

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE, INC.
Petitioner,

v.

EVOLUTIONARY INTELLIGENCE, LLC,
Patent Owner

Case IPR 2014-0086
Patent No. 7,010,536

PRELIMINARY RESPONSE BY PATENT OWNER

UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND	5
II. OVERVIEW OF THE ASSERTED PRIOR ART	9
III. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED.....	10
A. The Petition Fails To Explain the Relevance Of The References To The Claims As Required By 37 C.F.R. § 104(b)(5).....	10
B. The Petition Violates Rule 42.6 By Incorporating the Substance of Its Arguments By Reference	14
C. The Prior Art Raised in the Petition is Cumulative with the Prior Art Asserted by the Petitioner in Another Petition.	18
D. There Is No Reasonable Likelihood of the Claims Being Invalidated.	20
1. The Petitioner Fails to Construe and/or Incorrectly Construes Terms Material to all Claims.	20
a. “Container”	23
b. “Register”	25
c. “Gateway”	27
d. “Encapsulated”/”Encapsulating”	29
e. ““Active Space Register” / “Passive Space Register” / “Neutral Space Register”	30
f. “Acquire Register”	31

2. There Is No Reasonable Likelihood Of Claims 2-14 or 16 Being Anticipated
by Gibbs (Ex. 1006). 31

IV. CONCLUSION 33

**PRELIMINARY RESPONSE BY PATENT
OWNER UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

Patent Owner Evolutionary Intelligence LLC hereby respectfully submits this Preliminary Response to the Petition seeking *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 7,010,536.

The Petition is deficient and relies on prior art references that are entirely distinct from the '536 patent. The Petition should be rejected for four independent reasons. First, the Petition fails to explain the relevance of the prior art to the claims as required by 37 C.F.R. § 104(b)(5), including failing to establish that the prior art discloses all elements “arranged as in the claims.” Second, the Petition is deficient because it violates 37 C.F.R. 42.6(a)(3)’s strict prohibition against incorporating other arguments by reference. Third, the Petition relies on prior art that is cumulative of prior art raised in another pending petition filed by Petitioner, as well as with prior art considered during the prosecution of the underlying application. Finally, even setting aside these critical defects, the Petition should be rejected on the merits, because it fails to demonstrate a reasonable likelihood of any claims being invalid—particularly because it relies on unreasonably broad constructions for and fails to construe terms that are material to all of the claims at issue. For at least these reasons, the Petition does not show a reasonable likelihood of prevailing with respect to any of the challenged claims, and *inter partes* review should not be instituted.

This filing is timely under 35 U.S.C. § 313 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.107, as it is being filed within three months of the October 29, 2013 mailing date of the Notice granting the Petition a filing date of October 23, 2013.

I. Technology Background

The '536 patent describes a “System and Method for Creating and Manipulating Information Containers With Dynamic Registers.” The invention is directed at improving the processing of “containerized” data, such as the data that makes up web pages and documents. At the time of the invention, processing information resources on a computer network (e.g., the internet) was primarily static, in that the processing did not result in dynamic modifications that would improve future processing efforts. For example, the searching of data was “accomplished by individuals directing a search effort by submitting key words or phrases to be compared to those key words or phrases contained in the content or description of that information resource, with indices and contents residing in a fixed location unchanging except by human input.” Ex. 1001 at 1:22-28. As the '536 patent notes, this “static” information model was limited, because, *inter alia*, the information being processed did not evolve to reflect its actual utility to the people using it, and successful search strategies were not available to be used to process future searches. Ex. 1001 at 1:37-2:48. At most, the prior art allowed “hits” for a given web page to be tracked—a static process. *See* Ex. 1001, 2:8-13.

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.