

No. 2010-1037

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

RESEARCH CORPORATION TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,
Defendant-Appellee.

**Appeal from the United States District Court for the District
of Arizona in Case No. 01-CV-0658-TUC, Judge Robert C. Jones.**

BRIEF FOR PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT

M. MILLER BAKER
BLAIR M. JACOBS
PAUL E. POIROT
NATALIA V. BLINKOVA
McDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY
600 13TH STREET, N.W. SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096
(202) 756-8000

MICHAEL J. RUSING
RUSING & LOPEZ, PLLC
6262 N. SWAN ROAD
SUITE 200
TUCSON, AZ 85718
(520) 792-4800

*Attorneys for Plaintiff-Appellant
Research Corporation Technologies, Inc.*

January 15, 2010

CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST

Counsel for Appellant hereby certifies the following:

1. The full name of every party or amicus represented by me is:

RESEARCH CORPORATION TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

2. The names of the real parties in interest represented by me are:

RESEARCH CORPORATION TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

3. All parent corporations and any publicly held companies that own 10 percent (10%) or more of the stock of the parties represented by me are:

None.

4. The names of all law firms and the partners or associates that appeared for the parties or amicus now represented by me in the trial court or agency or are expected to appear in this court are:

Law Firm: McDermott Will & Emery LLP

Raphael V. Lupo, Terrence P. McMahon, Stephen K. Shahida, Paul E. Poirot, Natalia V. Blinkova, Isaac Crum, Bureden J. Warren, Paul Devinsky, Charles J. Hawkins, Hankil Kang, Blair M. Jacobs, M. Miller Baker, and Sarah Columbia.

Formerly of McDermott Will & Emery LLP

Donna M. Tanguay, Mehul R. Jani, Jiri F. Smetana, May Y. Chan, Jack Q. Lever, Brian E. Ferguson, Ronald J. Pabis, Kori Anne Bagrowski, and John R. Fuisz.

Law Firm: Rusing & Lopez

Michael J. Rusing, Todd M. Hardy, and Cynthia T. Kuhn.

1/15/10
Date



McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
(202) 756-8000

*Attorneys for Plaintiff-Appellant
Research Corporation Technologies, Inc.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iv
STATEMENT OF RELATED CASES	1
STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION.....	2
STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES.....	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	4
STATEMENT OF FACTS	8
A. RCT and Its Technology	8
1. Digital Halftoning Generally	9
2. Displaying and Printing an Image	11
3. Measuring the Quality of Halftoning Processes	14
a. Dot Profiles	14
b. Power Spectrum.....	16
c. Noise Exhibited by the Power Spectrum.....	17
d. Desirable Characteristics of Thresholding Processes.....	19
4. Thresholding	19
5. The Different Types of Masks	20
6. Parker and Mitsa Invent “Blue Noise” Halftoning Masks.....	21
B. The ’310, ’228, and ’772 Patents	22
1. The ’310 Patent.....	22
a. The ’310 Specification.....	22

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
b. The Asserted Claims of the '310 Patent	23
2. The '228 Patent	24
a. The Specification of the '228 Patent	25
b. The Asserted Claim of the '228 Patent.....	25
3. The '772 Patent and Its Predecessors	26
a. Claim 29 of the '305 Patent.....	27
b. The Asserted Claims of the '772 Patent	27
 SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	 28
 STANDARDS OF REVIEW	 30
 ARGUMENT	 31
 I. THE ASSERTED CLAIMS OF THE '310 AND '228 PATENTS SATISFY THE PATENTABILITY TEST OF <i>BILSKI</i>	 31
A. <i>Bilski's</i> Test for Patentability	31
B. The Asserted Claims Satisfy <i>Bilski's</i> "Machine" Prong	32
C. The Asserted Claims Satisfy <i>Bilski's</i> "Transformation" Prong	36
 II. THE DISTRICT COURT ERRED IN FINDING THAT THE ASSERTED CLAIMS OF THE LATER-FILED PATENTS ARE NOT ENTITLED TO THE EFFECTIVE FILING DATE OF THE 1990 AND 1991 APPLICATIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 120	 42
A. The District Court Erred by Failing to Require Microsoft to Produce Sufficient Evidence of Anticipatory Prior Art	43
B. The Later-Filed Claims Have Ample Written Description Support Under the District Court's Revised Claim Construction.....	46
1. The District Court's Claim Construction Rulings Demonstrate That the Later-Filed Patents Are Entitled to the Effective Filing Date of the 1990/1991 Applications.....	49

