

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

SMARTFLASH LLC,

Patent Owner.

Case CBM2015-00028

Patent 7,334,720 B2

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PATENT OWNER’S LIST OF EXHIBITS	ii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. OVERVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,334,720 B2.....	3
III. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE NOT DIRECTED TO A FINANCIAL PRODUCT OR SERVICE.....	5
IV. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OF THE ‘720 PATENT ARE TECHNOLOGICAL INVENTIONS EXEMPT FROM CBM REVIEW	10
V. MR. WECHSELBERGER’S DECLARATION SHOULD BE AFFORDED LITTLE OR NO WEIGHT.....	13
VI. APPLE’S UNTIMELY § 101 CHALLENGE WILL NOT SECURE THE JUST, SPEEDY, AND INEXPENSIVE RESOLUTION OF THE ISSUES SURROUNDING THE ‘720 PATENT.....	15
VII. APPLE’S § 103 OBVIOUSNESS CHALLENGES RAISE SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME PRIOR ART AND ARGUMENTS PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED.....	17
VIII. STEFIK ‘235 and STEFIK ‘980 ARE NOT A SINGLE REFERENCE	23
IX. CONCLUSION.....	25

PATENT OWNER'S LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit Number	Exhibit Description
2001	Congressional Record - House, June 23, 2011, H4480-4505
2002	Congressional Record - Senate, Sep. 8, 2011, S5402-5443
2003-2039	Reserved
2040	Declaration of Anthony Wechselberger in CBM2014-00104
2041	Declaration of Anthony Wechselberger in CBM2014-00105
2042	Patent Owner's Preliminary Response in CBM2014-00104
2043	Patent Owner's Preliminary Response in CBM2014-00105

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.107, Smartflash LLC (“Patent Owner”) files this preliminary response to the corrected petition, setting forth reasons why no new covered business method review of U.S. Patent 7,334,720 B2 should be instituted as requested by Apple, Inc. (“Apple” or “Petitioner”). Arguments presented herein are presented without prejudice to presenting additional arguments in a later response should the Board institute a CBM review.

I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner Apple seeks covered business method (CBM) review of claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Patent No. 7,334,720 B2 (“the ‘720 Patent”). Paper 5 at 1 (“Corrected Petition”). Apple challenges claim 1 on 35 U.S.C. § 103 obviousness grounds. Paper 5 at 1, 19. On March 31, 2014, Apple filed two earlier petitions, in CBM2014-00104 and -00105, also seeking CBM review of claim 1 of the ‘720 Patent on § 103 obviousness grounds. The PTAB denied review of claim 1 (among others) on § 103 obviousness grounds in both instances. *Apple Inc. v. Smartflash LLC*, Case CBM2014-00104 Paper 9 at 4, 15 (PTAB September 30, 2014) and Case CBM2014-00105, Paper 9 at 3, 15 (PTAB September 30, 2014).

Here, Apple re-raises its obviousness challenge to claim 1, relying on five pieces of prior art: three of which (Stefik ‘235, Stefik ‘980, and Maari) are the same prior art raised in both CBM2014-00104 and -00105; and two of which (Ahmad and Kopp) are “additional prior art” Apple “now identifies” “in light of

the Board's Decision." Corrected Petition at 2. The Petition alleges that Ahmad (a U.S. Patent issues in 1999) "was not known to Petitioner at the time of the original petitions." *Id.* However, such an assertion is not supported by any declaration from Petitioner. Moreover, Petitioner does not allege that Ahmad was not available, nor does it allege that Kopp (a U.S. Patent issued in 1999) was not known or not available to it when it filed its earlier petitions.

The Board should again deny review of claim 1 on Apple's § 103 obviousness grounds because the Corrected Petition "raises substantially the same prior art or arguments previously presented" and rejected by the Board in CBM2014-00104 and -00105. See, *Unilever, Inc. v. The Proctor & Gamble Company*, Case IPR2014-00506, Paper 17 at 6 (PTAB July 7, 2014)(Decision, Denying Institution of *Inter Partes* Review)(quoting 35 U.S.C. § 325(d)). In fact, in the face of serial petitions by other Petitioners, the Board has already held that the Board's "resources are better spent addressing matters other than [a Petitioner's] second attempt to raise a plurality of duplicative grounds against the same patent claims." *Conopco, Inc. dba Unilever v. The Proctor & Gamble Company*, Case IPR2014-00628, Paper 21 at 21 (PTAB October 20, 2014)(Decision, Declining Institution of *Inter Partes* Review).

In the instant petition, Apple also raises for the first time a 35 U.S.C. § 101 statutory subject matter challenge to claims 1 and 2 of the '720 Patent. Corrected

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.