

**Exhibit E - US Patent No. 6,933,929****Agreed Constructions**

<b>Claim Term, Phrase, or Clause</b>	<b>Agreed Construction</b>
“about the periphery of the opening” (claim 10)	“around the edges of the opening”

**Disputed Constructions**

<b>Claim Term, Phrase, or Clause</b>	<b>Apple’s Proposed Construction</b>	<b>Intrinsic Evidence</b>	<b>Extrinsic Evidence</b>	<b>Elan’s Proposed Construction</b>	<b>Intrinsic Evidence</b>	<b>Extrinsic Evidence</b>
“wall” (claim 10)	No construction necessary.	Claim 10; Fig. 4A; Fig. 4B; 8:18-26; APEL0001548-49; APEL0001560		upright surfaces of the recess and the opening; thickness of a device housing	Col. 8:27-31; Figs. 4A-4B; Claims 10 and 14; and associated text. ‘929 patent prosecution history including but not limited to the 7/15/2003 office action pp. 3-6, the 3/22/2004 amendments and response pp. 2-7, the 6/28/2004 office action pp. 2-5, the 9/2/2004	Mr. Dezmelyk is expected to provide testimony regarding how one skilled in the art would have read and understood the disputed claim terms. U.S. Patent No. 5,920,310 to Faggin <i>et al.</i> (Bates No. ELN015937-015950); U.S. Patent No.

Claim Term, Phrase, or Clause	Apple's Proposed Construction	Intrinsic Evidence	Extrinsic Evidence	Elan's Proposed Construction	Intrinsic Evidence	Extrinsic Evidence
					amendments and response pp. 2-9, the 12/3/2004 amendments and response pp. 2-8, and references cited therein.	6,262,717 to Donohue <i>et al.</i> (Bates No. ELN016046-016061); U.S. Patent No. 6,219,038 to Cho (Bates No. ELN016036-016045); U.S. Patent No. 6,392,637 to Liao <i>et al.</i> (Bates No. ELN016117-016127); and U.S. Patent No. RE40,323 to Bae (Bates No. ELN016626-016640) as cited in Elan's Invalidity Contentions.
"substantially flush" (claim 12)	No construction necessary.	Claim 12; Fig. 4A; 1:47-56; 8:7-17; 8:60-9:7; APEL0001509; APEL0001560		largely but not wholly even or same-level	Col. 8:15-17; 8:62-65; 9:5-7; 9:12-16; 9:26-33; 12:35-39; Figs. 4A-4B; Claims 1, 12 and	Mr. Dezmelyk is expected to provide testimony regarding how one skilled in the

Claim Term, Phrase, or Clause	Apple's Proposed Construction	Intrinsic Evidence	Extrinsic Evidence	Elan's Proposed Construction	Intrinsic Evidence	Extrinsic Evidence
					22; and associated text. '929 patent prosecution history including but not limited to the 7/15/2003 office action pp. 3-6, the 3/22/2004 amendments and response pp. 2-7, the 6/28/2004 office action pp. 2-5, the 9/2/2004 amendments and response pp. 2-9, the 12/3/2004 amendments and response pp. 2-8, and references cited therein	art would have read and understood the disputed claim terms. U.S. Patent No. 5,920,310 to Faggin <i>et al.</i> (Bates No. ELN015937-015950); U.S. Patent No. 6,219,038 to Cho (Bates No. ELN016036-016045); U.S. Patent No. 6,392,637 to Liao <i>et al.</i> (Bates No. ELN016117-016127); and U.S. Patent No. RE40,323 to Bae (Bates No. ELN016626-016640) as cited in Elan's Invalidity Contentions.

