

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE INC., SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC,
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC. AND SAMSUNG
ELECTRONICS COL., LTD.
Petitioners

v.

MICROGRAFX, LLC
Patent Owner

CASE IPR2014-00532
Patent 5,959,633

**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 42.120 TO
PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF UNITED
STATES PATENT NO. 5,959,633**

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

EXHIBIT LIST

Petitioners' Exhibits

Exhibit Number	Description	Date submitted to PRPS
Google-1001	5,959,633 Patent McFarland, et al	03/24/14
Google-1002	5,959,633 File History	03/24/14
Google-1003	Lastra Declaration	03/24/14
Google-1004	5,883,639 Patent (Walton, et al)	03/24/14
Google-1005	5,564,048 Patent (Eick, et al)	03/24/14
Google-1006	Inside Visual C 2nd Ed Version 1.5 (Kruglinski)	03/24/14
Google-1007	American Heritage Dictionary	03/24/14
Google-1008	Preliminary Disclosure of Asserted Claims & Infringement Contentions	03/24/14
Google-1009	Almeling Declaration In Support of Google's Motion for Pro Hac Vice Admission	09/19/14
Google-1010	Second Declaration of David S. Almeling in Support of Petitioners' Motion for <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> Admission	09/30/14

Patent Owner's Exhibits

Exhibit Number	Description	Date submitted to PRPS
Micrografx-2001	Lastra Declaration (NOT FILED)	
Micrografx-2002	IPR2014-00532 Decision to Institute IPR 8-12-14 (NOT FILED)	
Micrografx-2003	Annotated Figure 3 from Lastra Declaration	11/21/14
Micrografx-2004	Transcript of the 11/6/2014 Deposition of Dr. Anselmo Lastra	11/21/14
Micrografx-2005	Declaration of Garry Kitchen	11/21/14
Micrografx-2006	IEEE Authoritative Dictionary 7 th Edition	11/21/14
Micrografx-2007	IBM Terminology Online Dictionary	11/21/14

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. AUTHORIZATION FOR PAYMENT OF FEES.....	1
III. SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT.....	1
IV. BACKGROUND.....	3
A. History of Micrografx	3
B. The '633 Patent Invention.....	3
V. ARGUMENT.....	6
A. Legal Standards.....	6
B. Claim Construction of “external shape stored outside the computer program”	9
C. The Petition Fails to Show Anticipation Under § 102 by Walton.....	13
1. Overview of Walton	13
2. Walton cannot anticipate claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, 13, and 15 because it does not disclose “an external shape stored outside the computer program.”.....	22
3. Walton cannot anticipate claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, 13, and 15 because it does not disclose a “computer program [further] operable to: . . . delegate the production of a graphical image of the external shape to the external capabilities.”	24
D. The Petition Fails to Show Obviousness Under § 103 by Eick in view of <i>Inside Visual C++</i>	34
1. Overview of Eick.....	35
2. Overview of Kruglinski.....	42
3. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, 13, and 15 would not have been obvious over Eick in view of Kruglinski because Eick does not disclose external shapes having external capabilities.	44
4. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, 13, and 15 would not have been obvious over Eick in view of Kruglinski because Eick teaches away from external libraries.....	47
VI. Conclusion.....	56

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Abbott Labs. v. Cordis Corp.</i> 710 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	8
<i>Idle Free Sys., Inc. v. Bergstrom, Inc.</i> IPR2012-00027 (Paper 26 June 11, 2013).....	9
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	13
<i>In re Ochiai</i> 71 F.3d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1995)	7
<i>In re Skvorecz</i> 580 F.3d 1262 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	10
<i>In re Suitco Surface, Inc.</i> 603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	13
<i>In re Yamamoto</i> 740 F.2d 1569 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	10
<i>Int'l Flavors & Fragrances Inc. v. United States</i> IPR 2013-00124 (Paper 12 May 20, 2014).....	11
<i>Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.</i> 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	6
<i>Nichia Corp. v. Emcore Corp.</i> IPR2012-00005 (Paper 68 Feb. 11, 2014).....	9
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	8, 12
<i>Sanofi-Synthelabo v. Apotex, Inc.</i> 470 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	6
<i>Scripps Clinic & Research Found. v. Genentech, Inc.</i> 927 F.2d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	6

ZTE Corp. v. ContentGuard Holdings Inc.
IPR 2013-00136 (Paper 33 Nov. 7, 2013)9

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102.....14
35 U.S.C. § 103 7, 36
35 U.S.C. § 25110
35 U.S.C. §§ 311-3198

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.1007
77 Fed. Reg. 48,764 (Aug. 14, 2012)8

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.