# 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 IPR2015-01899 Patent 8,713,476 B2

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE




## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	Iı	ntroduction	1
II.		Background	3
8	a.	About U.S. Patent No. 8,713,476 (the "'476 patent" or "Martyn")	3
(		The Challenged Claims all Require a "limited list of data offered within the or more applications" and the "data" must be "seen within the respective dication"	8
		Petitioner Failed to Conduct a Proper Claim Construction Analysis and plied Unreasonably Broad Interpretations of the Claim Terms1	2
	d.	The Petitioner's View of Schnarel and Aberg is Incorrect	
$\epsilon$	e.	Introduction to Nason	
III		Argument	8
	a. Evi	Petitioner's Proposed Modification of Schnarel is Not Supported by the dence	
(		Schnarel Also Fails to Disclose a "limited list of data offered within the one nore applications" that is both displayed in an Application Summary and see thin the respective Application	
	c. De <sub>l</sub>	Schnarel Also Fails to Disclose or Suggest Each Feature of the Challenged pendent Claims	6
1	An	The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Nason Teaches Data In An plication Summary Being Selectable To Launch The Respective Application d Enable The Selected Data To Be Seen Within The Respective Application, Required By Claims 1 and 20	7
5		The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Nason Teaches "an application nmary that can be reached directly from the menu," As Recited In Claims 1 20	0
8		The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Nason Teaches That "the blication summary is displayed while the one or more applications are in an aunched state," As Recited In Claims 1 and 20	4



g. The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Nason Teaches That "the summary
further displays a limited list of functions offered in the one or more applications
As Recited In Claims 8 and 2968
h. The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Nason, Alone Or In Combination
With Wagner, Renders Claim 9 Obvious
i. An Invalidity Ruling in This Case Constitutes an Impermissible Taking of a
Private Right Without Article III Oversight74
V. Conclusion



### **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

#### Cases

Cammeyer v. Newton, 94 U.S. 225	75
In re Translogic Tech., Inc., 504 F.3d 1249, 1257 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	12
James v. Campbell, 104 U.S. 356	75
McCormick Harvesting Mach. Co. v. Aultman, 169 U.S. 606 (1898)	74, 75
Michigan Land and Lumber Co. v. Rust, 168 U.S. 589	75
Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc., 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	12, 13
Moore v. Robbins, 96 U.S. 530	75
Phillips v. AWH Corp., 415 F3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	12
PPC Broadband, Inc. v. Corning Optical Communications RF, LLC, Cas	e No.
2015-1361 et al. (Fed. Cir. Feb. 22, 2016)	12, 17
Seymour v. Osborne, 11 Wall. 516	75
United States v. Am. Bell Telephone Co., 128 U.S. 315	75
United States v. Palmer, 128 U.S. 262	75
United States v. Schurz, 102 U.S. 378	75
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 103	76
35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	
Other Authorities	
Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756 (Aug. 14, 2012)	12
Rules	
37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a)	66
37 C F R & 42 100(b)	12



## **LIST OF PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBITS**

<b>Exhibit</b>	<u>Description</u>
2001	Reserved
2002	Reserved
2003	Memorandum Opinion and Order on Claim Construction in Core Wireless Licensing S.A.R.L. v. LG Electronics, Inc. et al., 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	PPC Broadband, Inc. v. Corning Optical Commc'ns, Case No. 2015-1361 et al. (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



# DOCKET A L A R M

# 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.

