

TRACKTIME, LLC. v. AMAZON.COM SERVS. LLC, Appeal No. 2024-1102 (Fed. Cir. July 2, 2026). Before Prost, Taranto, and Kovner (by designation). Appealed from D. Del. (Judge Noreika).

Background:

TrackTime owns a patent claiming a method and a system used on a mobile device to navigate to certain times within a media file by using a transcript. The patent recited two relevant limitations relating to "executable program code," the first being "configured to facilitate annotation" and the second being "configured to synchronously play [...] multimedia." TrackTime sued Amazon, alleging infringement by the Amazon Music app.

During claim-construction proceedings, Amazon argued that the two limitations were means-plus-function limitations that lacked corresponding structure in the specification. TrackTime replied that relevant artisans would have understood the terms to refer to known code within existing programs. The district court agreed with Amazon, concluding that the disclosure relating to the "executable program code" in the specification was merely generic such that it does not provide corresponding structure, and found that the asserted claims of the patent are invalid for indefiniteness. Before the conclusion of the trial, the Federal Circuit decided another case, *Dyfan*, which held that terms relating to code, being "partly defined by [their] function[s]," may avoid being subject to §112(f) "when coupled with language describing [their] operation" that is understood by relevant artisans to refer to "off-the-shelf code and applications." TrackTime appealed.

Issues/Holdings:

Considering the intervening *Dyfan* decision, does the record support the district court's conclusion that the "executable program code" limitations are subject to §112(f)? No. Vacated and remanded.

Discussion:

TrackTime argued that, under *Dyfan*, recitation of code in combination with the recitation of the "well-understood" functions the code performs is not subject to §112(f). TrackTime further argued that the district court erred in conducting an insufficient analysis of the record. In addition to arguing lack of structure in the specification, Amazon argued that *Dyfan* applied only to recitations of code with functions clearly linked to "off-the-shelf" software and that TrackTime's mobile implementation of the claimed features is described in its own specification as being novel.

The Federal Circuit partly agreed with TrackTime, holding that, under *Dyfan*'s standard, since code is "partly defined by its function," whether software is subject to §112(f) significantly depends on the functions it is claimed to perform and whether there was anything in the claims relevant artisans would understand to disclose how such functions are performed (beyond mere "calling for [] a functional result"). The Federal Circuit held that the district court's analysis of the record was insufficient to make a holding either way because the district court did not conduct *Dyfan*'s inquiry into extra-patent usage that may connote sufficient structure.