

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

NIPPON TELEGRAPH AND
TELEPHONE CORPORATION and
ESSENTIAL WIFI LLC,

Plaintiffs,

v.

MEDIATEK INC. AND
MEDIATEK USA INC.

Defendants.

C. A. No. 1:20-cv-00632-ADA

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

NIPPON TELEGRAPH AND
TELEPHONE CORPORATION and
ESSENTIAL WIFI LLC,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ACER INC. AND
ACER AMERICA INC,

Defendants.

C. A. No. 1:20-cv-00769-ADA

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

NIPPON TELEGRAPH AND
TELEPHONE CORPORATION and
ESSENTIAL WIFI LLC,

Plaintiffs,

v.

TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INC.,

Defendant.

C.A. No. 1:20-cv-00583-ADA

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

JOINT CLAIM CONSTRUCTION STATEMENT

Pursuant to the Court’s Third Amended Scheduling Order, Plaintiffs Nippon Telegraph and Telephone Corp. and Essential WiFi, LLC, and Defendants MediaTek, Inc. and MediaTek USA, Inc.; Acer, Inc. and Acer America, Inc.; and Texas Instruments, Inc. submit this Joint Claim Construction Statement attaching the enclosed chart of disputed and agreed claim terms (Ex. A) for the asserted claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 7,242,720 (“the ’720 Patent”) (Ex. B); 7,280,551 (“the ’551 Patent”) (Ex. C); 7,400,616 (“the ’616 Patent”) (Ex. D); and 7,545,781 (“the ’781 Patent”) (Ex. E).

Dated: January 28, 2021

/s/ Steven R. Daniels

Steven R. Daniels
Texas Bar No. 24025318
Jia-Geng Lu
Texas Bar No. 24081010
(Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
Bryan D. Atkinson
Texas Bar No. 24036157
(Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
607 W. 3rd Street, Suite 2500
Austin, Texas 78701
Telephone: (512) 770-4200
Facsimile: (844) 670-6009
SDaniels@dickinsonwright.com
JLu@dickinsonwright.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs
Nippon Telegraph and Telephone Corporation
and Essential WiFi, LLC*

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Ognjen Zivojnovic

J. Mark Mann
State Bar No. 12926150
mark@themannfirm.com
G. Blake Thompson
State Bar No. 24042033
blake@themannfirm.com
MANN | TINDEL | THOMPSON
300 West Main Street
Henderson, Texas 75652
(903) 657-8540
(903) 657-6003 (fax)

Kevin P.B. Johnson (pro hac vice)
kevinjohnson@quinnemanuel.com
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN, LLP
555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
Telephone: 650-801-5000
Facsimile: 650-801-5100

Eric Hui-chieh Huang (*pro hac vice*)
erichuang@quinnemanuel.com
John T. McKee
johnmckee@quinnemanuel.com
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN, LLP
51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
New York, NY 10010
Telephone: 212-849-7000
Facsimile: 212-849-7100

Ognjen Zivojnovic (*pro hac vice*)
ogizivojnovic@quinnemanuel.com
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN, LLP
50 California Street, 22nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94611
Telephone: 415-875-6600
Facsimile: 415-875-6700

*Attorneys for Defendants and
Counter-Plaintiffs MediaTek Inc. and
MediaTek USA Inc.*

/s/ Amit Makker

Wesley Hill

Texas State Bar No. 24032294

E-mail: wh@wsfirm.com

Andrea L. Fair

Texas State Bar No. 24078488

E-mail: andrea@wsfirm.com

WARD, SMITH & HILL, PLLC

PO Box 1231

Longview, Texas 75606-1231

(903) 757-6400 (telephone)

(903) 757-2323 (facsimile)

Kevin Wheeler (pro hac vice)

kevin.wheeler@lw.com

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

555 Eleventh St., NW, Ste. 1000

Washington, DC 20004

Tel: (202) 637-2200

Fax: (202) 637-2201

Amit Makker (pro hac vice)

Amit.Makker@lw.com

Latham & Watkins LLP

505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000

San Francisco, CA 94111-6538

Tel: (415) 395-8034

Fax: (415) 395-8095

Attorneys for Defendant

Texas Instruments Inc.

/s/ Kevin Jones

Kaiwen Tseng (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)

CA Bar No. 193756

Kevin Jones (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)

CA Bar No. 240205

Craig Kaufman (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)

CA Bar No. 159458

TECHKNOWLEDGE LAW GROUP LLP

100 Marine Parkway, Suite 200

Redwood Shores, CA 94650

Tel. (650) 51705268

ktseng@tklg-llp.com

Eric H. Findlay

Texas Bar No. 00789886

FINDLAY CRAFT, P.C.

102 N. College Ave. Suite 900

Tyler Texas 75702

Tel. (903) 534-1100

Fax: (903) 534-1137

efindlay@findlaycraft.com

*Counsel for Defendants Acer America
Corporation and Acer, Inc.*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 28th day of January, 2021, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system per Local Rule CV-5(b)(1), which will send notification of such filing to all counsel of record who are deemed to have consented to electronic service. Any other counsel of record will be served by electronic mail, facsimile transmission and/or first class mail on this same date.

