

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

Immervision, Inc. v. Apple Inc.

C.A. No. 21-1484 (MN) (CJB) (D. Del. Feb. 11, 2026) · No. C.A. No. 21-1484 (MN) (CJB) · Decided February 11, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Delaware adopts a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation and grants Apple Inc.’s renewed motion for judgment on the pleadings. The court holds that asserted patent claim 21 is a single-means claim and is invalid for lack of enablement under 35 U.S.C. § 112. The court overrules Immervision’s objections and denies the parties’ claim construction motions as moot.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Delaware
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Maryellen Noreika
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Delaware
DECIDED	February 11, 2026
DOCKET	C.A. No. 21-1484 (MN) (CJB)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed de novo a magistrate judge's report and recommendation recommending that Apple prevail on a Rule 12(c) motion for judgment on the pleadings. Immervision objected to the recommendation. The district court overruled the objections, adopted the report, granted Apple's renewed motion for judgment on the pleadings, and denied the parties' claim-construction motions as moot.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the magistrate judge's report and recommendation de novo under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b)(3). For the Rule 12(c) motion, the court applied the Rule 12(b)(6) standard, viewing factual allegations in the light most favorable to the nonmovant and granting relief only when no material issue of fact remained and the movant was entitled to judgment as a matter of law.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Immervision, Inc. v. Apple Inc.

TOPICS

patent law

motion for judgment on the pleadings

commercial litigation

intellectual property

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

patent law

patent enablement

civil procedure

judgment on the pleadings

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether claim 21 is a single-means claim under the means-plus-function requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112.
2. Whether a single-means claim is invalid for lack of enablement without a traditional fact-intensive enablement inquiry.
3. Whether Apple's Rule 12(c) motion and briefing violated the claim-construction briefing limits or scheduling order.

HOLDINGS

1. Claim 21 is a single-means claim because, under the parties' positions and the plain claim language, the optical-means limitation is the only actually claimed element; the additional language merely describes characteristics of that element or the lens's output.
2. Because claim 21 is a single-means claim, it is invalid for lack of enablement; a traditional fact-intensive enablement inquiry is unnecessary in this circumstance.
3. Apple's Rule 12(c) motion and briefing did not violate the claim-construction briefing limits or scheduling order, and the motion was properly considered.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A single-means claim is a means-plus-function claim that claims just one element, not a combination of elements as required by 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 6.” (Discussion § III.B)

“Thus, as the Report correctly concluded, “[c]ourts need not perform the traditional, fact-intensive enablement inquiry in this scenario.”” (Discussion § III.C)

“The fundamental problem for Immervision though is that the single-means analysis must focus on elements the patentee actually claimed, and Immervision did not claim the “implied parts critical to the preamble.”” (Discussion § III.B)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Immervision asserted only dependent claim 21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,844,990, which depends on cancelled claim 17. The parties agreed that claim 21 used means-plus-function format and that the preamble was limiting. Immervision also agreed that the language following the optical-means limitation in claim 17 described

characteristics of that single optical means, and characterized claim 21's compression and expansion language as a property of the lens's output rather than a separate claimed function.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Immervision asserted dependent patent claim 21 against Apple. While claim-construction briefing was pending, Apple moved for judgment on the pleadings, arguing that claim 21 was invalid for lack of enablement because it was a single-means claim. Magistrate Judge Burke recommended granting the motion; after Immervision objected, the district court held oral argument, reviewed the recommendation de novo, adopted it, and entered judgment for Apple.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Wolffington v. Reconstructive Orthopaedic Assocs. II* PC, 935 F.3d 187, 195 (3d Cir. 2019)
- *In re Burlington Coat Factory Secs. Litig.*, 114 F.3d 1410, 1426 (3d Cir. 1997)
- *Gordian Med., Inc. v. Vaughn*, No. 22-319 (MN), 2022 WL 17084125, at *1 (D. Del. Nov. 18, 2022)
- *Barry v. Stryker Corp.*, No. 20-1787 (RGA), 2023 WL 3224498, at *1 (D. Del. May 3, 2023)
- *Rogers v. Wilmington Tr. Co.*, No. 18-116 (CFC), 2019 WL 4596650, at *2 (D. Del. Sept. 23, 2019)
- *You Map, Inc. v. Snap Inc.*, No. 20-162 (CFC), 2021 WL 327388, at *1 (D. Del. Feb. 1, 2021)
- *In re Hyatt*, 708 F.2d 712, 714-15 (Fed. Cir. 1983)
- *Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.*, 9 F. Supp. 3d 1126, 1127-30 (C.D. Cal. 2014)
- *Ex Parte Manabu Iwamoto*, Appeal 2009-004015, 2010 WL 4789630 (B.P.A.I. Nov. 23, 2010)
- *Ex Parte Lev*, No. 2009-004431, 2010 WL 337240, at *6-*7 (B.P.A.I. Jan. 28, 2010)
- *CBT Flint Partners v. Goodmail Systems*, No. 7-3124 (TWT), 2008 WL 3929808, at *6-*7 (N.D. Ga. Aug. 20, 2008)
- *Crystal Semiconductor Corp. v. TriTech Microelectronics Int'l, Inc.*, 246 F.3d 1336, 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2001)
- *Immervision, Inc. v. LG Elecs. U.S.A., Inc.*, No. 18-1630 (MN) (CJB), 2022 WL 903860, at *2 (D. Del. Mar. 28, 2022)