:23 8 language. They were focused on the destination

03:23 9 tracking system aspect of it. So I think that to try

03:23 10 and, you know, bootstrap in the for use language and

03:23 11 apply it to our situation here is not a correct reading

03:23 12 of TomTom.

03:23 13 But be that as it may, TomTom accepts the

03:23 14 inquiry as if you delete the preamble phrase, does it

03:23 15 affect the structure of the claim? Here, it does not.

03:23 16 If you delete to help a user hear audio outputs

03:23 17 produced by the device, it does not affect the

03:23 18 structure of the claim and it satisfies that test

03:23 19 articulated by the Federal Circuit.

03:23 20 Thank you.

03:24 21 THE COURT: Anything else?

03:24 22 MS. SPECHT: No, Your Honor. Thank you.

03:24 23 THE COURT: I'll be back in a few

03:24 24 seconds.

03:24 25 (Pause in proceedings.)

03:25 1 THE COURT: If we could go back on the
03:25 2 record.
03:25 3 Let me say, as I try to do as often as
03:25 4 possible, I'm always amazed at the quality of arguments
03:25 5 I get. I wouldn't be able to make any of the arguments
03:25 6 that you all just did so well. By both sides. It's --
03:25 7 it makes it -- this job enjoyable.
03:25 8 So the Court is going to -- let me just
03:25 9 make sure I am maintaining -- I know what I want to do
03:26 10 but let me see if that's maintaining or not.
03:26 11 The Court is going to find a partial --
03:26 12 preamble's partially limiting. I think this was our
03:26 13 preliminary construction but I agree with it and I'm
03:26 14 going to impose it. The structural component of the
03:26 15 preamble is limiting but the -- to at least help, that
03:26 16 language, that the -- I think Apple wanted in here
03:26 17 component is not limiting.
03:26 18 I only have a minute or two left, but if
03:26 19 there's anything that needs my attention now, if anyone
03:26 20 wants to raise it, I'm happy to take it up before I
03:26 21 jump into something else.
03:26 22 So Apple's counsel's in front of me. Is
03:26 23 there anything, Apple, you want to take up? Please let
03:26 24 me know. If not, I'll hear from plaintiff and then
03:26 25 we'll say good-bye and until we meet again.

03:26 1 Nothing else from Apple.

03:26 2 Anything from plaintiff?

03:26 3 MS. GLAUSER: No, Your Honor. Thank you

03:26 4 for your time this afternoon. Good luck at the next

03:27 5 hearing.

03:27 6 THE COURT: Always. I'll do my best.

03:27 7 Maybe I'll get the hang of this at some point so.

03:27 8 Y'all have a good afternoon. Take care.

03:27 9 (Hearing adjourned.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT)
2 WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS)
3
4
5 I, Kristie M. Davis, Official Court
6 Reporter for the United States District Court, Western
7 District of Texas, do certify that the foregoing is a
8 correct transcript from the record of proceedings in
9 the above-entitled matter.
10 I certify that the transcript fees and
11 format comply with those prescribed by the Court and
12 Judicial Conference of the United States.
13 Certified to by me this 20th day of April
14 2026.
15
16 /s/ Kristie M. Davis
KRISTIE M. DAVIS
Official Court Reporter
17 PO Box 20994
Waco, Texas 76702
18 (254) 666-0904
kmdaviscsr@yahoo.com
19
20
21
22
23
24
25