

9 NOT FOR CITATION  
10 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
11 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
12 SAN JOSE DIVISION

13 TRENT WEST,

14 Plaintiff,

15 v.

16 JEWELRY INNOVATIONS, INC., TOSYALI  
17 INTERNATIONAL, INC. (dba BENCHMARK),  
18 DIAMOND NORTHSTAR, INC. (dba  
19 TUNGSTEN MAGNUM) and A JAMAIS  
DESIGNS, INC. (dba INFINITY RINGS), and  
CROWN RINGS, INC.

20 Defendant.

Case Number C-07-1812 JF (HRL)

ORDER<sup>1</sup> CONSTRUING CLAIMS OF  
UNITED STATES PATENT NOS.  
6,928,734; 6,990,736, 7,032,314; AND  
7,076,972

[re: docket nos. 125, 145]

21  
22  
23 On April 3, 2008, the Court held a hearing for the purpose of construing disputed terms in  
24 the claims of United States Patent Nos. 6,928,734 (“the ’734 patent”), 6,990,736 (“the ’736  
25 patent”), 7,032,314 (“the ’314 patent”) and 7,076,971 (“the ’972 patent”). After consideration of  
26 the arguments and evidence presented by the parties and the relevant portions of the record, the  
27 Court construes the disputed terms as set forth below.

28  

---

<sup>1</sup> This disposition is not designated for publication and may not be cited.

1 **I. BACKGROUND**

2 This case involves jewelry rings made of tungsten carbide and a method for making such  
3 rings. Plaintiff Trent West (“West”) alleges that jewelry rings sold by Defendants Jewelry  
4 Innovations, Inc., Tosal International, Ltd dba Benchmark, Northstar Diamond, Inc., and  
5 Crown Rings, Inc.<sup>2</sup> (collectively “Benchmark”) infringe four West patents including the ’734,  
6 ’736, ’314, and the ’972 patents. (collectively referred to as “the patents”).

7 The ’736, ’314, and ’972 patents are continuations-in-part of Application No. 149,796,  
8 filed on September 8, 1998, now U.S. Patent No. 6,062,045. The ’734 patent issued from  
9 Application No. 426,054 that was filed on April 28, 2003. The specifications of the patents are  
10 similar although each contain some additional material. The invention generally relates to a  
11 method for making jewelry out of tungsten carbide. The patents describe a method of “creating  
12 commercially viable tungsten carbide jewelry.” Plaintiff’s Opening Claim Construction Brief at  
13 3:7. The ’734 patent is directed to jewelry rings. The ’314, ’736, and ’972 are directed to  
14 methods of making jewelry rings and finger rings.

15 **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

16 Claim construction is a question of law to be decided by the Court. *Markman v.*  
17 *Westview Instruments, Inc.*, 52 F.3d 967, 979 (Fed. Cir. 1995), *aff’d* 517 U.S. 370 (1996). The  
18 patentee’s use of a claim term in the specification is highly relevant to understanding the proper  
19 context in which the term is used. *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2005).  
20 The specification is the “single best guide to the meaning of a disputed term.” *Id.*, *citing*  
21 *Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.*, 90 F.3d 1576, 1582 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

---

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 <sup>2</sup> At meetings between the parties regarding claim construction, Crown Rings, Inc.  
28 (“Crown”) submitted its own proposed construction to the disputed terms. However, subsequent  
to the meeting, Crown did not file a brief supporting its proposed construction but rather  
submitted a notice of joinder adopting Benchmark’s proposed claim construction.

1 **III. DISCUSSION**

2 1. “Powdered materials”, “Powders”

3 These terms appear in the ’734, ’736 , and ’314 patents. “Powdered materials” is recited  
4 in the ’734 patent at independent claim 16 (emphasis added):

5 1. A method of providing a tungsten-carbide based annular jewelry article having  
6 a desired surface profile and including an annular band which comprises:  
7 providing a mixture of two or more **powdered materials** which consist  
8 essentially of at least 50 weight percent tungsten carbide . . .

