

United States District Court,
W.D. Michigan, Southern Division.

WHIRLPOOL CORPORATION and Whirlpool Patents Company,
Plaintiffs and Counter-Defendants.

v.

LG ELECTRONICS, INC,
Defendant and Counter-Claimant.

LG Electronics, U.S.A., Inc,
Defendant and Counter-Claimant.

General Electric Company,
Defendant and Counter-Claimant.

No. 1:04-CV-100

Nov. 8, 2005.

Anthoula Pomrening, Daniel A. Boehnen, Donald Louis Zuhn, Jr., Sean Michael Sullivan, Christopher Michael Cavan, Nicole Keenan, McDonnell, Boehnen, Hulbert & Berghoff, Chicago, IL, Mary C. Bonnema, G. Thomas Williams, McGarry, Bair, PC, Grand Rapids, MI, for Plaintiffs.

Andrew Chanho Sonu, Gerson S. Panitch, John Matthew Williamson, Parmanand K. Sharma, Richard Lee Stroup, Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP, Washington, DC, Bryan R. Walters, Peter A. Smit, Varnum, Riddering, Schmidt & Howlett, LLP, Grand Rapids, MI, Charles Suh, Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP, Reston, VA, for Defendant.

ORDER CONSTRUING TERMS

ROBERT HOLMES BELL, Chief Judge.

In accordance with the opinion entered this date,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the disputed terms in U.S. Patent No. 6,212,722 (the '722 Patent") are construed as follows:

* "dragged" and in Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 10, 17, 18, 25, 28 is construed as "pulled with friction";

* "drag forces" in Claims 14, 19 is construed as "forces that pull with friction";

* "above" in Claims 1-3, 6, 8-11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 25, 28, 31 is construed as "over";

* the corresponding structure for "means for supplying a quantity of wash liquid" in Claims 27 and 29 is not adequately disclosed;

- * the corresponding structure for "means for oscillating the impeller" in Claim 28 is "a power transmission device and motor," or, alternatively, "a direct drive type power transmission system";
- * the corresponding structure for "means for impeding the angular movement of the cloth items" in Claim 28 is "a plurality of protrusions"; and
- * the corresponding structure for "means for balancing the forces" in Claim 31 is not adequately disclosed.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the disputed terms in U.S. Patent No. 4,784,666 ("the '666 Patent") are construed as follows:

- * the corresponding structure for "means for providing agitation" in Claim 13 is "a device that moves cloth items to and fro";
- * "passing ... through said wash load" in Claim 13 is construed as "passing [detergent solution] through the wash load, not merely over or around";
- * "passing an amount ... in excess of that necessary to saturate the wash load" in Claim 13 is construed as "continuously passing a concentrated detergent solution so that the total amount passed through would be greater than the amount necessary to saturate the wash load";
- * "passing ... without mechanically agitating said wash load" in Claim 13 is construed as "without using a means for providing agitation to agitate the wash load"; and
- * "said wash load is agitated" in Claim 14 is construed as "moving the wash load to and fro."

W.D.Mich.,2005.

Whirlpool Corp. v. LG Electronics, Inc.

Produced by Sans Paper, LLC.