

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE INC.,
Petitioner

v.

SUMMIT 6 LLC,
Patent Owner

Case: IPR2015-00806
Patent 7,765,482

**CORRECTED PETITIONER'S REPLY
TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE COMBINATION OF CREAMER AND AIHARA RENDERS THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OBVIOUS	2
III.	THE COMBINATION OF MAYLE AND NARAYEN ALSO RENDERS THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OBVIOUS	5
IV.	PATENT OWNER’S ATTEMPT TO REBUT THE MOTIVATION TO COMBINE THE PRIOR ART FAILS	7
A.	Patent Owner Failed to Rebut the Motivation to Combine Creamer and Aihara.....	7
B.	Patent Owner Failed to Rebut the Motivation to Combine Mayle and Narayen.....	9
V.	PATENT OWNER HAS NOT PRESENTED OBJECTIVE EVIDENCE OF NONOBVIOUSNESS.....	12
A.	Patent Owner Has Not Demonstrated a Nexus.....	13
B.	Patent Owner’s Alleged Evidence of Long-Felt Need, Commercial Success, Licensing, or Industry Praise is Insufficient.	15
C.	Any Commercial Success Resulted from Other Factors.....	20
VI.	THE TESTIMONY OF PATENT OWNER’S WITNESSES SHOULD BE GIVEN LITTLE WEIGHT	22
A.	Sarah Pate & Scott Lewis	22
B.	Dr. Kaliski Should be Given Little Weight.....	23
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	25

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit 1001	U.S. 7,765,482 (“the ’482 patent”)
Exhibit 1002	Complaint in <i>Summit 6 LLC v. HTC Corp., et al.</i> , No. 7:14-cv-00014-O (N.D. Tex. Feb. 18, 2014) (ECF No. 1), served on Real Parties in Interest on February 25 & 26, 2014.
Exhibit 1003	Declaration of Dr. Paul Clark
Exhibit 1004	U.S. 6,930,709 to Creamer <i>et al.</i> (“Creamer”)
Exhibit 1005	U.S. 6,223,190 to Aihara <i>et al.</i> (“Aihara”)
Exhibit 1006	U.S. 6,018,774 to Mayle <i>et al.</i> (“Mayle”)
Exhibit 1007	U.S. 6,035,323 to Narayen <i>et al.</i> (“Narayen”)
Exhibit 1008	Provisional Application No. 60/085,585, filed on May 15, 1998 (“Creamer ’98”)
Exhibit 1009	Provisional Application No. 60/067,310, filed Dec. 4, 1997 (“Creamer ’97”)
Exhibit 1010	<i>Ex-parte</i> Re-Examination No. 90/012,987, Applicant Arguments & Remarks Made in an Amendment, March 31, 2014
Exhibit 1011	Plaintiff’s Opening Claim Construction Brief in <i>Summit 6 LLC v. HTC Corp., et al.</i> , No. 7:14-cv-00014-O (N.D. Tex. Feb. 18, 2014) (ECF No. 217)
Exhibit 1012	Civil Summons and Proof of Service for Real Parties in Interest in <i>Summit 6 LLC v. HTC Corp., et al.</i> , No. 7:14-cv-00014-O (N.D. Tex. Feb. 18, 2014) (ECF Nos. 11, 13, 14)
Exhibit 1013	Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement in <i>Summit 6 LLC v. HTC Corp., et al.</i> , No. 7:14-cv-00014-O (N.D. Tex. Feb. 18, 2014) (ECF No. 149)
Exhibit 1014	Joint Notice of Settlement in <i>Summit 6 LLC v. HTC Corp., et al.</i> , No. 7:14-cv-00014-O (N.D. Tex. Feb. 18, 2014) (ECF No. 238)
Exhibit 1015	Settlement Agreement Between HTC Entities and Summit 6 LLC

Exhibit 1016	Transcript of February 19, 2016 deposition of Scott Lewis
Exhibit 1017	Transcript of February 26, 2016 deposition of Dr. Martin Kaliski
Exhibit 1018	Declaration of Dr. Gary Frazier
Exhibit 1019	Transcript of February 18, 2016 deposition of Sarah Pate

Petitioner Google Inc. (“Petitioner”) submits this Reply to Patent Owner’s Response in Opposition to the Petition for Inter Partes Review (the “Response” Paper 28) of U.S. Patent No. 7,765,482 (“the ’482 Patent”).

I. INTRODUCTION

The challenged claims are unpatentable. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] However, despite longstanding precedent to the contrary, Patent Owner argues that making known steps less “cumbersome” renders the claims non-obvious. This argument fails. Indeed, that a known process was cumbersome suggests that a person of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine known technologies to improve the process. As demonstrated by the Petition, a person of skill in the art would be motivated to combine the cited prior art. In view of those combinations, every challenged claim is obvious.

Patent Owner’s attempt to overcome the strong obviousness showing by proffering evidence of alleged secondary considerations also fails. Patent Owner’s evidence is not credible. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]. And its technical expert admitted he had no independent opinion regarding commercial success, but rather that he “was told that that was the case by the attorneys that [he is] working with.”

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.