

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 2015-01898

Patent 8,434,020 B2

---

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO  
PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF  
U.S. PATENT NO. 8,434,020  
UNDER 35 USC §§ 311-319 AND 37 CFR §42.100 ET SEQ.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>I. Introduction.....</b>   | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>II. Overview of the ‘020 Patent. ....</b>  | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>III. Argument.....</b>   | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>A. Patentability of the Challenged Claims Over Schnarel and the Knowledge of a PHOSITA.....</b>  | <b>5</b>  |
| 1. Overview of Schnarel.....  | 6         |
| 2. Schnarel Fails to Teach an Application Summary Window that can be Reached Directly from the Main Menu.....   | 8         |
| 3. The Modification to Schnarel Based on the Knowledge of a POSITA Changes the Principle of Operation of Schnarel.....  | 10        |
| 4. Claim 11 is Separately Patentable Over Schnarel, Whether Considered Alone or In Combination with the Knowledge of a POSITA.....  | 12        |
| <b>B. Patentability of the Challenged Claims Over Schnarel and Aberg. ....</b>  | <b>13</b> |
| 1. The Modification to Schnarel Based on the Aberg does not Yield the Subject Matter Recited in the Challenged Claims and Changes the Principle of Operation of Schnarel..... | 13        |
| 2. Claim 11 is Separately Patentable Over Schnarel and Aberg, Whether Considered Alone or In Combination with the Knowledge of a POSITA.....                                  | 16        |
| <b>C. Patentability of Claim 6 Over Schnarel, PHOSITA and Yurkovic.....</b>   | <b>16</b> |
| <b>D. Patentability of Claim 6 Over Schnarel, Aberg and Yurkovic.....</b>   | <b>17</b> |

**E. Patentability of the Challenged Clams Over Nason and Nason in Combination with the knowledge of a POSITA. .... 18**

1. Overview of Nason ..... 18

2. Nason Fails to Teach or Suggest Each Function in the List Being Selectable to Launch the First Application and Initiate the Selected Function, Whether Considered Alone or in Combination with the Knowledge of a POSITA. .... 20

**F. Patentability of Claim 6 Over Nason and Yurkovic, and Nason, Yurkovic and the Knowledge of a PHOSITA..... 25**

**G. Patentability of Claim 11 Over Wagner and Nason, and Wagner, Nason and the Knowledge of a PHOSITA. .... 26**

**IV. Conclusion..... 26**

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### CASES

|   |        |
|---|--------|
| <i>CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Int’l. Corp.</i> ,<br>349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003) ..... | 10     |
| <i>In re Ratti</i> ,<br>270 F.2d 810 (C.C.P.A. 1959).....                           | 10, 15 |
| <i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> ,<br>550 U.S. 398 (2007).....                 | 10     |

### STATUTES

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| 35 U.S.C. § 314(a) ..... | 2 |
|--------------------------|---|

### REGULATIONS

|                            |   |
|----------------------------|---|
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c)..... | 2 |
|----------------------------|---|

## I. INTRODUCTION.

Petitioner challenges the validity of claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, and 16 of US Patent 8,434,020 (the “‘020 Patent”) as follows:

- Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, and 16 are alleged to be obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,225,409 to Schnarel (“Schnarel”) knowledge of a person of ordinary skill in the art (“POSITA”);
- Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, and 16 are alleged to be obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Schnarel and U.S. Patent No. 6,993,362 to Aberg (“Aberg”);
- Claim 6 is alleged to be obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Schnarel, the knowledge of a POSITA, and U.S. Patent No. 6,668,353 to Yurkovic (“Yurkovic”);
- Claim 6 is alleged to be obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Schnarel, Aberg, and Yurkovic;
- Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 10, 13, and 16 are alleged to be obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,593,945 to Nason (“Nason”);

# 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.