/s/ Steven R. Daniels

Steven R. Daniels

EXHIBIT A

EXHIBIT A: Joint Claim Construction Chart

U.S. Patent No. 7,242,720

Claim Term	Plaintiffs' Proposed Construction	Defendants' Proposed Construction
“interference canceller” Claims 18, 19, 21, 22, 31, 32 (proposed by Plaintiffs)	“a device, embodied in software and/or hardware, designed to reduce effects of unwanted signals or noise on a desired signal”	plain meaning
“the OFDM signal transmitting device comprises at least an interference canceller among an inverse matrix computer, the interference canceller, and a pilot signal generator” Claim 18 (proposed by Defendants)	“interference canceller” construed as above; remainder of the claim term speaks for itself and should be construed as plain meaning.	“the OFDM signal transmitting device comprises at least an interference canceller operating in connection with an inverse matrix computer and a pilot signal generator”
“the OFDM signal receiving device comprises at least an inverse matrix computer and an interference canceller among the inverse matrix computer, the interference canceller and a pilot signal generator” Claim 22 (proposed by Defendants)	“interference canceller” construed as above; remainder of the claim term speaks for itself and should be construed as plain meaning.	“the OFDM signal receiving device comprises at least an inverse matrix computer and an interference canceller operating in connection with a pilot signal generator”

Claim Term	Plaintiffs' Proposed Construction	Defendants' Proposed Construction
<p>“the OFDM signal receiving device comprises at least an inverse matrix computer among the inverse matrix computer and a pilot signal generator”</p> <p>Claim 31 (proposed by Defendants)</p>	<p>claim term speaks for itself and should be construed as plain meaning</p>	<p>“the OFDM signal receiving device comprises at least an inverse matrix computer operating in connection with a pilot signal generator”</p>

U.S. Patent No. 7,280,551

Claim Term	Plaintiffs' Proposed Construction	Defendants' Proposed Construction
<p>“transmitting a plurality of wireless packets simultaneously”</p> <p>Claims 1, 2, 5, 6 (proposed by Defendants)</p>	<p>the claim term speaks for itself and should be construed as plain meaning; usage in preamble is not limiting.</p>	<p>at least this quoted portion of the preamble is limiting and should be given its plain meaning</p>
<p>“wireless channels”</p> <p>Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8 (proposed by Plaintiffs)</p>	<p>“frequency ranges provided to transmit packets”</p> <p>AGREED</p>	<p>“frequency ranges provided to transmit packets”</p> <p>AGREED</p>
<p>“multiple wireless channels”</p> <p>Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8 (proposed by Plaintiffs)</p>	<p>“multiple frequency ranges provided to transmit packets”</p> <p>AGREED</p>	<p>“multiple frequency ranges provided to transmit packets”</p> <p>AGREED</p>
<p>“mandatory channel”</p> <p>Claims 1, 2, 5, 6 (proposed by Plaintiffs)</p>	<p>“one of several frequency ranges provided between two STAs, whose busy/idle state determines whether there is transmission</p>	<p>plain meaning</p>

Claim Term	Plaintiffs' Proposed Construction	Defendants' Proposed Construction
	regardless of idle state of the other available channels”	

U.S. Patent No. 7,400,616

Claim Term	Plaintiffs' Proposed Construction	Defendants' Proposed Construction
“data packet” Claims 1, 5 (proposed by Plaintiffs)	“a unit of data that is transmitted over a wireless medium”	plain meaning
“transmitting a plurality of data packets simultaneously” Claim 1 (proposed by Defendants)	“data packet” construed as above; remainder of the claim term speaks for itself and should be construed as plain meaning; usage in preamble is not limiting.	at least this quoted portion of the preamble is limiting and should be given its plain meaning

U.S. Patent No. 7,545,781

Claim Term	Plaintiffs' Proposed Construction	Defendants' Proposed Construction
“simultaneously transmitting . . . a plurality of wireless packets” Claims 1, 16 (proposed by Defendants)	the claim term speaks for itself and should be construed as plain meaning: usage in preamble is not limiting.	at least this quoted portion of the preamble is limiting and should be given its plain meaning
“wireless channels” Claims 1, 9, 16, 24 (proposed by Plaintiffs)	“frequency ranges provided to transmit packets” AGREED	“frequency ranges provided to transmit packets” AGREED

Claim Term	Plaintiffs' Proposed Construction	Defendants' Proposed Construction
<p>“multiple wireless channels”</p> <p>Claims 1, 16 (proposed by Plaintiffs)</p>	<p>“multiple frequency ranges provided to transmit packets”</p> <p>AGREED</p>	<p>“multiple frequency ranges provided to transmit packets”</p> <p>AGREED</p>
<p>“paired wireless channel”</p> <p>Claims 1, 16 (proposed by Defendants)</p>	<p>the claim term speaks for itself and should be construed as plain meaning</p>	<p>“channel that would be affected by leakage from the transmitting wireless channel”</p>
<p>“predetermined time Ts”</p> <p>Claims 1, 16 (proposed by Defendants)</p>	<p>“amount of time that is defined before the duration of a data transmission is known”</p>	<p>“a transmission inhibition time that is defined by a received packet during transmission of a wireless packet”;</p> <p>alternatively, indefinite</p>
<p>“setting, by said transmit-side STA, time (Tmax+Ts) as transmission inhibition time to a paired wireless channel . . . , the transmission inhibition time used in the virtual carrier sense”</p> <p>Claim 1 (proposed by Defendants)</p>	<p>the claim term speaks for itself and should be construed as plain meaning</p>	<p>“setting the virtual carrier sense transmission inhibition time for the paired wireless channel in the transmit-side STA to (Tmax+Ts)”</p>
<p>“a virtual carrier sense unit of said transmit-side STA setting time (Tmax+Ts) as transmission inhibition time to a paired wireless channel”</p>	<p>the claim term speaks for itself and should be construed as plain meaning</p>	<p>“a virtual carrier sense unit of said transmit-side STA setting the virtual carrier sense transmission inhibition time for the paired wireless channel in the transmit-side STA to (Tmax+Ts)”</p>

Claim Term	Plaintiffs' Proposed Construction	Defendants' Proposed Construction
Claim 16 (proposed by Defendants)		