

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

**APPLE, INC. AND MOTOROLA MOBILITY, LLC**

**Petitioners**

**v.**

**GLOBAL TOUCH SOLUTIONS, LLC**

**Patent Owner**

**Patent No. 8,288,952**

**Issued: Oct. 16, 2012**

**Filed: Nov. 17, 2011**

**Inventor: Frederick Johannes Bruwer**

**Title: INTELLIGENT USER INTERFACE INCLUDING A TOUCH  
SENSOR DEVICE**

---

***Inter Partes* Review No.: IPR2015-01175**

---

**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	I
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	IV
STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS IN DISPUTE.....	VI
EXHIBIT LIST .....	VII
I. STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUESTED .....	1
II. INTRODUCTION .....	3
III. TESTIMONY OF PETITIONERS' EXPERT.....	8
IV. THE LAW .....	11
A. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	11
B. OBVIOUSNESS .....	13
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	14
A. "USER INTERFACE" (CLAIMS 1 AND 26).....	15
B. "ENERGY CONSUMING LOAD" (CLAIMS 1 AND 26).....	16
C. "TOUCH SENSOR FUNCTIONS" (CLAIM 1) AND "TOUCH SENSING FUNCTIONS" (CLAIM 26) .....	20
D. "SELECTION AND ACTIVATION OF A FUNCTION OR MODE OF THE PRODUCT IN RESPONSE TO A FURTHER ACTIVATION SIGNAL(S) RECEIVED FROM THE USER INTERFACE" (CLAIM 2).....	24
E. "A FUNCTION THAT WAS ACTIVATED IN RESPONSE TO AN ACTIVATION SIGNAL RECEIVED FROM SAID USER INTERFACE" (CLAIMS 3 AND 24).....	27
F. "PRODUCT FUNCTIONS" (CLAIM 22).....	29

VI.	BEARD IN VIEW OF RATHMANN DOES NOT RENDER CLAIMS 1-3, 16, 17, 19, 22-24, 26, 27, AND 38-40 OBVIOUS .....	30
A.	BEARD IN VIEW OF RATHMANN DOES NOT DISCLOSE "A PRODUCT COMPRISING A POWER SOURCE, OR A CONNECTION FOR A POWER SOURCE, AND AT LEAST ONE ENERGY CONSUMING LOAD" (CLAIMS 1-3, 16, 17, 19, 22-24, 26, 27, AND 38-40).....	30
B.	BEARD IN VIEW OF RATHMANN DOES NOT DISCLOSE THE "MICROCHIP AT LEAST PARTIALLY IMPLEMENTING THE TOUCH SENSOR FUNCTIONS" (CLAIM 1) OR THE "MICROCHIP AT LEAST PARTIALLY IMPLEMENTING THE TOUCH SENSING FUNCTIONS" (CLAIM 26) (CLAIMS 1-3, 16, 17, 19, 22-24, 26, 27, AND 38-40) .....	45
C.	BEARD IN VIEW OF RATHMANN DOES NOT DISCLOSE "SELECTION AND ACTIVATION OF A FUNCTION OR MODE OF THE PRODUCT IN RESPONSE TO A FURTHER ACTIVATION SIGNAL(S) RECEIVED FROM THE USER INTERFACE" (CLAIM 2).....	48
D.	BEARD IN VIEW OF RATHMANN DOES NOT DISCLOSE "AUTOMATICALLY DEACTIVATING A FUNCTION THAT WAS ACTIVATED IN RESPONSE TO AN ACTIVATION SIGNAL RECEIVED FROM SAID USER INTERFACE, A PREDETERMINED PERIOD OF TIME AFTER IT WAS ACTIVATED" (CLAIMS 3 AND 24).....	50
E.	BEARD IN VIEW OF RATHMANN DOES NOT DISCLOSE "WHEREIN THE POWER SOURCE IS ENCLOSED IN THE PRODUCT HOUSING" (CLAIM 19).....	51
F.	BEARD IN VIEW OF RATHMANN DOES NOT DISCLOSE "ACTIVATING OR DEACTIVATING PRODUCT FUNCTIONS IN RESPONSE TO SIGNALS RECEIVED FROM THE USER INTERFACE" (CLAIM 22).....	54
VII.	BEARD IN VIEW OF RATHMANN AND DANIELSON DOES NOT RENDER CLAIMS 4 AND 14 OBVIOUS.....	56

A. BEARD IN VIEW OF RATHMANN AND DANIELSON DOES NOT CURE THE ABOVE-DESCRIBED DEFICIENCIES OF BEARD IN VIEW OF RATHMANN (CLAIMS 4 AND 14).....56

VIII. CONCLUSION.....57

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

Alloc, Inc. v. USITC, 342 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	12, 16, 20
Becton, Dickinson and Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Group, LP, 616 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	25
Bicon, Inc. v. Straumann Co., 441 F.3d 945 (Fed.Cir.2006).....	28
CAE Screenplates Inc. v. Heirich Fiedler GmbH & Co. KG, 224 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	25
Chicago Bd. Options Exch., Inc. v. Int'l Sec. Exch., LLC, 677 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	27, 28
Digital-Vending Servs. Int'l, LLC v. Univ. of Phoenix, Inc., 672 F.3d 1270 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	28
Gaus v. Conair Corp., 363 F.3d 1284 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	25
Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	13
Hockerson–Halberstadt v. Converse Inc., 183 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....	27
In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	14
In re NTP, Inc., 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed.Cir.2011) .....	12
In re Suitco Surface, Inc., 603 F.3d 1255 (Fed.Cir. 2010) .....	11
Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil, 774 F.2d 1132, 227 USPQ 543 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	53
KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	13, 14
Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc., 52 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (en banc).11	
Medtronic, Inc., et al. v. Troy R. Norred, M.D., Case IPR2014-00110 at Paper No. 23 (PTAB, October 8, 2014) .....	11
Microsoft Corp. v. Multi–Tech Sys., Inc., 357 F.3d 1340 (Fed.Cir.2004).....	12
Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc., 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	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.