UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SONY COMPUTER ENTERTAINMENT AMERICA LLC
Petitioner

v.

APLIX IP HOLDINGS CORPORATION
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2015-00230
Patent 7,463,245

PETITIONER'S RESPONSE TO PATENT OWNER'S

MOTION FOR OBSERVATION

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner respectfully requests that the Board consider the record, rather than Patent Owner's ("PO") characterizations of the record, in determining patentability of U.S. Patent No. 7,463,245 ("the '245 Patent"). PO's observations are misleading, because the observations either mischaracterize the record, or include assertions that are not supported by the record.

II. RESPONSES TO OBSERVATIONS

1. The testimony cited in this observation does not support PO's assertion that Dr. Welch's opinion is based upon a misunderstanding. *See* **Ex. 2034**, *Welch Dec. 17 Tr.* at 6:10-10:25; **Ex. 1042**, *Welch Supp. Decl.* at ¶¶ 2-10. To the contrary, the record shows, and Dr. Welch explained, that statements in Dr. Welch's supplemental declaration are in direct response to specific opinions offered by Dr. MacLean. *See id.* Previously, Dr. MacLean opined that the delineations must be defined at the application level, and therefore would change from application to application. *See*, *e.g.*, **Ex. 1040**, *MacLean Tr.*at 137:5-13 (Liebenow is not sufficient because Dr. MacLean "just couldn't find examples of where [Liebenow] ha[d] an application actually define where the delineations were.") (emphasis added); **Ex. 2003**, *MacLean Decl.* at ¶ 66. Now, PO's position is apparently that the delineations must be changeable from application to application, but do not actually have to change. This attempt to soften Dr. MacLean's opinion is misplaced, and is different than PO's

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

position in its Response. *See id.*; *see also* **Paper 18**, *Response* at 19 (citing MacLean as support for the proposition that in the '245 Patent "delineations themselves are defined, i.e., drawn, at the application level."). In any event, there is no more support in the '245 Patent for the requirement that the delineations must be changeable than there is for the requirement that delineations must change. *See*, *e.g.*, **Ex. 1042**, *Welch Supp. Decl.* at ¶¶ 2-10.

2. The testimony cited in this observation does not support PO's assertions. Dr. Welch testifies that the '245 Patent describes computational aspects broadly, and pointed to specific disclosure in the specification that supports his opinion. *See* **Ex. 2022**, *Welch Dec. 17 Tr.* at 11:1-15:11; *see also* **Ex. 1001**, *'245 Patent* at 14:45-54.

3. The testimony cited in this observation does not support PO's assertions. As Dr. Welch testified, just because the '245 Patent allowed that a game developer "could" set up configurations does not mean that the claims must be limited to application-defined delineations. *See* **Ex. 2034**, *Welch Dec. 17 Tr.* at 15:13-17:3; *see also id.* at 11:1-15:11; **Ex. 1001**, *'245 Patent* at 14:45-54.

4. The testimony cited in this observation does not support PO's assertions, and PO mischaracterizes Dr. Welch's testimony by omitting relevant testimony. Looking to the full testimony on this point, Dr. Welch explains that "the description of the invention is the entire patent. Everything from the claims down to the specification and the background is an important part of setting the context of, for example, the

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

later sections…." **Ex. 2034**, *Welch Dec. 17 Tr.* at 24:5-19; *see also generally id.* at 23:16-29:4. Dr. Welch also explains that a patent specification would be understood to be like a funnel, where the background sets the stage and context, and the detailed description provides specific examples. *See id.* at 28:11-29:4. PO's assertion that paragraph [0002] is not part of Liebenow's description of the invention is simply untrue, and no part of Dr. Welch's testimony supports this faulty conclusion. *See* **Ex. 1003**, *Liebenow*; *see also* **Ex. 2034**, *Welch Dec. 17 Tr.* at 23:16-29:4.

5. The testimony cited in this observation does not support PO's assertions. Once again, PO was attempting to have Dr. Welch agree to PO's oversimplifications and generalizations of the record. *See* **Ex. 2034**, *Welch Dec. 17 Tr.* at 29:6-37:4. Dr. Welch was understandably unwilling to agree to PO's oversimplified view, and the record shows Dr. Welch's explanation as to why. *See id.*

Respectfully submitted,
ERISE IP, P.A.

BY: /Abran J. Kean/

Eric A. Buresh, Reg. No. 50,394
Abran J. Kean, Reg. No. 58,540
6201 College Blvd., Suite 300
Overland Park, KS 66211
P: (913) 777-5600
F: (913) 777-5601
eric.buresh@eriseip.com
abran.kean@eriseip.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PETITIONER

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE ON PATENT OWNER UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.6

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e), the undersigned certifies that on January 8, 2016 the foregoing *Petitioner's Response to Patent Owner's Motion for Observation* was served via electronic filing with the Board on the following counsel of record for Patent Owner:

Michael Mauriel, USPTO Reg. No. 44,226
Sherman W. Kahn (pro hac vice)
MAURIEL KAPOUYTIAN WOODS LLP
15 West 26th Street, 7th Floor
New York, NY 10010
Telephone: (212) 529-5131 Ex. 101
Facsimile: (212) 529-5132
E-mail: mmauriel@mkwllp.com
skahn@mkwllp.com

Robert J. Gilbertson (pro hac vice)
Sybil L. Dunlop (pro hac vice)
X. Kevin Zhao (pro hac vice)
GREENE ESPEL PLLP
222 South Ninth Street, Ste. 2200
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 373-0830
Facsimile: (612) 373-0929
E-mail: bgilbertson@greeneespel.com
sdunlop@greeneespel.com
kzhao@greeneespel.com

Dated: January 8, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

ERISE IP, P.A.

BY: /Abran J. Kean/
Eric A. Buresh, Reg. No. 50,394
Abran J. Kean, Reg. No. 58,540

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.

WHAT WILL YOU BUILD? | sales@docketalarm.com | 1-866-77-FASTCASE

fastcase®
Smarter legal research.