

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. IPR2015-00729

Patent No. 7,280,097

**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

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iv
EXHIBIT LIST	vi
I. FACTUAL BACKGROUND	1
II. THE PETITION CITES NO EVIDENCE OF OBVIOUSNESS OF CLAIMS 1, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 25, 26, 27, 36, 37, and 38.....	5
III. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	7
IV. PETITIONER’S OBVIOUSNESS CASE RESTS ON NON- ANALOGOUS ART	8
A. Nishiumi (U.S. Patent No. 5,903,257).....	10
1. Nishiumi and the ’097 patent occupy different fields of endeavor.....	10
2. Nishiumi is not reasonably pertinent to the particular problem the ’097 inventors aimed to solve	15
B. Tu (U.S. Application No. 2004-0139254 A1)	20
1. Tu and the ’097 patent occupy different fields of endeavor.....	20
2. Tu is not reasonably pertinent to the particular problem the ’097 inventors aimed to solve	22
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	24
A. All independent claims: “hand-held host device”.....	26
B. All independent claims: an “input controller [being] configured to generate an input signal . . . to control execution of the one or more functions of the software application . . .”	27

C.	Claims 2, 16, 28 and all dependent claims: an “input element . . . on [a] surface[]”	29
D.	Dependent claims 5, 19, and 30: “configured to optimize a biomechanical effect of the human user’s opposing thumb and fingers”	30
E.	Dependent claims 17 and 28: “second surface,” and “third surface”	31
VI.	PETITIONER’S PROPOSED PRIOR-ART COMBINATIONS DO NOT RENDER THE ’097 PATENT’S CLAIMS OBVIOUS	32
A.	Mollinari and Nishiumi do not render claims 1-4, 7, 8, 13, 14, 16-18, 21, 23-29, 31, and 34-38 obvious	32
1.	Mollinari and Nishiumi should not be combined	33
2.	Even if wrongly combined, Mollinari and Nishiumi do not disclose claims 1-4, 7, 8, 13, 14, 16-18, 21, 23-29, 31, and 34-38.....	37
B.	Mollinari, Nishiumi, and Tu do not render claims 6, 22, and 32 obvious	40
C.	Kerr and Lum do not render claims 10-12 obvious	41
VII.	SHIMA DOES NOT ANTICIPATE CLAIMS 5, 19, AND 30.....	45
A.	Shima does not disclose using his mouse phone with a hand-held host device.....	46
B.	Shima does not disclose three “surfaces” having three different “input assemblies”	52
C.	Shima does not disclose input assemblies “configured to optimize a biomechanical effect of the human user’s opposing thumb and fingers”	54
VIII.	CONCLUSION	56

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
Cases	
<i>Circuit Check Inc. v. QXQ Inc.</i> 795 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	10
<i>Cohesive Techs., Inc. v. Waters Corp.</i> 543 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	6
<i>Gemtron Corp. v. Saint-Gobain Corp.</i> 572 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	46
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> 383 U.S. 1 (1966)	8
<i>In re Bigio</i> 381 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	10, 11, 15, 20, 22
<i>In re Cortright</i> 165 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	25
<i>In re Clay</i> 966 F.2d 656 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	11, 15, 22
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC</i> 793 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	24
<i>In re Kahn</i> 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	46
<i>In re Klein</i> 647 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	9, 15
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	25
<i>In re Skvorecz</i> 580 F.3d 1262 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	25

<i>In re Suitco Surface, Inc.</i> 603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	25
<i>In re Translogic Tech., Inc.</i> 504 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	25
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> 550 U.S. 398 (U.S. 2007)	9, 34, 35, 46
<i>Leapfrog Enter. Inc. v. Fisher-Price Inc.</i> 485 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	35
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	25
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	26
<i>Ruiz v. A.B. Chance Co.</i> 357 F.3d 1270 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	34
<i>Schott Gemtron Corp., v. SSW Holding Company, Inc.</i> IPR2013-00358.....	16
<i>State Contracting & Eng'g Corp. v. Condotte America, Inc.</i> 346 F.3d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	10
<i>Structural Rubber Products Co. v. Park Rubber Co.</i> 749 F.2d 707 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	6
<i>Synopsys, Inc. v. Mentor Graphics Corp.</i> IPR2012-00042.....	5
<i>Wang Labs., Inc. v. Toshiba Corp.</i> 993 F.2d 858 (Fed. Cir. 1993)	11, 15, 22
Other References	
Janice M. Mueller, <i>Patent Law</i> (4th ed. 2013)	9

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.