

1 BITA RAHEBI (CA SBN 209351)
 brahebi@mofo.com
 2 ALEX S. YAP (CA SBN 241400)
 ayap@mofo.com
 3 NICHOLAS R. FUNG (CA SBN 312400)
 nfung@mofo.com
 4 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
 707 Wilshire Boulevard
 5 Los Angeles, California 90017-3543
 Telephone: (213) 892-5200
 6 Facsimile: (213) 892-5454

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

12 Attorneys for Defendant
 APPLE INC.

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

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

Case No. 3:18-cv-02245-JD
**DEFENDANT APPLE’S REPLY IN
 SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION FOR
 SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
1		
2		
3	I. INTRODUCTION	1
4	II. ARGUMENT	2
5	A. The Asserted Claims Lack Written Description Support.....	2
6	1. Firstface’s Citations Do Not Support Performing Fingerprint	
7	Authentication Without “Additional User Input”	2
8	2. Firstface’s Reliance on Other Functions Reinforces Its Written Description	
9	Problem	3
10	3. What the Inventors Silently Knew and Whether the Claims Were Allowed	
11	Do Not Show Possession	4
12	4. Dr. Almeroth’s Opinions Do Not Cure the Lack of Written Description....	4
13	5. Dr. Cockburn’s Obviousness Opinions Do Not Conflict.....	6
14	6. The Specification Does Not Disclose Further Turning on the Display	6
15	7. The Korean Application’s Priority Date Does Not Help Firstface	7
16	B. Firstface Cannot Recover for Pre-Suit Inducement	8
17	C. The Accused Products Lack a “Power Button for Pressing to Turn On/Off the	
18	Terminal,” as All Asserted Claims Require.....	8
19	1. Pressing the “Top,” “Side,” or Sleep/wake” Button Undisputedly Is	
20	Insufficient to Turn Off the Accused Products	8
21	2. Firstface’s New “On <i>or</i> Off” Theory Should Be Stricken	9
22	3. Apple Did Not Waive Its Ensnarement Defense.....	10
23	4. Firstface Never Carried Its Burden to Present a Hypothetical Claim	11
24	5. Even if Firstface Could Allege Equivalents, No Genuine Issues of Material	
25	Fact Preclude Summary Judgment in Apple’s Favor.....	12
26	D. The Accused Products Do Not Satisfy the “Without Additional User Input” or	
27	“One-Time Pressing” Limitations.....	13
28	1. The Accused Products Undisputedly Require Both Touching with Human	
	Flesh <i>and</i> Pressing for Fingerprint Authentication.	13
	2. Firstface’s Expert and Counterarguments Confirm Non-Infringement	13
	3. Dr. Cockburn’s Opinions Do Not “Undermine” Non-Infringement.....	13
	III. CONCLUSION	14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES1
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**Page(s)****Cases**

<i>Apple Inc. v. Firstface Co., Ltd.</i> , 2021 WL 4156323 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 13, 2021).....	4
<i>Cellspin Soft, Inc. v. Fitbit, Inc.</i> , 2022 WL 2784467 (N.D. Cal. June 15, 2022)	5, 8
<i>Golden Bridge Tech., Inc. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 758 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	5
<i>Jang v. Boston Sci. Corp.</i> , 872 F.3d 1275 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	11
<i>Lockwood v. Am. Airlines</i> , 107 F.3d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	3, 5
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. i4i Ltd. P’ship</i> , 131 S. Ct. 2238 (2011)	8
<i>O2 Micro Int’l, Ltd. v. Monolithic Power Sys.</i> , 467 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	5
<i>Raytheon Co. v. Cray, Inc.</i> , 330 F.R.D. 525 (W.D. Wis. 2019)	8
<i>Rivera v. ITC</i> , 857 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	5
<i>Sonos, Inc. v. Google LLC</i> , 591 F. Supp. 3d 638 (N.D. Cal. 2022)	9
<i>Veloz v. Pac. Gas & Elec. Co.</i> , 2014 WL 1865786 (N.D. Cal. May 8, 2014)	5
<i>ZapFraud, Inc. v. Barracuda Networks, Inc.</i> , 528 F. Supp. 3d 247 (D. Del. 2021).....	9

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Firstface’s opposition confirms that summary judgment in Apple’s favor is proper.