9 The term “powders” is recited in the ’736 patent at dependent claim 10 (emphasis added):

10 10. The method of claim 1<sup>[3]</sup>, wherein the hard material is formed by sintering **powders**  
11 that consist essentially of tungsten carbide and a metal binder material.

12 The term “powders” also is recited in the ’315 patent at dependent claim 19:

13 19. The method of claim 1<sup>[4]</sup>, wherein the hard material is formed by sintering **powders**  
14 that consist essentially of at least tungsten carbide and a metal binder material.

15 The parties propose the following construction:

Term	West’s proposed construction	Benchmark’s proposed construction
“Powdered materials”	Substance composed of fine particles.	Any solid substance reduced to a state of fine, loose, dry particles by crushing, grinding, disintegration, etc.
“Powders”		

16 West asserts that the ’734, ’736, and ’314 patent specifications use the term but that the  
17 term is never defined in either the specification or the prosecution history. West argues that  
18 because the intrinsic evidence does not define the term, the Court should look to dictionary  
19 definitions for guidance. West’s proposed construction adopts Webster’s Third New  
20 International Dictionary (“Webster’s”) definition of the word “powder”.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 <sup>3</sup> 1. A method of making a jewelry article which comprises: providing an annular  
27 substrate formed of a hard material predominantly comprising tungsten carbide . . .

28 <sup>4</sup> 1. A method of making a jewelry ring which comprises: providing an annular finger  
ring made of a hard material consisting essentially of tungsten carbide, . . .

1 Benchmark agrees that the term is not defined in the specification or the prosecution  
2 history. Benchmark argues that powder should be defined according to its ordinary and  
3 customary meaning and that the terms “dry” and “loose” are part of the ordinary and customary  
4 meaning of “powder.” For support, Benchmark points to the same dictionary definition cited by  
5 West. In the definition, Webster’s includes several examples that illustrate its definition. One is  
6 “dry pulverized earth or disintegrated matter.” Another is “powder snow: fine *dry* light snow . . .  
7 .” Benchmark offers no explanation for the term “loose” other than to say it is part of the  
8 ordinary and customary meaning of powder.

9 Unless the intrinsic evidence compels a contrary conclusion, the claim language carries  
10 the meaning accorded those words in the usage of skilled artisans at the time of invention.  
11 *SmithKline Beecham Corp. v. Apotex Corp.*, 403 F.3d 1331, 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2005) *citing*  
12 *Virtronics Corp. v. Conception, Inc.*, 90 F.3d 1576, 1582 (Fed. cir. 1996). The claim should be  
13 construed in line with the “technological and temporal” context of the claimed invention.  
14 *SmithKline*, 403 F.3d at 1338. Here, the invention uses the term “powders” as it relates to the  
15 field of powder metallurgy. For example, the specification of the ’734 patent states:

16 I have recently discovered that through the use of powder metallurgy and sintering  
17 processes, such materials can be manufactured and used to provide faceted  
18 designs that were not heretofore practiced. Furthermore, such materials can be  
19 used to enhance and protect precious metals and gemstones in this jewelry setting.

20 ’734 patent, col.1 lns.42-47. Embodiments of the inventions relate to “powdered materials” with  
21 said materials being defined as metals. *See* ’734 patent, col.6 ln.54-col.7 ln.26. Accordingly, in  
22 the context of the invention here, powder is used as it relates to the field of powder metallurgy  
23 and metals in powder form.

24 West does not offer any evidence that its general 1976 Webster’s dictionary definition of  
25 the term powder is what a person of ordinary skill in the art would understand the term to mean  
26 in the context of the invention in the instant case. Benchmark argues that West’s general  
27 definition is too broad because other compositions, such as slurries, also can be composed of fine  
28 particles.

