

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APPLE INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

SMARTFLASH LLC,

Patent Owner.

---

Case CBM2015-00031

Patent 8,336,772

---

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. 8,336,772 ..... 3

III. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE NOT DIRECTED TO A FINANCIAL PRODUCT OR SERVICE..... 5

IV. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OF THE ‘772 PATENT ARE TECHNOLOGICAL INVENTIONS EXEMPT FROM CBM REVIEW .... 11

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 ‘772 PATENT..... 14

VII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ..... 17

VIII. APPLE’S § 103 OBVIOUSNESS CHALLENGES RAISE SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME PRIOR ART AND ARGUMENTS PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED..... 18

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
2003-2043	Reserved
2044	Declaration of Anthony Wechselberger in CBM2014-00110
2045	Declaration of Anthony Wechselberger in CBM2014-00111
2046	Patent Owner's Preliminary Response in CBM2014-00110
2047	Patent Owner's Preliminary Response in CBM2014-00111

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 8,336,772 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, 5, 8, and 10 of U.S. Patent No. 8,336,772 (“the ‘772 Patent”). Paper 5 at 1 (“Corrected Petition”). Apple challenges claims 1, 5, 8, and 10 on 35 U.S.C. §101 statutory subject matter grounds and § 103 obviousness grounds. Corrected Petition at 1, 17.

On April 3, 2014, Apple filed two earlier petitions, in CBM2014-00110 and -00111, also seeking CBM review of claims 1, 5, 8, and 10 of the ‘772 Patent on § 103 obviousness grounds. The PTAB denied review of claims 1, 5, 8, and 10 (among others) on § 103 obviousness grounds in both instances. *Apple Inc. v. Smartflash LLC*, Case CBM2014-00110 Paper 7 at 3, 19 (PTAB September 30, 2014) (*Decision Denying Institution of Covered Business Method Patent Review*) and Case CBM2014-00111, Paper 7 at 3, 21 (PTAB September 30, 2014) (*Decision Denying Institution of Covered Business Method Patent Review*).

Here, Apple re-raises its obviousness challenge to claims 1, 5, 8, and 10, relying on four pieces of prior art: two of which (Poggio, and Sato) are the same prior art raised in CBM2014-00110, three of which (Ginter, Poggio, and Sato) are the same prior art raised in CBM2014-00111; and one of which (Subler) is “additional prior art” Apple “now identifies” “in light of the Board’s Decision.” Corrected Petition at 2. Apple does not allege that Subler, a U.S. Patent issued in 1997, was not known or not available to it when it filed its earlier petitions.

The Board should again deny review of claims 1, 5, 8, and 10 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 CBM2014-00110 and -00111. 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).

# 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.