3 On written description, Firstface does not dispute its expert’s concession that “the
4 specification does not explicitly state that fingerprint authentication is performed without
5 additional user input.” (D.I. 221-8 (“Almeroth Reb. Rpt.”), ¶ 1154.) Although Firstface offers a
6 hodge-podge of citations to try to avoid invalidity, only one discusses fingerprint authentication at
7 all. None discloses activating the display and performing fingerprint authentication in response to
8 a single button press without additional user input. At its core, Firstface’s position is that the
9 skilled artisan would have found that functionality to be obvious—but that is legally insufficient.

10 On infringement of the “power button” limitation, Firstface’s concessions also doom its
11 infringement positions. Firstface openly admits that pressing the “top,” “side,” or “sleep/wake”
12 button will not, in fact, power off the accused devices. Instead, the user must “press[] and hold[]
13 the button and then slide a slider on the device touchscreen” to do so. (D.I. 255 (“Opp.”) at 3.)
14 Apple thus does not literally infringe. Firstface’s belated attempt to construe “on/off” during
15 expert discovery and its failure to conduct a hypothetical claim analysis also defeat its
16 infringement position. Firstface’s construction for “on/off” as “on or off” further is wrong on the
17 merits. As for equivalents, Firstface does not dispute its expert’s admission that pressing a button
18 alone is “simpler and less cumbersome” than pressing and sliding. (*Id.* at 7.) Nor does Firstface
19 dispute that pressing and sliding is a “substantially different way” of turning off a device.

20 On infringement of the “without additional user input” limitation, Firstface’s expert’s
21 concessions again are fatal. Although Firstface contends that it would be “nonsensical” to
22 characterize a button press using a finger as two separate inputs, its source code expert Nigel
23 Jones has admitted that the Accused Products operate in exactly this way: “Upon detection of a
24 finger on the sensor *following a button press*, . . . an unlock sequence starts to ensure the
25 fingerprint is properly matched.” (D.I. 221-6, ¶ 91 (emphasis added).) Because there are no
26 genuine disputed facts as to how the Accused Products operate, Apple is entitled to summary
27 judgment of non-infringement for this reason as well.

28 Finally, on indirect infringement, Firstface effectively concedes that Apple lacked pre-suit

1 knowledge of the patents, as it has agreed to forego claims for pre-suit damages. Apple therefore
2 requests summary judgment of no indirect infringement as to at least pre-suit inducement.

3 **II. ARGUMENT**

4 **A. The Asserted Claims Lack Written Description Support**

5 Firstface overcame Apple’s IPR challenges to the few surviving claims based on the
6 “without additional user input” limitation. But Firstface first added that limitation in 2015, three
7 years after the alleged priority date. It therefore struggles to identify specification support for this
8 limitation. That lack of support renders the patents invalid.

9 10 **1. Firstface’s Citations Do Not Support Performing Fingerprint Authentication Without “Additional User Input”**

11 Both experts agree that the specification does not expressly refer to performing any
12 function—whether fingerprint authentication or otherwise—“without additional user input.” (D.I.
13 221-28 (“Cockburn Op. Rpt.”), ¶¶ 3003, 3004; D.I. 221-8, ¶ 1152.) Lacking such an express
14 disclosure, Firstface offers a mish-mash of citations to try to save its claims. (Opp. at 13-14.)

15 None of those citations helps Firstface. Only one refers to “fingerprint recognition”—as
16 part of a long list of authentication methods. (D.I. 221-22 (“’373 patent”), 8:13-20). As for its
17 other citations (4:36-40; 4:51-53; 4:61-65; 4:65-5:2; 5:52-55; 7:16-17; 8:7-12), all at most
18 describe pressing a button to perform a function. (Opp. at 13-14.). None discusses performing a
19 function, much less fingerprint authentication, without additional user input.

20 To evade summary judgment, Firstface newly argues that the specification describes
21 “benefits of performing the functions in response to a one-time press of the activation button.”
22 (Opp. at 14 (citing ’373 patent, 1:34-41; 9:29-33; 11:61-65; 12:4-7).) As an initial matter,
23 Firstface did not disclose this argument or the allegedly supportive citations in related
24 interrogatory responses or in its expert’s report. Firstface therefore has waived this argument.
25 *See Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*, No. 11-cv-1846, 2012 WL 3155574, at *7 (N.D. Cal. Aug.
26 2, 2012) (barring reliance on theories not disclosed in interrogatory responses).

27 But even if otherwise, the referenced “benefits” are agnostic as to whether fingerprint
28 authentication is performed with additional user input. For example, whether a manufacturer

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.