

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 No. 7,463,245

**PATENT OWNER APLIX IP HOLDINGS CORPORATION'S
RESPONSE TO THE PETITION**

Mail stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandra, VA 22313-145

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iv
EXHIBIT LIST	vi
I. FACTUAL BACKGROUND	1
II. THE PETITION CITES NO EVIDENCE OF OBVIOUSNESS OF CLAIMS 1, 7, 10-12, 17, AND 20.....	3
III. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	5
IV. PETITIONER’S OBVIOUSNESS CASE RESTS ON NON-ANALOGOUS ART	6
A. Andrews is not analogous art	12
B. Hedberg is not analogous art.....	16
V. PETITIONER’S PROPOSED PRIOR-ART COMBINATIONS DO NOT RENDER THE ’245 PATENT’S CLAIMS OBVIOUS.....	19
A. LIEBENOW AND ANDREWS do not render claims 1-5, 7, 10-15, 17, and 20 obvious.....	20
1. Liebenow and Andrews should not be combined.....	22
2. Even if wrongly combined, Liebenow and Andrews do not disclose claims 1-5, 7, 10-15, 17, and 20	29
B. LIEBENOW AND HEDBERG do not render claims 8, 9, and 17-19 obvious	41
1. Liebenow and Hedberg should not be combined	41
2. Even if wrongly combined, Liebenow and Hedberg do not disclose claims 8, 9, and 17-19.....	43

C.	LIEBENOW AND MARTIN do not render claim 6 obvious	44
1.	Liebenow and Martin should not be combined	45
2.	Even if wrongly combined, Liebenow and Martin do not disclose claim 6	48
D.	GRIFFIN AND LIEBENOW do not render claim 16 obvious	49
1.	Griffin and Liebenow should not be combined	49
2.	Even if wrongly combined, Griffin and Liebenow do not disclose claim 16.....	54
VI.	SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS SHOW THAT THE '245 PATENT'S CLAIMS ARE NOT OBVIOUS.....	55
VII.	CONCLUSION	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
Cases	
<i>Advanced Display Sys., Inc. v. Kent State Univ.</i> 212 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	58, 59
<i>Apple Inc. v. ITC</i> 725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	55
<i>Boehringer Ingelheim Vetmedica, Inc. v. Schering–Plough Corp.</i> 320 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	58
<i>Circuit Check Inc. v. QXQ Inc.</i> No. 2015-1155, 2015 WL 4603797 (Fed. Cir. July 28, 2015)	8, 9
<i>Cohesive Techs., Inc. v. Waters Corp.</i> 543 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	4
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> 383 U.S. 1 (1966)	6
<i>In re Bigio</i> 381 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	8, 17
<i>In re Clay</i> 966 F.2d 656 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	9, 10, 12, 13, 18
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended- Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	58
<i>In re Klein</i> 647 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	7, 11, 19
<i>InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGo Communs., Inc.</i> 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	42, 48

<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> 550 U.S. 398 (U.S. 2007)	7, 20, 23
<i>K-Tec, Inc. v. Vita-Mix Corp.</i> 696 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	11, 19
<i>Leapfrog Enter. Inc. v. Fisher-Price Inc.</i> 485 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	20
<i>Leo Pharm. Prods., Ltd. v. Rea</i> 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	56, 58
<i>Mintz v. Dietz & Watson, Inc.</i> 679 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	56
<i>MEHL/Biophile Int'l Corp. v. Milgraum</i> 192 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	4
<i>MobileMedia Ideas LLC v. Apple Inc.</i> 780 F.3d 1159 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	24
<i>Ortho-McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Mylan Labs, Inc.</i> 520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	55
<i>Ruiz v. A.B. Chance Co.</i> 357 F.3d 1270 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	19
<i>State Contracting & Eng'g Corp. v. Condotte America, Inc.</i> 346 F.3d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	8
<i>Transocean Offshore Deepwater, Inc. v. Maersk Drilling USA, Inc.</i> 699 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	56
<i>Wang Labs., Inc. v. Toshiba Corp.</i> 993 F.2d 858 (Fed. Cir. 1993)	8, 10, 12, 13, 17
Other References	
Janice M. Mueller, <i>Patent Law</i> (4th ed. 2013)	7

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.