

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

CORE WIRELESS LICENSING S.A.R.L.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-01898
Patent 8,434,020 B2

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....	1
II. Background.....	4
a. About U.S. Patent No. 8,434,020 (the “‘020 patent” or “Martyn”).....	4
b. The Challenged Claims all Require an “application summary window” to display “a limited list of at least one function”	9
c. Petitioner Failed to Conduct a Proper Claim Construction Analysis and Applied Unreasonably Broad Interpretations of the Claim Terms.....	12
d. The Petitioner’s View of Schnarel and Aberg is Incorrect	20
e. Introduction to Nason	26
III. Argument	29
a. Schnarel Fails to Disclose the “limited list of at least one function offered within the first application”	29
b. Petitioner’s Proposed Modification of Schnarel is Not Supported by the Evidence.....	38
c. Schnarel Also Fails to Disclose Each Feature of the Challenged Dependent Claims	42
d. The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Nason Teaches “each function in the list being selectable to launch the first application and initiate the selected function,” As Recited In Claims 1 and 16	46
e. The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Nason Teaches “an application summary window that can be reached directly from the main menu,” As Recited In Claims 1 and 16	59
f. The Petitioner Also Fails To Demonstrate That Nason Teaches That “the summary window further display a list of data stored in that application,” As Recited In Claim 10	62
g. The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Nason, Alone Or In Combination With Wagner, Renders Claim 11 Obvious	67

h. An Invalidity Ruling in This Case Constitutes an Impermissible Taking of a Private Right Without Article III Oversight70

IV. Conclusion72

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Cammeyer v. Newton</i> , 94 U.S. 225	71
<i>In re Translogic Tech., Inc.</i> , 504 F.3d 1249, 1257 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	12
<i>James v. Campbell</i> , 104 U.S. 356	71
<i>McCormick Harvesting Mach. Co. v. Aultman</i> , 169 U.S. 606 (1898).....	71, 72
<i>Michigan Land and Lumber Co. v. Rust</i> , 168 U.S. 589.....	71
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxycorr, Inc.</i> , 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	13, 14
<i>Moore v. Robbins</i> , 96 U.S. 530.....	71
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	13
<i>PPC Broadband, Inc. v. Corning Optical Communications RF, LLC</i> , Case No. 2015-1361 <i>et al.</i> (Fed. Cir. Feb. 22, 2016)	13, 18
<i>Seymour v. Osborne</i> , 11 Wall. 516	71
<i>United States v. Am. Bell Telephone Co.</i> , 128 U.S. 315	71
<i>United States v. Palmer</i> , 128 U.S. 262	71
<i>United States v. Schurz</i> , 102 U.S. 378	71

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 103	72
35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	1

Other Authorities

Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756 (Aug. 14, 2012).....	12
---	----

Rules

37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a).....	64
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)	12

LIST OF PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBITS

<u>Exhibit</u>	<u>Description</u>
2001	Reserved
2002	Reserved
2003	Memorandum Opinion and Order on Claim Construction in <i>Core Wireless Licensing S.A.R.L. v. LG Electronics, Inc. et al.</i> , Case No. 2:14-cv-911-JRG-RSP
2004	Partial Trial Transcript in <i>Core Wireless Licensing S.A.R.L. v. LG Electronics, Inc. et al.</i> , Case No. 2:14-cv-911-JRG-RSP
2005	Reserved
2006	Reserved
2007	Reserved
2008	U.S. Patent No. 6,781,611 to Richard (“Richard”)
2009	U.S. Patent No. 6,993,328 to Oommen (“Oommen”)
2010	<i>PPC Broadband, Inc. v. Corning Optical Commc’ns</i> , Case No. 2015-1361 <i>et al.</i> (Fed. Cir. Feb. 22, 2016)
2011	Declaration of Scott A. Denning (“Denning”)
2012	Transcript of the Deposition of Brad A. Myers (“Myers”)
2013	U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/135,385

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.