The parties have provided the Court with little guidance as to how the term should be

1 construed. For additional guidance, the Court looked at how the term is defined in other  
2 dictionaries. Webster’s New Collegiate Dictionary 922 (9th Ed. 1990) defines the term  
3 “powder” as “matter in a finely divided state: particulate matter.” It includes as an example of a  
4 powder “fine, dry snow.” The McGraw-Hill Dictionary of Scientific and Technical Terms 1653  
5 (6th Ed. 2003) defines powder as “[a] loose grouping or aggregation of solid particles, usually  
6 smaller than 1000 micrometers.” It included the term “loose” in the definition. The ASTM  
7 Dictionary of Engineering Science & Technology 465 (10th Ed. 2005) defines a powder as  
8 “particles that are usually less than 1000 [micrometers]” or “particles of a solid characterized by  
9 small size, nominally within the range of from 0.1 to 1000 [micrometers].”

10 These definitions support West’s proposed construction in that a powder is defined by  
11 small particle size. However, as discussed above, the specific definition proposed by West  
12 arguably could apply to particles in another state. There also appears to be support for  
13 Benchmark’s inclusion of the terms “dry” and “loose”. However, Benchmark has not provided  
14 guidance to the Court as to how dry or loose the powder must be. Accordingly, the Court adopts  
15 a modified definition of powder: “matter in a finely divided state: particulate matter.” This  
16 construction does not cover slurries because slurries would not be in a finely divided state, nor  
17 does it include the vague terms “dry” and “loose”.

18 2. “Consist(s) Essentially Of” or “Consisting Essentially Of”

19 The phrases “consist(s) essentially of” or “consisting essentially of” are used in several of  
20 the asserted claims. A representative claim of the ’734 patent is set forth below with the disputed  
21 term highlighted in bold.

22 16. A method of providing a tungsten-carbide based annular jewelry article having a  
23 desired surface profile and including an annular band which comprises: providing a  
24 mixture of two or more powdered materials which **consist essentially of** at least 50  
25 weight percent tungsten carbide . . .  
26  
27  
28

1 The parties propose the following construction:

Term	West’s proposed construction	Benchmark’s proposed construction
“Consist(s) Essentially Of”	Includes the named material(s) and other materials that do not affect the basic and novel characteristics of the invention	Excludes components or ingredients that materially affect the basic and novel characteristics of the claimed composition
“Consisting Essentially Of”		

8 Benchmark concedes in its opposition papers that the term “composition” in its proposed  
9 definition should be changed to “invention.” The parties dispute whether the transitional phrase  
10 “consisting essentially of” should be inclusive or exclusive. Benchmark argues that the phrase  
11 should be construed as it proposes because West used the term in an exclusionary way during the  
12 prosecution of the ’734 patent:

13 Also, claim 46 recites that the hard material is formed by sintering powders that  
14 “consist essentially of” tungsten carbide and a metal binder material. This  
15 language excludes amounts of materials like nitrides that have an undesirable  
16 effect on the claimed invention. this claim transition term is open to cover  
17 additional components but *excludes* components that “‘materially affect the basic  
18 and novel characteristics’ of the claimed composition.” *Atlas Powder Co. v. E. I.*  
19 *Du Pont de Nemours*, 750 F.2d 1569, 1574 (Fed. Cir.1984) (quoting *In re Herz*,  
20 537 F.2d 549, 551 (C.C.P.A. 1976)) (emphasis added).

18 The phrase “consisting essentially of” “limits the scope of a claim to the specified  
19 materials or steps ‘and those that do not materially affect the basic and novel characteristics of  
20 the claimed invention.’” *Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP)* §2111.03 (8th ed.  
21 2001) (Rev. 6, August 2006) (quoting *In re Herz*, 537 F.2d 549, 551-52 (CCPA 1976)). In this  
22 case, West argued to the patent office that its use of this phrase excluded components that  
23 materially affected the invention. Accordingly, the Court adopts Benchmark’s proposed  
24 definition, with the exception that it includes the term “invention” instead of “composition”.

25 3. “Blank”

26 The term “blank” is used in the asserted claims of the ’734 patent. A representative claim  
27 of the ’734 patent is set forth below with the disputed term highlighted in bold.

