UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC., GOOGLE INC., AND MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC Petitioners v.

ARENDI S.A.R.L. Patent Owner

Patent No. 7,917,843 Issue Date: February 24, 2009

Title: METHOD, SYSTEM AND COMPUTER READABLE MEDIUM FOR ADDRESSING HANDLING FROM A COMPUTER PROGRAM

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2014-00208

PETITIONERS' REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE



TABLE OF CONTENTS

				Page	
TAB	BLE OI	F AUT	HORITIES	ii	
PET	ITION	IERS' 1	EXHIBIT LIST	iii	
I.	INT	RODU	CTION	1	
II.	REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S ARGUMENTS4				
	A.	Pand	lit Renders The Challenged Claims Obvious	4	
		1.	The Retrieved Definition or Other Information ("Second Information") in Pandit Is Related to the Type of "First Information"		
		2.	Reliance on the Common Sense and Knowledge of One of Ordinary Skill in the Art Is Not Only Appropriate, It Is Necessary		
		3.	The Patent Owner Misapplies Federal Circuit Law in Arguing that Common Sense Has No Role in the Obviousness Analysis	10	
		4.	Searching for Duplicates Is a Simple Method Known to a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art		
		5.	Searching For Duplicates Need Not Rely on the Use of a Name		
TTT	CON		SION	15	



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES	Page(s)
I/P Engine, Inc. v. AOL Inc., No. 2013-1307, 2014 U.S. App. LEXIS 15667, at *17-18 (Fed. Cir. Aug. 15, 2014)	12
DyStar Textilfarben GmbH & Co. v. C.H. Patrick Co., 464 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	12
Eizo Corp. v. Barco N.V. IPR2014-00358, 2014 WL 3704253, at *9, (PTAB July 23, 2014)	3, 11
K/S HIMPP v. Hear-Wear Techs., LLC, 751 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	3
KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	8, 12
Perfect Web Technologies, Inc. v. InfoUSA, Inc., 587 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	2, 3, 9
SIBIA Neurosciences, Inc. v. Cadus Pharmaceutical Corp., 225 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	10
OTHER AUTHORITIES	
27 C E D & 42 22	1



Petitioners' Exhibit List for Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,496,843

Exhibit Description	Exhibit #
U.S. Patent No. 7,917,843 to Hedloy	1001
Declaration of Dr. Daniel A. Menascé	1002
Amendment dated January 24, 2008	1003
Non Final Office Action dated October 24, 2008	1004
Amendment dated December 8, 2010	1005
SIGCHI Bulletin (April 1998) at 51-63	1006
U.S. Patent No. 5,946,647 to Miller et al.	1007
U.S. Patent No. 5,644,735 to Luciw et al.	1008
U.S. Patent No. 5,859,636 to Pandit et al.	1009
SIGCHI Bulletin (April 1998) at 53-63 (web version)	1010
Declaration of Julie S. Turner	1011
Declaration of Robert Kent	1012
*Petitioners' Exhibits 1001 - 1012 were previously filed and are listed based on 37 C.F.R. § 42.63.	d again here
Deposition Transcript of Daniel A. Menascé, Ph.D.	1013

^{**}Petitioners' Exhibit 1013 is newly filed.



Apple Inc., Google Inc., and Motorola Mobility LLC (collectively, "Petitioners") provide this Reply under 37 C.F.R. § 42.23 to the August 26, 2014 "Patent Owner Response" (Paper No. 17; "Response"). With this Reply and the Petition filed on December 2, 2013 (Paper No. 1), Petitioners request relief through the cancellation of claims 1-2, 8, 14-17, 20-21, 23-24, 30, 36-39, and 42-43 of U.S. Patent No. 7,917,843 ("the '843 patent"; Ex. 1001).

I. INTRODUCTION

The '843 patent is directed to name and address handling within a document created by a computer program, such as a word processing program. (1:18-26.) The claims are specifically directed to finding information (Second Information) related to the contents of a document (First Information) and performing an action using that information. (3:42-67.) Displaying an address and inserting an address into the document are the only actions disclosed in the '843 patent that use information located by a search.

The Board instituted *inter partes* review based upon Pandit (Ex. 1009). (*See* Decision (June 11, 2014), Paper No. 8 at 19.) Pandit is directed to recognition of and operation on text data. For example, a document is illustrated in Figs. 1a-1f. Various text items in the document can be selected by the user and analyzed to determine the nature of the text, *e.g.*, whether it is a date, an email address or a phone number. Based upon this determination, various actions relating to the



DOCKET

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.

