

Filed on behalf of: IPR LICENSING, INC.

Entered: December 5, 2014

Jonathan D. Link
Latham & Watkins LLP
555 11th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20004-1304
Telephone: (202) 637-2200
Facsimile: (202) 637-2201
E-mail: jonathan.link@lw.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MICROSOFT CORPORATION

Petitioner

v.

IPR LICENSING, INC.

Patent Owner

Case IPR2015-00074
U.S. Patent No. 8,380,244

Before PATRICK E. BAKER, *Trial Paralegal*.

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO
MICROSOFT CORPORATION'S PETITION FOR
INTER PARTES REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,380,244**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction And Summary Of Preliminary Response	1
II. Legal Standards	3
III. Overview Of the ‘244 Patent	5
IV. Overview Of The Prosecution History	7
V. Claim Construction	10
VI. The 800 ITC Investigation.....	10
VII. the Petition Should be Denied as Duplicative	12
VIII. Microsoft Has Failed To Make A Prima Facie Case Of Invalidity.....	15
A. The Petition Fails To Establish A Reasonable Likelihood That The Claims Of The ‘244 Patent Would Have Been Obvious	15
1. The Petition Fails To Demonstrate A Reasonable Likelihood That The Challenged Claims Are Obvious In View Of “Ground 1”	16
B. Microsoft Has Failed To Establish That The “GPRS Standards” Are Prior Art.....	24
IX. The Petition Is Barred Under 35 U.S.C. § 315(b)	26
A. Factual Background.....	27
B. The Plain Language Of 35 U.S.C. § 315(b) Bars The Petition.....	28
C. Nokia Is A Privy Of Microsoft.....	32
D. Petitioner’s Purported Liability “Separate And Apart” From Nokia’s Liability Is Irrelevant.....	34
X. Conclusion	35

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
CASES	
<i>Anova Food, LLC v. Sandau</i> , IPR2013-00114 (PTAB Sept. 13, 2013)	29
<i>Apple Inc. v. Achates Reference Publ'g Co., Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00080 (PTAB June 3, 2013)	34
<i>CCS Fitness, Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.</i> , 288 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	4
<i>Dominion Dealer Solutions, LLC v. AutoAlert, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00220 (PTAB Aug. 15, 2013)	24
<i>Ex parte Funai Elec. Co., Ltd.</i> , Appeal No. 2010-003274, Reexamination 90/010,021 (BPAI Oct. 29, 2010).....	12
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966)	4, 19
<i>Hartford Underwriters Ins. Co. v. Union Planters Bank, N.A.</i> , 530 U.S. 1 (2000)	29
<i>Hoechst Aktiengesellschaft v. Quigg</i> , 917 F.2d 522 (Fed. Cir. 1990)	29
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	21, 23
<i>In re Kotzab</i> , 217 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	5, 19, 20
<i>In re Rouffet</i> , 149 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	19, 20
<i>In re Sang-Su Lee</i> , 277 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	20
<i>Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , IPR2013-00324 (PTAB Nov. 21, 2013)	13

<i>Killip v. Office of Pers. Mgmt.</i> , 991 F.2d 1564 (Fed. Cir. 1993).....	31
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	passim
<i>Kyocera Wireless Corp. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 545 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	26
<i>Medtronic, Inc. v. Endotach LLC</i> , IPR2014-00695 (PTAB Sept. 25, 2014).....	31
<i>Medtronic, Inc. v. Nuvasive, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00487 (PTAB Sept. 11, 2014).....	13
<i>Medtronic, Inc. v. Robert Bosch Healthcare Sys., Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00436 (PTAB June 19, 2014).....	13
<i>Ortho-McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Mylan Labs., Inc.</i> , 520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	21
<i>Perfect Web Techs., Inc. v. InfoUSA, Inc.</i> , 587 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	23
<i>Siegel v. Daiwa Securities Co. Ltd.</i> , 842 F. Supp. 1537 (S.D.N.Y. 1994).....	33
<i>Taylor v. Sturgell</i> , 553 U.S. 880 (2008).....	33
<i>Tegal Corp. v. Tokyo Electron Co., Ltd.</i> , No. 01-1019, 2002 U.S. App. LEXIS 1992 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 1, 2002).....	33
<i>Texas Instruments Inc. v. Cypress Semiconductor Corp.</i> , 90 F.3d 1558 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	11
<i>Unified Patents, Inc. v. PersonalWeb Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2014-00702 (PTAB July 24, 2014)	13, 14, 15
<i>Unigene Labs., Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 655 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	21

Zerto, Inc. v. EMC Israel Dev. Ctr., Ltd.,
IPR2013-00458 (PTAB Jan. 16, 2014)..... 5, 25

OTHER AUTHORITIES

157 Cong. Rec. S5429 (daily ed. Sept. 8, 2011).....30
35 U.S.C. § 103(a) 4, 18, 24
35 U.S.C. § 311(b)5
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)4
35 U.S.C. § 315(a)29
35 U.S.C. § 315(b) passim
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)14
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)4
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)18
37 C.F.R. § 42.81
77 Fed. Reg. 48680 (Aug. 14, 2012)32
77 Fed. Reg. 48756 (Aug. 14, 2012) 4, 32
H.R. Rep. No. 112-9830
Patent Trial and Appeal Board, Standard Operating Procedure 2 (Rev. 8),
Publication of Opinions and Designation of Opinions as Precedential.....31

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.