

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,774,280

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.
Petitioner,
v.

CONTENTGUARD HOLDINGS, INC.,
Patent Owner

Patent No. 7,774,280

Issued: August 10, 2010

Filed: October 4, 2004

Inventors: Nguyen, *et al.*

Title: System and Method for Managing Transfer of Rights Using Shared State Variables

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2015-00354

PRELIMINARY RESPONSE OF PATENT OWNER

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE PETITION FAILS TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS FOR INSTITUTING AN <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW	4
A. The Petition Fails to Comply With 35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3) and 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.22(a)(2) and 42.104(b)(4)	4
B. The Board Should Not Institute Trial Based on the Petition’s Redundant Grounds	8
1. Horizontal Redundancies Across Related Petitions Merit Their Denial	9
2. Vertical Redundancies Within This Petition Also Merit Its Denial	12
III. THE PETITION ADVANCES CERTAIN FLAWED CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS THAT SHOULD BE REJECTED	13
A. Overview of the ‘280 Patent.....	15
B. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	18
C. Response to Apple’s Proposed Claim Constructions.....	18
1. Meta-right.....	18
2. Usage right	20
3. State variable.....	22
4. Wherein the created right includes at least one state variable.....	23
5. License	24
6. Repository	24
a. Physical integrity	25
b. Communications integrity	26
c. Behavioral integrity	26
7. Means-plus-function limitations	27
IV. TRIAL SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED ON THE MEANS-PLUS- FUNCTION CLAIMS BECAUSE THE PETITION FAILS TO PROVIDE A PROPER ANALYSIS OF THOSE CLAIMS.....	33

V.	THE PETITION DOES MEET APPLE’S BURDEN TO SHOW A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS ON ITS REMAINING GROUNDS OF INVALIDITY	34
A.	Legal Standards	35
B.	The Petition Fails to Demonstrate That the Challenged Claims Are Obvious Based on Ginter	39
1.	The Office Previously Found the Claims Patentable Over the Teachings of Ginter.....	39
2.	Ginter Fails to Disclose Several Limitations of the Claims	42
a.	Ginter Fails to Disclose: “a meta-right specifying a right that can be created when the meta-right is exercised”	43
b.	Ginter Fails to Disclose: “a meta-right . . . enforceable by a repository”	46
c.	Ginter Fails to Disclose: “determining, by a repository, whether the rights consumer is entitled to the right specified by the meta-right” and “exercising the meta-right to create the right specified by the meta-right if the rights consumer is entitled to the right specified by the meta-right”	48
d.	Ginter Fails to Disclose: “wherein the created right includes at least one state variable based on the set of rights and used for determining a state of the created right.”	50
e.	Ginter Fails to Disclose: the limitations of dependent claims 2, 4, 13, 15, 25 and 27	51
f.	Ginter Fails to Disclose: dependent claims 11, 22 and 34.....	52
F.	Secondary Considerations	58
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	58

Table of Authorities

Cases

<i>Activevideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	36
<i>Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr., In re</i> , 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	13, 14
<i>Bass, In re</i> , 314 F.3d 575 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	14
<i>Canon, Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00535, Paper 9 (Sept. 24, 2014)	11
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (Aug. 29, 2014)	5, 36, 38
<i>Conopco, Inc. v. Procter & Gamble Co.</i> , IPR2013-00510, Paper 9 (Feb. 12, 2014)	5
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC, In re</i> , No. 2014-1301, 2015 U.S. App. LEXIS 1699 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 4, 2015)	13
<i>Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , <i>In re</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	38
<i>Dell, Inc. v. Elecs & Telecommc'ns Res. Inst.</i> , IPR2014-00152, Paper 12 (May 16, 2014)	38
<i>Dominion Dealer Solutions, LLC v. Autoalert, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00223, Paper 9 (August 15, 2013)	39
<i>Donaldson Co., In re</i> , 16 F.3d 1189 (Fed. Cir. 1994)(en banc)	34
<i>Dow Chem. Co., In re</i> , 837 F.2d 469 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	37
<i>EMC Corp. v. PersonalWeb Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2013-00087, Paper 25 (June 5, 2013)	9
<i>Finisar Corp. v. DirecTV Group, Inc.</i> , 523 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	28
<i>Fresenius USA, Inc. v. Baxter Int'l, Inc.</i> , 582 F.3d 1288 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	34
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966)	7, 35
<i>Idle Free Sys., Inc. v. Bergstrom, Inc.</i> , IPR2012-00027, Paper 26 (June 11, 2013)	9
<i>Intri-Plex Techs., Inc. v. Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics Rencol Ltd.</i> , IPR2014-00309, Paper 83 (Mar. 23, 2014)	35, 38

<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	35, 36
<i>Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.</i> , CBM2012-00003, Paper 7 (Oct. 25, 2012)	passim
<i>Med. Instr. & Diagnostics Corp. v. Elekta AB</i> , 344 F.3d 1205 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	31
<i>Medtronic, Inc. v. Robert Bosch Healthcare Systems, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00436, Paper 17 (June 19, 2014)	37
<i>Newell, In re</i> , 891 F.2d 899 (Fed. Cir. 1989)	38
<i>NTP, Inc., In re</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	38
<i>Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.</i> , 774 F.2d 1082 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	58
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)(en banc)	14
<i>SAS Inst. Inc. v. Complementsoft, LLC</i> , IPR2013-00581, Paper 15 (Dec. 30, 2013)	12
<i>SAS Inst. Inc. v. Complementsoft, LLC</i> , IPR2013-00581, <i>reh’g denied</i> , Paper 17 (Feb. 24, 2014)	12
<i>Star Scientific, Inc. v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.</i> , 655 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	38
<i>TecSec, Inc. v. IBM Corp.</i> , 731 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	28
<i>Translogic Tech., Inc., In re</i> , 504 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	14
<i>Travelocity.com L.P. et al. v. Conos Technologies, LLC</i> , CBM2014-00082, Paper 12 (Oct. 16, 2014)	3, 8
<i>TRW Auto. US LLC v. Magna Elecs., Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00258, Paper 16 (June 26, 2014)	37
<i>Typhoon Touch Techs., Inc. v. Dell, Inc.</i> , 659 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	28
<i>Wowza Media Sys., LLC v. Adobe Sys., Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00054, Paper 12 (Apr. 8, 2013)	5
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 112	27
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	1
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	11

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.