Claim Term, Phrase, or Clause	Apple's Proposed Construction	Intrinsic Evidence	Extrinsic Evidence	Elan's Proposed Construction	Intrinsic Evidence	Extrinsic Evidence
"housing" (claims 10, 12, 14, 15, 17)	No construction necessary.	Claim 10; Claim 12; Claim 14; Claim 15; Claim 17; Fig. 4A; Fig. 4B ; 1:22-24; 1:38-46; 1:47-56; 2:44-56; 3:1-6; 7:57-8:17; 8:18-26; 8:27-46; 8:60-9:7; 9:8-23; 9:24-33		a rigid structure enclosing the components and circuitry of a device; a "bracket structure" supporting a trackpad from the inside of the device enclosure is not a "housing"	Cols. 1:18-20; 1:22-30; 1:38-56; 2:19-28; 3:1-6; 7:61-8:6; 8:7-16; 8:20-31; 9:5-7; 9:10-16; 9:26-33; Abstract; Figs. 4A-4B; Claims 1, 7-10, 12-15, 18 and 21-24; and associated text. '929 patent prosecution history including but not limited to the 7/15/2003 office action pp. 3-6, the 3/22/2004 amendments and response pp. 2-7, the 6/28/2004 office action pp. 2-5, the 9/2/2004 amendments and response pp. 2-9, the 12/3/2004 amendments and response pp. 2-8,	Mr. Dezmelyk is expected to provide testimony regarding how one skilled in the art would have read and understood the disputed claim terms. U.S. Patent No. 5,920,310 to Faggin <i>et al.</i> (Bates No. ELN015937-015950); U.S. Patent No. 6,262,717 to Donohue <i>et al.</i> (Bates No. ELN016046-016061); U.S. Patent No. 6,219,038 to Cho (Bates No. ELN016036-016045); U.S. Patent No. 6,392,637 to

Claim Term, Phrase, or Clause	Apple's Proposed Construction	Intrinsic Evidence	Extrinsic Evidence	Elan's Proposed Construction	Intrinsic Evidence	Extrinsic Evidence
					and references cited therein.	Liao <i>et al.</i> (Bates No. ELN016117-016127); and U.S. Patent No. RE40,323 to Bae (Bates No. ELN016626-016640) as cited in Elan's Invalidity Contentions. <i>McGraw-Hill Dictionary of Scientific and Technical Terms, Third Edition</i> , p.769 (Bates Nos. ELN017232-34).
"track pad label" (claims 13, 15)	"a protective label that is placed over the touch pad"	Claim 13; Claim 15; Fig. 4A; 8:7-17; 8:18-26; 8:47-59; 8:60-9:7; 9:8-23; APEL0001532-33	Apple may provide expert testimony regarding how one skilled in the art would have read and understood the disputed claim terms.	a protective covering over the track pad	Cols. 8:20-24; 8:38-46; 8:50-59; 8:65-9:18; Figs. 4A-4B; Claims 1, 4-5, 7-9, 13-15 and 21-24; and associated text. '929 patent prosecution	Mr. Dezmelyk is expected to provide testimony regarding how one skilled in the art would have read and understood the disputed claim

Claim Term, Phrase, or Clause	Apple's Proposed Construction	Intrinsic Evidence	Extrinsic Evidence	Elan's Proposed Construction	Intrinsic Evidence	Extrinsic Evidence
					history including but not limited to the 7/15/2003 office action pp. 3-6, the 3/22/2004 amendments and response pp. 2-7, the 6/28/2004 office action pp. 2-5, the 9/2/2004 amendments and response pp. 2-9, the 12/3/2004 amendments and response pp. 2-8, and references cited therein.	terms. U.S. Patent No. 6,262,717 to Donohue <i>et al.</i> (Bates No. ELN016046-016061); U.S. Patent No. 6,219,038 to Cho (Bates No. ELN016036-016045); and U.S. Patent No. 6,392,637 to Liao <i>et al.</i> (Bates No. ELN016117-016127) as cited in Elan's Invalidity Contentions.
"substantially the same thickness" (claim 16)	No construction necessary.	Claim 16; 8:27-46; 8:60-9:7		largely but not wholly the same in thickness	Cols.1:52-56; 8:2-6; 8:43-46; Figs. 4A-4B; Claims 16 and 21; and associated text. '929 patent prosecution history including	Mr. Dezmelyk is expected to provide testimony regarding how one skilled in the art would have read and understood the

Claim Term, Phrase, or Clause	Apple's Proposed Construction	Intrinsic Evidence	Extrinsic Evidence	Elan's Proposed Construction	Intrinsic Evidence	Extrinsic Evidence
					<p>but not limited to the 7/15/2003 office action pp. 3-6, the 3/22/2004 amendments and response pp. 2-7, the 6/28/2004 office action pp. 2-5, the 9/2/2004 amendments and response pp. 2-9, the 12/3/2004 amendments and response pp. 2-8, and references cited therein</p>	<p>disputed claim terms. U.S. Patent No. 5,920,310 to Faggin <i>et al.</i> (Bates No. ELN015937-015950); U.S. Patent No. 6,219,038 to Cho (Bates No. ELN016036-016045); U.S. Patent No. 6,392,637 to Liao <i>et al.</i> (Bates No. ELN016117-016127); U.S. Patent No. RE40,323 to Bae (Bates No. ELN016626-016640) as cited in Elan's Invalidity Contentions.</p>