

1 BITA RAHEBI (CA SBN 209351)
brahebi@mofo.com
2 NICHOLAS R. FUNG (CA SBN 312400)
nfunc@mofo.com
3 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
707 Wilshire Boulevard
4 Los Angeles, California 90017-3543
Telephone: (213) 892-5200
5 Facsimile: (213) 892-5454

6 RICHARD S.J. HUNG (CA SBN 197425)
rhung@mofo.com
7 SHAELYN K. DAWSON (CA SBN 288278)
shaelyndawson@mofo.com
8 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
425 Market Street
9 San Francisco, California 94105-2482
Telephone: (415) 268-7000
10 Facsimile: (415) 268-7522

11 Attorneys for Defendant
APPLE INC.

12
13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
14 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
15 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
16

17
18 FIRSTFACE CO., LTD.,
19 Plaintiff,
20 v.
21 APPLE INC.,
22 Defendant.

Case No. 3:18-cv-02245-JD

**DEFENDANT APPLE INC.'S
OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF
FIRSTFACE CO., LTD.'S MOTION
FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY
JUDGMENT; MEMORANDUM OF
POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

Date March 30, 2023
Time: 10:00 a.m.
Place: Courtroom 11
Judge: Hon. James Donato

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1		
2	I.	INTRODUCTION 1
3	II.	FACTUAL BACKGROUND 1
4	A.	Apple 1
5	B.	This Lawsuit..... 2
6	C.	The <i>Inter Partes</i> Review Proceedings 3
7	III.	THE ACCUSED PRODUCTS DO NOT MEET THE “ON/OFF” LIMITATION. 3
8	A.	Firstface’s New “On <i>or</i> Off” Infringement Theory Should Be Stricken. 3
9	B.	The Plain Meaning of the “On/Off” Claim Limitation Means On and Off. 4
10	C.	The Specification and Extrinsic Evidence Confirm that “On/Off” Means On <i>and</i> Off. 5
11	D.	Claim Differentiation Does Not Support Firstface’s Construction..... 6
12	E.	Summary Judgment of Noninfringement Is Appropriate. 7
13	1.	The Accused Products Do Not Satisfy The “On/Off” Limitation..... 7
14	2.	Apple Is Not Judicially Estopped as to the “On/Off” Limitation. 8
15	a.	Apple Did Not Make Inconsistent Statements During IPR. 9
16	b.	Apple Did Not Persuade the PTAB to Adopt a Position Regarding the “On/Off” Limitation. 10
17	c.	It Is Apple, Not Firstface, That Would Be Prejudiced. 10
18	IV.	FIRSTFACE’S MOTION REGARDING THE ATRIX 4G SHOULD BE DENIED..... 10
19	A.	Firstface’s Motion Should Be Denied Because It Does Not Address Apple’s Atrix 4G Obviousness Combinations, Yet Seeks Judgment On Them. 11
20	1.	Apple’s Invalidity Position Is that Atrix 4G Alone <i>or</i> in Combination With Other Art Renders Invalidates the Asserted Claims. 11
21	2.	Firstface Fails To Address Apple’s Obviousness Combinations. 12
22	B.	The On-Sale Bar Does Not Require Performing the Claimed Method Steps. 13
23	C.	Factual Disputes Preclude Summary Judgment as to the Atrix 4G Alone. 14
24	V.	THE APPLE FINGERPRINT PROTOTYPE IS PRIOR ART 15
25	A.	Apple’s Employees Conceived the Apple Fingerprint Prototype. 15
26	B.	One Need Not Show Conception of Elements Already Reduced to Practice. 17
27	C.	Apple Presented Evidence of Actual and Constructive Reduction to Practice. 18
28	D.	Apple Presented Ample Evidence of Diligence. 19
	VI.	IPR ESTOPPEL DOES NOT BAR RELIANCE ON THE IPHONE 3GS AND 4..... 20
	1.	IPR Estoppel at Most Bars System Art that Is Duplicative of Printed Publications. 20

