

# EXHIBIT 6

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

FITBIT, INC.,

Petitioner

v.

PHILIPS NORTH AMERICA LLC,

Patent Owner

---

Case No. IPR2020-00828

U.S. Patent No. 8,277,377

---

**PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE  
UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 313 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	BACKGROUND .....	4
	A. The '377 Patent .....	4
	1. The Patented Technology .....	4
	2. Challenged Claims .....	8
	3. Prosecution History .....	9
	B. The Parties' Related District Court Litigation .....	15
III.	THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION PURSANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 314(a) .....	16
	A. The <i>Fintiv</i> Factors Weigh Against Institution .....	19
	1. Petitioner Has Not Sought to Stay the Fitbit Litigation .....	19
	2. The Progression of the Fitbit and Garmin Litigations Weigh Heavily in Favor of Denial .....	19
	3. The District Courts and the Parties Have Invested a Significant Amount of Resources in the District Court Litigations .....	21
	4. The Issues Raised in the Petition Will Be Resolved by the District Court Litigations .....	22
	5. Petitioner Is Also a Party to the Fitbit Litigation .....	22
	6. The Weakness of the Petition Also Weighs in Favor of Denying Institution .....	23
IV.	THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE IT FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS .....	23
	A. Ground 1 .....	23

IPR2020-00828

Patent Owner Preliminary Response

1. The Asserted Prior Art .....23

2. The Petition Fails to Show Why a POSA Would Have Been Motivated to Combined Browne, Ausems and Hsu .....33

3. The Petition Fails to Show How the Browne-Ausems-Hsu Combination Discloses Would Have Included All Features of the Challenged Claims .....44

B. Ground 2.....46

1. The Asserted Prior Art .....46

2. The Petition Fails to Show Why a POSA Would Have Been Motivated to Combine Hickman With Theimer.....52

3. The Petition Fails to Show How the Hickman-Theimer Combination Discloses Would Have Included All Features of the Challenged Claims .....58

C. Ground 3.....60

1. Vaisanen.....60

2. For the Same Reasons as Explained Above for Ground 2, Ground 3 Fails.....60

V. BOTH GROUNDS SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER § 325(d) .....60

A. Discretionary Denial Is Appropriate for Ground 1 .....61

1. *Advanced Bionics Prong 1* .....61

2. *Advanced Bionics Prong 2* .....66

B. The Petition Fails to Show Why a § 325(d) Denial Would Not Be Appropriate With Respect to Ground 2 .....67

VI. CONCLUSION.....68

**EXHIBITS**

Exhibit No.	Description
2001	Complaint for Patent Infringement, filed July 22, 2019 in <i>Philips North America LLC v. Fitbit, Inc.</i> , Case 1:19-cv-11586 (D. Mass.)
2002	Defendant Fitbit, Inc.'s Renewed Rule 12(b)(6) Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff Philips North America LLC's First Amended Complaint Under 35 U.S.C. § 101, filed Dec. 12, 2019 in <i>Philips North America LLC v. Fitbit, Inc.</i> , Case 1:19-cv-11586 (D. Mass.)
2003	Scheduling Order filed Mar. 25, 2020 in <i>Philips North America LLC v. Fitbit, Inc.</i> , Case 1:19-cv-11586 (D. Mass.)
2004	Garmin's P.R. 3-3 Disclosures, in <i>Philips North America LLC v. Garmin International, Inc. and Garmin Ltd.</i> , Case No. 2:19-cv-06301-AB-KS (C.D. Cal.)
2005	Defendant Fitbit's Invalidity and Noninfringement Contentions, March 13, 2020, <i>Philips North America LLC v. Fitbit, Inc.</i> , Case 1:19-cv-11586 (D. Mass.)
2006	Text Only Scheduling Notice dated July 28, 2020, in <i>Philips North America LLC v. Garmin International, Inc. and Garmin Ltd.</i> , Case No. 2:19-cv-06301-AB-KS (C.D. Cal.)
2007	Order Re: Jury/Court Trial filed Jan. 8, 2020, in <i>Philips North America LLC v. Garmin International, Inc. and Garmin Ltd.</i> , Case No. 2:19-cv-06301-AB-KS (C.D. Cal.)
2008	Notice Resetting a Hearing filed June 4, 2020, in <i>Philips North America LLC v. Fitbit, Inc.</i> , Case 1:19-cv-11586 (D. Mass.)
2009	Excerpt from Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary Third Edition (1997)
2010	U.S. Patent No. 6,013,007 (Root et al.)
2011	U.S. Patent No. 6,790,178 (Mault)

# 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.