28 16. A method of providing a tungsten-carbide based annular jewelry article  
having a desired surface profile and including an annular band which comprises:

1 providing a mixture of two or more powdered materials . . . compressing the  
2 powdered material mixture at a pressure sufficient to form an annular **blank**; and  
3 sintering the annular **blank** at a temperature sufficient to form the tungsten-  
carbide based annular jewelry article.

4 The parties propose the following construction:

Term	West’s proposed construction	Benchmark’s proposed construction
“blank”	shaped and formed material which may be handled in solid form in preparation for further processing	A pre-sintered pressure molded ring shape formed by the compression of two or more powdered materials that consist essentially of at least 50 weight percent tungsten carbide.

11  
12 West asserts that its construction is correct because it “is drawn from the language of the  
13 ’734 [patent] specification and incorporates a succinct dictionary definition to further inform its  
14 meaning to one of ordinary skill in the art.” Plaintiff’s Opening Claim Construction Brief at  
15 11:11-13. West points to the following language in the ’734 patent specification for support: “a  
16 quantity of powdered . . . material that can be compressed and formed into an oversized ‘green’  
17 ring blank . . .” ’734 patent, col.6 lns.43-48. The powders are “compacted to form a solid of the  
18 desired shape . . . that allows the part to be handled.” ’734 patent, col.1 lns.56-63. From this  
19 language, West argues that its construction of “a shaped and formed material which may be  
20 handled in solid form” is taken directly from the specification. Additionally, West contends that  
21 the ’734 patent specification further describes the sintering process that follows the formation of  
22 the blank, *see* ’734 patent, col. 2, ln.30- col. 3 ln.30, and provides that the blank is formed so that  
23 it may be handled for further processing. Finally, West argues that Webster’s defines a “blank”  
24 as “something in an unfinished or incomplete state that is designed for further working or  
25 manipulation.” West uses this definition to provide support for the inclusion of the language “in  
26 preparation for further processing” in its proposed construction.

27 Benchmark admits in its opposition brief that its proposed construction adds “irrelevant  
28 and/or redundant terms, and should be disregarded.” Benchmark Opposition at 6:25-25.

1 However, Benchmark argues that West’s proposed construction is too convoluted to be workable  
2 and should not be adopted either. Rather, Benchmark suggests that the term “blank” is known in  
3 the industry to be “a piece of material prepared to be made into something (as a key) for further  
4 operation.”

5 At the hearing, the parties stated that they had reached an agreement that the term “blank”  
6 and that the term should be construed as proposed by West. Accordingly, the Court will adopt  
7 West’s definition of this term.

8 4. “Grinding”

9 The term “grinding” is used in the claims of the ’314 patent. Independent claim 1 is  
10 representative, with the disputed term highlighted in bold.

11 1. A method of making a jewelry ring which comprises: providing an annular  
12 finger ring made of a hard material consisting essentially of tungsten carbide, with  
13 the annular finger ring having at least one external facet and defining an aperture  
14 configured and dimensioned to receive a person’s finger; and **grinding** the at least  
one external facet to a predetermined shape to provide a pleasing appearance to  
the jewelry ring . . .

15 The parties propose the following construction:

Term	West’s Proposed Construction	Benchmark’s Proposed Construction
“Grinding”	shaping, forming, finishing or polishing by friction	shaping by friction

16 West argues that Benchmark’s construction is improperly narrow. Benchmark contends  
17 that West’s proposed construction is inconsistent with the manner in which the term is used in  
18 the patent and the specification. In particular, Benchmark argues that West’s proposed  
19 construction impermissibly includes “polishing” and finishing” in its definition of “grinding”.  
20 Benchmark points to dependent claim 3 of the ’314 patent, which depends from independent  
21 claim 1, includes the step of “highly polishing the at least one external facet . . .” Further, claims  
22 5, 6, and 8 of the ’314 patent also all depend from claim 1 and add the additional polishing step.  
23 Specifically, claims 5 and 6, which depend from claim 4, which depends from claim 1, all add a  
24 polishing step of polishing the facets “to a mirror finish.” Claim 8 also includes a polishing step.  
25  
26  
27  
28



1 Benchmark argues that because the claims refer to polishing separately from grinding , the term  
2 “polishing” cannot be synonymous with “grinding.”

