

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.
Petitioner

v.

DSS TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT, INC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR: Unassigned
Patent 6,128,290

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,128,290
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 and 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.1-.80, 42.100-.123**

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	MANDATORY NOTICES (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(1)).....	3
	A. Real Party-In-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1))	3
	B. Notice of Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)).....	3
	C. Designation of Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3))	4
	D. Notice of Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4))	4
III.	GROUND FOR STANDING (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)).....	4
IV.	STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED AND THE REASONS THEREFOR (37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)).....	5
V.	THE '290 PATENT.....	5
	A. Overview of the '290 Patent.....	5
	B. Priority Date of the '290 Patent.....	6
	C. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	8
VI.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	8
	A. “within short range of said server unit”	9
	B. “code sequence”	10
VII.	IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)).....	11
	A. Statutory Grounds for the Challenge.....	11
	B. Citation of Prior Art	12
	C. The Proposed Grounds Are Not Redundant.....	12
VIII.	GROUND OF REJECTION	15
	A. Ground 1: Claims 1-4 would have been obvious in view of Barber.....	15
	1. Overview of Barber.....	15
	2. Independent claim 1 would have been obvious in view of Barber.	18
	3. Claim 2 would have been obvious in view of Barber.....	31
	4. Claim 3 would have been obvious in view of Barber.....	31
	5. Claim 4 would have been obvious in view of Barber.....	32
	B. Ground 2: Claims 1-4 would have been obvious over Natarajan in view of Neve.....	33
	1. Overview of Natarajan.....	33

2.	Overview of Neve	37
3.	Overview of the Combination of Natarajan and Neve	39
4.	Independent claim 1 would have been obvious over Natarajan in view of Neve.	42
5.	Claim 2 would have been obvious over Natarajan in view of Neve.	56
6.	Claim 3 would have been obvious over Natarajan in view of Neve.	57
7.	Claim 4 would have been obvious over Natarajan in view of Neve.	58
IX.	CONCLUSION.....	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Alloc, Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 342 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	8
<i>Canon Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC</i> , IPR2014-00535, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 24, 2014)	13
<i>In re Cortright</i> , 165 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	8
<i>KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	42, 48
<i>Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casualty Ins. Co.</i> , CBM2012-00003, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 25, 2012)	13
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	8

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102	11
35 U.S.C. § 102(b)	12, 13, 14
35 U.S.C. § 103	11, 12, 13, 14
35 U.S.C. § 112	9
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	12

Rules

37 C.F.R. § 42.10(b)	4
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)	8
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)	4
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)	11
37 C.F.R. § 42.106(a)	4

37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a).....	5
37 C.F.R. § 42.63(e).....	4
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(1).....	3
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1).....	3
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2).....	3
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3).....	4
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4).....	4

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.