



1 component.  
2 (ECF 383 (“Claim Construction Order”) at 5-9.)

3 2. On January 10, 2020, SpeedTrack sought clarification from the Court regarding its  
4 construction of “[category descriptions] having no predefined hierarchical relationship.” (ECF 387.)

5 3. On February 26, 2020, in response to SpeedTrack’s motion for clarification, the Court  
6 issued an Order modifying its construction of the phrase “[category descriptions] having no  
7 predefined hierarchical relationship,” and modified it to mean:

8 The category descriptions have no predefined hierarchical relationship. A hierarchical  
9 relationship is a relationship that pertains to hierarchy. A hierarchy is a structure in  
10 which components are ranked into levels of subordination; each component has zero,  
one, or more subordinates; and no component has more than one superordinate  
component.

11 Category descriptions based on predefined hierarchical field-and-value relationships  
12 are disclaimed. “Predefined” means that a field is defined as a first step and a value  
13 associated with data files is entered into the field as a second step. “Hierarchical  
14 relationship” has the meaning stated above. A field and value are ranked into levels of  
15 subordination if the field is a higher-order description that restricts the possible  
meaning of the value, such that the value must refer to the field. To be hierarchical,  
each field must have zero, one, or more associated values, and each value must have  
at most one associated field.

16 (ECF 412 at 12.)

17 4. The Court further stated that “[a]s used in the construction, the terms ‘field’ and  
18 ‘value’ mean nothing more complicated than ‘a category’ and ‘an example of that category’ (e.g.,  
19 ‘language’ and ‘French’).” (ECF 412 at 12:1-3).

20 5. In view of the Court’s modified construction of the phrase “[category descriptions]  
21 having no predefined hierarchical relationship” and Plaintiff’s determination thereon as set forth in  
22 the Parties’ Joint Stipulation, none of Defendants’ accused products or services infringe, either  
23 literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, any claim of the ’360 Patent as Defendants’ accused  
24 products and services use field-and-value relationships, as those terms are used in the Court’s  
25 modified construction.

26 6. Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above in Paragraph 5, Defendants’ accused

1 products and services do not infringe, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, any claim of US  
2 Patent 5,544,360 under the Court’s modified construction of the phrase “[category descriptions]  
3 having no predefined hierarchical relationship.”

4 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED as follows:


5 JUDGMENT of non-infringement of United States Patent No. 5,544,360 is entered in favor  
6 of Defendants for the reason that Defendants’ accused products and services do not infringe, literally  
7 or under the doctrine of equivalents, any claims of US Patent 5,544,360 under the Court’s modified  
8 construction of the phrase “[category descriptions] having no predefined hierarchical relationship.”

9 Final judgment is hereby entered in favor of Defendants and against Plaintiff on Plaintiff’s  
10 claims for infringement of the ’360 Patent.

11 The Clerk is directed to enter this final judgment.

12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13  
14 Date: March 6, 2020

  
United States District Judge