3 Benchmark also points to the specification of the ‘314 patent to the effect that: “The  
4 invention involves the provision of jewelry items made from super hard metals such as tungsten  
5 and cemented carbide and high tech ceramics of various colors processed into a predetermined  
6 shape then sintered in a furnace and ground and polished into finished form.” ’314 patent, col.8  
7 lns.19-23. The specification also reads: “Once cooled, the hardened ring stock or other blank  
8 configuration can be ground and polished to provide the hard metal or ceramic ring component.”  
9 ’314 patent, col.6 lns.14-15. Finally, Benchmark points out that the term “finish” also is used  
10 separately in the specification: “Following the sintering operation, the ring stock can be ground  
11 and finish polished . . .” ’314 patent col.4 lns.49-50.

12 Benchmark provides ample support in the intrinsic record to demonstrate that the terms  
13 “finishing” and “polishing” should not be part of the definition of “grinding” as used in the  
14 context of the patents at issue here. Benchmark states that it does not object to the term  
15 “forming” being included in the definition. According, the Court construes the term “grinding”  
16 as “shaping or forming by friction.”

17 5. “Virtually Indestructible During Normal Use”

18 The phrase “virtually indestructible during use” or “virtually indestructible during normal  
19 use” is used in the ’314 patent and the ’972 patent. Independent claim 1 of the ‘314 patent is  
20 representative with the disputed term highlighted in bold :

21 1. A method of making a jewelry ring which comprises: providing an annular  
22 finger ring made of a hard material consisting essentially of tungsten carbide . . .  
23 with the hard material being long wearing and **virtually indestructible during**  
24 **use** of the jewelry ring.  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 The parties propose the following construction:

Term	West’s Proposed Construction	Benchmark’s Proposed Construction
“virtually indestructible during normal use”	practically incapable of having its aesthetic appearance destroyed during employment and enjoyment in a normal daily jewelry wearing environment	“Virtually indestructible”: rarely, if ever, breaks, fractures, nicks, dents, or deforms
		“normal use” and “use”: Any use of a ring during wearing the ring, or any activity related to the wearing of the ring

9  
10 a. “Virtually Indestructible”

11 West argues that this term is directed to the aesthetic appearance of the claimed rings.  
12 West asserts that the specification of the ’314 and ’972 patents support its proposed construction.  
13 West points to a portion of the specification that describes a design made on a tungsten ring that  
14 was “not possible using prior art rings making techniques and technologies, because if such  
15 configuration had been made, the peaks 122 would have quickly been eroded, destroying the  
16 aesthetic appearance of the ring.” ’314 patent, col.7 lns.57-65; ’972 patent, col.7 lns.54-61.  
17 Additionally, the patent specifications state that “[t]hese facets are unique to hard metal  
18 configurations in that precious metal is too soft and facet edges formed in such soft metals would  
19 wear off readily with normal everyday use.” ’314 patent, col.8 ln.64-col.9 ln.3; ’972 patent col.8  
20 lns.58-64.

21 Benchmark disputes West’s proposed construction of the term “indestructible.”  
22 Benchmark argues that “indestructible” must cover more than the aesthetic properties of the  
23 ring. It contends that the term cannot refer to the claimed invention not readily wearing down  
24 because this quality is embodied in the term “long wearing” that is used separately in the claim  
25 from “indestructible”. However, Benchmark does not point to any evidence in the specification  
26 showing that the term is directed to the ring itself rather than the aesthetic properties of the ring.

