

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Pat. No. 7,365,871

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Apple Inc.

Petitioner

v.

E-Watch, Inc.

Patent Owner

Case IPR2015-00411

Patent 7,365,871

PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. GROUNDS FOR STANDING PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(A)	6
III. OVERVIEW OF THE ‘871 PATENT	6
IV. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(B)	6
A. 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(1): Claims For Which Inter Partes Review Is Requested	6
B. 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(2): The Prior Art And Specific Grounds On Which The Challenge To The Claims Is Based	7
C. 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3): Claim Construction	7
D. 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4): How The Construed Claims Are Unpatentable	9
E. 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(5): Supporting Evidence	9
V. THERE IS A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT AT LEAST ONE CLAIM OF THE ‘871 PATENT IS UNPATENTABLE	9
A. Claims 1-15 Are Anticipated By WO 1999/035818	9
1. The Effective Filing Date For The ‘871 Patent Is January 3, 2003	10
2. ‘073 Prosecution History	11
3. The Public Record Demonstrates Deliberate Abandonment of the ‘073 Application.	14
4. No Record Evidence of “Unintentional” Delay	17
5. The PTO “Assumed” Unintentional Delay -- It Did Not Decide The Merits Of The Issue.	19
6. The Effective Filing Date Of The ‘871 Patent Is January 3, 2003	20
B. The ‘818 Publication Has The Same Disclosure As The ‘871 Patent, Rendering Claims 1-15 Of The ‘871 Patent Anticipated	21
1. Independent claim 1 is disclosed by the ‘818 publication	22

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
2. Independent claim 6 is disclosed by the ‘818 publication.....	29
3. Independent claim 9 is disclosed by the ‘818 publication.....	34
4. Independent claim 12 is disclosed by the ‘818 publication.....	41
5. Dependent claims 2-5, 7, 8, 10, 11, and 13-15 are disclosed by the ‘818 publication	44
C. Summary -- Claims 1-15 Of The ‘871 Patent Are Invalid As Anticipated By The ‘818 publication.....	48
D. Different Bases of Unpatentability in Petitioner’s Three Petitions Regarding the ‘871 Patent are Independent, Distinct and not Redundant.....	49
VI. MANDATORY NOTICES PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(A)(1).....	51
A. C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(a): Real Party-In-Interest	51
B. C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2): Related Matters	51
C. C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3) and (4): Lead and Back-up Counsel and Service Information.....	52
VII. CONCLUSION.....	52

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
CASES	
<i>E-Watch, Inc. and E-Watch Corporation v. Apple Inc.</i> , U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Civil Action No. 2:13-CV-1061	51
<i>In re Am. Acad. Sci. Tech. Ctr.</i> , 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir., 2004)	7
<i>In re Application G</i> , 11 USPQ2d 1378 (Comm’r, 1989).....	15
<i>In re Maldague</i> , 10 USPQ2d 1477 (Comm’r 1988).....	15
<i>Lawman Armor Corp. v. Simon</i> , 2005 U.S. Dist. Lexis 10843 (E.D. Mich., March 29, 2005).....	14
<i>Lumenyte Int’l Corp. v. Cable Lite Corp.</i> , Nos. 96-1011, 96-1077, 1996 U.S. App. LEXIS 16400, 1996 WL 383927 (Fed. Cir. July 9, 1996)(unpublished).....	14
STATUTES	
35 U.S.C. 102(b)	9
35 U.S.C. § 102	7, 9
35 U.S.C. § 102(b)	5, 7
35 U.S.C. § 120	10, 12
35 U.S.C. § 133	11

OTHER AUTHORITIES

35 C.F.R. § 42.1(b)50

37 C.F.R. § 1.689

37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b)passim

37 C.F.R. § 1.137(c).....13

37 C.F.R. § 1.737(b)21

37 C.F.R. § 41.100(b)7

37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(1).....51

37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)51

37 C.F.R. § 42.10(b)52

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a).....6

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)6

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(1).....6

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(2).....7

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3).....7

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4).....9

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(5).....9

37 CFR 1.137(b)14

37 CFR 11.1814

IPR2014-00439, Paper 16, pp. 5-8.....5

MPEP 711.03(c)(II)(C)13

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.