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
2. The Disclosure of the 1990/1991 Applications is Not Limited to a Single Technique	55
3. The District Court Erred by Substituting Its Own Interpretation of the Disclosure for the Only Admissible Evidence from the Perspective of a Skilled Artisan	56
4. The District Court Erred By Extending Its Erroneous Ruling Regarding the '772 Patent to Claim 29 of the '305 Patent, Which Recites a Blue Noise Mask	59
C. The District Court Erred by Failing to Apply Its Adopted Claim Construction When Analyzing the Disclosure of the 1990/1991 Applications.....	60
D. If This Court Reverses the District Court's Entry of Partial Summary Judgment with Respect to the '772 Patent, This Court Should Declare the Later-Filed Claims Are Not Invalid	60
CONCLUSION	61

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
Cases	
<i>Carnegie Mellon University v. Hoffmann-La Roche Inc.</i> , 541 F.3d 1115 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	57
<i>Cooper Cameron Corp. v. Kvaerner Oilfield Prods.</i> , 291 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	46
<i>Diamond v. Diehr</i> , 450 U.S. 175 (1981)	41
<i>Ex parte Borenstein</i> , Appeal No. 2008-3475, 2009 WL 871128 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int., March 30, 2009).....	35
<i>Gen. Elec. Co. v. Nintendo Co.</i> , 179 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	45
<i>Gentry Gallery, Inc. v. Berkline Corp.</i> , 134 F.3d 1473 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	51
<i>Go Med. Indus. Pty, LTD. v. Inmed Corp.</i> , 471 F.3d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	30, 31
<i>Gottshchalk v. Benson</i> , 409 U.S. 63 (1972)	41
<i>In re Abele</i> , 684 F.2d 902 (CCPA 1982).....	36, 37, 38
<i>In re Bilski</i> , 545 F.3d 943 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	<i>passim</i>
<i>In re Daniels</i> , 144 F.3d 1452 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	31
<i>In re Gosteli</i> , 872 F.2d 1008 (Fed. Cir. 1989)	42
<i>In re Kaslow</i> , 707 F.2d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	42
<i>Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.</i> , 481 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	45

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

(continued)

	Page
<i>Lizardtech, Inc. v. Earth Resource Mapping, Inc.</i> , 424 F. 3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	55
<i>Lockwood v. Amer. Airlines, Inc.</i> , 107 F.3d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	49
<i>Parker v. Flook</i> , 437 U.S. 584 (1978)	41
<i>PowerOasis, Inc. v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.</i> , 522 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	43, 46, 60
<i>Ralston Purina Co. v. Far-Mar-Co, Inc.</i> , 772 F.2d 1570 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	31, 42, 54
<i>Reiffin v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 214 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	46, 51
<i>Research Corporation Technologies, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 536 F.3d 1247 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	1, 4, 43
<i>Tech. Licensing Corp. v. Videotek, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	42, 43, 52
<i>Tronzo v. Biomet, Inc.</i> , 156 F.3d 1154 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	31
<i>Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar</i> , 925 F.2d 1555 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	58
<i>Zenon v. U.S. Filter Corp.</i> , 506 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	44

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 101	<i>passim</i>
35 U.S.C. § 112	31, 46
35 U.S.C. § 120	<i>passim</i>

STATEMENT OF RELATED CASES

On August 1, 2008, a panel of this Court (Newman, Rader, and Friedman) decided a prior appeal, No. 2006-1275, from the same underlying action. That decision is reported as *Research Corporation Technologies, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.*, 536 F.3d 1247 (Fed. Cir. 2008).

The Supreme Court granted certiorari in the case of *Bilski v. Kappos*, No. 08-964 (June 1, 2009). The disposition of that case could directly affect this Court's decision in the instant appeal.

STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

The district court had jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1338(a). This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1295(a)(1).

This action was dismissed by stipulation of the parties pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(1)(A)(ii) on August 31, 2009. RCT timely filed its notice of appeal on September 23, 2009.

The balance of the brief has been eliminated for this sample. For a copy of the complete brief please call our office. Thank you.