27 The claim asserts that the “hard material” is “long wearing” and “virtually indestructible.”  
28 The hard material is defined in the claim as “an annular finger ring made of a hard material

1 consisting essentially of tungsten carbide.” The claim goes on to state that this annular ring has  
 2 at least one external facet. Similarly, claim 1 of the ’917 patent states that “the hard material  
 3 being long wearing and virtually indestructible during normal use of the finger ring so that each  
 4 facet retains its mirror finish.” Thus, it appears that the claims in fact are describing the retention  
 5 of the aesthetic properties of the ring. Accordingly, the Court will adopt West’s proposed  
 6 construction.

7 b. “During Normal Use”

8 West argues that its definition is supported by the specification. See ‘314 patent, col. 1,  
 9 lns. 39-43; ‘972 patent, col.1 lns.39-43. Benchmark asserts that this term does not require  
 10 construction because it has a common meaning. In view of the arguments and the specification,  
 11 the Court will adopt West’s proposed construction.

12 6. “Without Variations In Its Width”

13 The phrase “without variations in its width” is used in the asserted claims of the ’972  
 14 patent. Independent claim 1 is representative with the highlighted term in bold.

15 1. A finger ring comprising : an annular body made of a sintered hard material  
 16 comprising a predominately tungsten carbide material, wherein the annular body  
 17 has at least two external surfaces that are continuous and of a width sufficient to  
 18 provide each external surface with a facet . . . wherein each facet extends  
 19 concentrically and continuously around the circumference of the ring **without**  
 20 **variations in its width . . .**

21 The parties propose the following construction:

Term	West’s proposed construction	Benchmark’s proposed construction
“without variations in its width”	with no appreciable variations in its distance from side to side when viewed with the naked eye of an ordinary ring wearer	no measurable variation in width

24 The dispute between the parties involves not so much the meaning of the phrase as the  
 25 meaning by which any variation, or lack of it, is to be determined. West’s proposed definition  
 26 states that such variation should be determined visually by the naked eye of the ring wearer.  
 27 Benchmark asserts that any variation should be measured more precisely.

28

1 West identifies language in the specification that it claims supports its argument that the  
2 variation does not need to be laser like precision. *See* '972 patent, col. 7 lns. 56-59; col.8 lns 61-  
3 64. For example, West points to one passage describing facets that states that the “highly  
4 polished facets 121 on the outer surface of the ring create a unique design and visual impression  
5 heretofore not possible using prior art ring making techniques.” '972 patent, col.7 lns.56-59.

6 Benchmark argues that during prosecution of the '972 patent, the examiner cited to a  
7 piece of prior art, U.S. Patent No. 2,050,253 (“Bager”), which taught a ring with a cavity or  
8 groove set to receive an ornamental strip. According to Benchmark, the illustrations in Bager  
9 show a uniform cavity with no variation in width to the naked eye. However, in the remarks,  
10 West asserted that while the illustrations appear to show a uniform-width ring, “it is clear that the  
11 pressing and contracting would necessarily result in modification of the width to introduce  
12 variations therein . . .” According to Benchmark, this means that the variation must be measured  
13 by a means more precise than that taught in Bager. Benchmark also argues that jewelry industry  
14 is by nature based on precise measurements and thus the width of the ring must be subject to  
15 more precise measurement. However, Benchmark provides no evidence to support this assertion.

16 West responds to the argument of prosecution history estoppel based on Bager by noting  
17 that the amendment “refers to a patent that discusses “chasing” of an ornamental strip, meaning  
18 the ornamental strip is mechanically altered to introduce variations in its width.” Plaintiff’s  
19 Reply at 10: 2-4. There appears to be no clear disavowal of scope. Rather, the specification  
20 supports West’s construction. Accordingly, the Court adopts the construction of this term  
21 proposed by West.

22  
23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24  
25  
26 DATED: April 10, 2008

27  
28  
  
JEREMY FOGEL  
United States District Judge

1 This Order has been served on the following persons:

2 \_\_\_\_\_

3 evking@kingandkelleher.com

4 bekins@joneswaldo.com

5 trojan@trojanlawoffices.com

6 evking@kingandkelleher.com

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28