

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SkyHawke Technologies, LLC
Petitioner

v.

L&H Concepts, LLC
Patent Owner

Case IPR2014-00438
Patent 5,779,566

**PATENT OWNER L&H CONCEPTS, LLC'S
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Statement of Relief Requested	3
III.	Claim Construction	3
	A. The Preambles Are Limitations	4
	B. Additional Terms Proposed By Petitioner	7
IV.	The Petition Fails to Establish that the Cited Art Practices Claims 1 and 13	8
	A. Petitioner Asserts that Claims 1 and 13 are Indefinite	8
	B. Petitioner Fails to Identify a Prior Art Structure that Meets Its “Generic Structure” for the “Key Entry Means” of Claim 1	11
	C. Petitioner Fails to Identify a Prior Art Structure that Meets Its “Generic Structure” for the “Means for Displaying” in Claim 13	13
V.	The Board Should Not Institute Petitioner’s Redundant Challenges	15
	A. The Board’s Precedent Requires Petitioner to Distinguish Between Otherwise Redundant Prior Art References	16
	B. Petitioner’s Statement of Non-Redundancy Establishes that the Ultra Golf Reference is the Stronger Ground	17
	C. Petitioner is Correct that the Palmer-Based Challenges Do Not Disclose the Claimed Information Screens.....	19
	D. The Challenges to Claim 17 are Doubly Redundant	20
VI.	Conclusion.....	21

LIST OF EXHIBITS¹

Exhibit No.	Description
2001	<i>Berk-Tek LLC v. Belden Technologies Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00057 (Paper 21, May 14, 2013)
2002	<i>In re Morris</i> , 127 F.3d 1048 (Fed. Cir. 1997)
2003	<i>NTP, Inc. v. Research In Motion, Ltd.</i> , 418 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2005)
2004	<i>Catalina Mktg. Int'l, Inc. v. Coolsavings.com, Inc.</i> , 289 F.3d 801 (Fed. Cir. 2002)
2005	<i>Novatek, Inc. v. Sollami Co.</i> , No. 2013-1389, 2014 U.S. App. LEXIS 5512 (Fed. Cir. Mar. 26, 2014)
2006	'566 patent prosecution history, May 27, 1997 Office Action Response
2007	<i>Blackberry Corporation, et a., v. Mobilemedia Ideas, LLC</i> , IPR2013-00036, (Paper 65, Mar. 7, 2014)
2008	<i>Universal Remote Control, Inc. v. Universal Electronics, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00152, (Paper 8, Aug. 19, 2013)
2009	<i>Sony Corp v. Yissum Research Development Co. of the Hebrew Univ. of Jerusalem</i> , IPR2013-00219 (Paper 33, Nov. 21, 2013)
2010	<i>Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casualty Co.</i> , CBM2012-00003 (Paper 7, Oct. 25, 2012)
2011	<i>Oracle Corp. v. Patent of Clouding IP, LLC</i> , IPR2013-00075 (Paper 15, June 13, 2013)

¹ Consistent with 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.6(c)-(d), none of these cited exhibits are already in the record.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a), the patent owner, L&H Concepts, LLC (“L&H” or “Patent Owner”), hereby submits the following Preliminary Response in response to the Petition for Inter Partes Review (“IPR”) of U.S. Patent No. 5,779,566 (“the ’566 patent”) numbered IPR2014-00438 (the “00438 Petition”), filed by SkyHawke Technologies, LLC (“SkyHawke” or “Petitioner”).

I. INTRODUCTION

Inter partes review is a forum—much like the original examination—where the PTO can consider the best and most comprehensive prior art and determine whether or not the claims are allowable. Instituting *inter partes* review on “multiple grounds without meaningful distinction by the petitioner is contrary to the legislative intent [of the AIA].” *Berk-Tek LLC v. Belden Technologies Inc.*, IPR2013-00057 (Paper 21, May 14, 2013), Ex. 2001 at 5.

Petitioner is seeking (at least) a double review of the claims of the ’566 patent, with only conclusory language to support its assertion of non-redundancy. Petitioner reasonably could have limited its challenge of the claims of the ’566 patent to a single petition² but chose not to, instead using twice the pages and twice (and, for one claim, thrice) the reference combinations in hopes of invalidating

² IPR2014-00437 also addresses claims of the ’566 patent based on the same references.

claims which have already been recognized as valid through *ex parte* reexamination.

Given that the Patent Owner is unable to present new evidence in the Preliminary Response context, Patent Owner focuses this response on addressing defects in the Petition and addressing the redundancies in the Petition that will make any eventual proceeding less efficient for the parties and the Board.³ First, as described below, the Petition fundamentally fails with regard to claims 1-5 and 13 because (1) Petitioner asserts that the claims are indefinite, and (2) the cited references do not meet the claim construction proposed by Petitioner. Thus, even if one were to accept the Petition as wholly correct in its assertions, the references cited fail.

Next, with regard to the remaining claim 17, if the Board chooses to institute, the challenge based on the combination of the Palmer and Vanden Heuvel references is needlessly redundant, as even Petitioner concedes that the combination of Palmer and Vanden Heuvel is less complete (and thus inferior) to

³ No adverse inference should be drawn from Patent Owner's discussion of the comparative strength of the base references with regard to institution of this IPR. *See Office Patent Trial Practice Guide*, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756, 48764, § II-C (Aug. 14, 2012).

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.