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

2. Firstface Bears the Burden of Proving IPR Estoppel..... 21

3. Firstface Improperly Attempts To Shift Its Burden to Apple. 21

4. Firstface’s Does Not Meet Its Burden of Proving IPR Estoppel. 23

VII. FIRSTFACE’S OWN EXPERT OPENED THE DOOR FOR APPLE’S
ENABLEMENT DEFENSE 25

VIII. CONCLUSION 25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

		Page(s)
1		
2		
3	Cases	
4	<i>3M Innovative Proprs. Co. v. Tredegar Corp.</i> ,	
5	725 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	5
6	<i>Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. v. LG Elecs., Inc.</i> ,	
7	No. 14-cv-1012, 2017 WL 1383271 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 18, 2017).....	9
8	<i>Andersen Corp. v. Fiber Composites, LLC</i> ,	
9	474 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	6, 7
10	<i>Apple Inc. v. Firstface Co.</i> ,	
11	No. 21-1001, 2021 WL 4156323 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 13, 2021)	7
12	<i>Apple Inc. v. Firstface Co.</i> ,	
13	No. IPR2019-00614, Paper 2	23
14	<i>Apple Inc. v. Firstface Co.</i> ,	
15	Nos. IPR2019-00613, Paper 27.....	7
16	<i>Apple Inc. v. Firstface Co.</i> ,	
17	Nos. IPR2019-00614, Paper 27.....	7
18	<i>Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> ,	
19	No. 11-CV-01846, 2012 WL 3155574 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 2, 2012).....	14, 15
20	<i>Baker Hughes, Inc. v. Davis-Lynch, Inc.</i> ,	
21	31 F. App'x 650 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	11
22	<i>BASF Corp. v. SNF Holding Co.</i> ,	
23	955 F.3d 958 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	13
24	<i>Baughman v. Walt Disney World Co.</i> ,	
25	685 F.3d 1131 (9th Cir. 2012).....	9
26	<i>Bourg v. Aetna Inc.</i> ,	
27	628 F. App'x 489 (9th Cir. 2015)	8
28	<i>Cellspin Soft, Inc. v. Fitbit, Inc.</i> ,	
	No. 17-cv-5928, 2022 WL 2784467 (N.D. Cal. June 15, 2022).....	23
	<i>Contour IP Holding, LLC v. Gopro, Inc.</i> ,	
	No. 17-cv-4738, 2020 WL 109063 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 9, 2020).....	21, 24
	<i>DMF, Inc. v. AMP Plus, Inc.</i> ,	
	No. 18-cv-7090, 2021 WL 6499980 (C.D. Cal. May 5, 2021)	21

1	<i>Dow Chem. Co. v. Astro-Valcour, Inc.</i> ,	
2	267 F.3d 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	15, 17
3	<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Cisco Sys. Inc.</i> ,	
4	No. 17-cv-72, 2019 WL 6174936 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 20, 2019)	4
5	<i>Fox Grp., Inc. v. Cree, Inc.</i> ,	
6	700 F.3d 1300 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	16, 17
7	<i>Helsinn Healthcare S.A. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> ,	
8	855 F.3d 1356, 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2017), <i>aff'd</i> 139 S. Ct. 628 (2019)	15
9	<i>Ingenco Holdings, LLC v. ACE Am. Ins. Co.</i> ,	
10	921 F.3d 803 (9th Cir. 2019).....	25
11	<i>Kannuu PTY Ltd. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> ,	
12	15 F.4th 1101 (Fed. Cir. 2021).....	8
13	<i>In re Koninklijke Philips Pat. Litig.</i> ,	
14	No. 18-cv-01885, 2020 WL 7392868 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 13, 2020)	5, 21
15	<i>Kruse Tech. Partnership v. DMAX, Ltd.</i> ,	
16	No. 09-cv-458, 2010 WL 11507591 (C.D. Cal. July 14, 2010),	
17	<i>on reconsideration</i> , 2010 WL 11519252 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 21, 2010)	5
18	<i>Luke v. Family Care & Urgent Med. Clinics</i> ,	
19	246 F. App'x 421 (9th Cir. 2007)	23
20	<i>MBO Labs. v. Becton, Dickinson & Co.</i> ,	
21	602 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	16
22	<i>Microchip Tech. Inc. v. Aptiv Servs. US LLC</i> ,	
23	No. 17-cv-1194, 2020 WL 4335519 (D. Del. July 28, 2020)	21, 24
24	<i>Minton v. Nat'l Ass'n of Sec. Dealers, Inc.</i> ,	
25	336 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	13
26	<i>Mull v. Motion Picture Indus. Health Plan</i> ,	
27	No. CV 12-06693, 2014 WL 1514812 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 4, 2014).....	10
28	<i>New Hampshire v. Maine</i> ,	
	532 U.S. 742 (2001).....	9
	<i>Nike, Inc. v. Skechers U.S.A.</i> ,	
	No. 17-cv-8509, 2020 WL 10486482 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 26, 2020).....	21, 22
	<i>Optical Coating Laboratory, Inc. v. Applied Vision, Ltd.</i> ,	
	No. 96-cv-4689, 1996 WL 53631 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 19, 1996).....	5

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.