UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.
Petitioner

v.

LONGITUDE FLASH MEMORY SYSTEMS S.A.R.L.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2015-01950
Patent 7,818,490

PATENT OWNER LONGITUDE FLASH MEMORY SYSTEMS S.A.R.L. AND EXCLUSIVE LICENSEE LONGITUDE LICENSING LTD.'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Table of Contents

I. Introduction 1

II. Background.....2

A. About U.S. Patent No. 7,818,490 (the "'490 patent") 2

B. Petitioner's Grounds of Challenge 9

III. Claim Construction.....11

A. Petitioner's Proposed Construction Is Unsupported 11

IV. The Petitioner Does Not Demonstrate That It Is More Likely Than Not to Prevail On Any Challenged Claim on the '490 Patent.....13

A. Petitioner Improperly Circumvents the Board's Page Limit Rule.....13

B. Petitioner Fails to Demonstrate That Niijima Anticipates Claims 73-86 and 92 or Renders Those Claims Obvious in View of the Knowledge of a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art (Ground 1) 17

1. Petitioner Improperly Conflates Multiple Embodiments in Niijima 18

2. The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Niijima in View of the Knowledge of a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Discloses "programming the one or more pages of updated user data…in at least a second block of memory storage elements," As Recited In Independent Claim 73 22

3. The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Niijima in View of the Knowledge of a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Discloses "wherein the one or more pages of updated user data are programmable into pages of said at least the second block…having different offset positions therein than the offset positions of pages within said at least first block," As Recited In Independent Claims 73 25

4. The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Niijima in View of the Knowledge of a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Discloses Programming Logical Addresses Within Pages In Which the Pages of Updated or Original User Data Are Programmed, As Required In Claims 75, 78, and 86 28

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

5. The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Niijima in View of the Knowledge of a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Discloses "reading from the pages of updated user data the logical addresses associated with the read pages of updated user data," As Recited In Claim 76.....31
6. The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Niijima in View of the Knowledge of a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Discloses That The Programmed Logical Addresses Include a Logical Block Number and a Logical Page Offset, As Required By Claims 77 and 80.....31
7. The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Niijima in View of the Knowledge of a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Discloses "organizing the read pages of original user data that have not been updated and the read pages of updated user data in an order of their associated logical addresses," As Recited In Claim 82.....34
8. The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Niijima in View of the Knowledge of a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Discloses "wherein organizing the read pages of original and updated user data includes temporarily storing within the memory system at least some of the read pages of user data in the organized order," As Recited In Claim 83.....36

C. The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Niijima in View of Wells Renders Obvious Claims 87 and 88 (Ground 2).....37

1. The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Niijima in View of Wells Discloses "wherein the plurality of blocks of memory storage elements are organized in a plurality of units of physically separate groupings of blocks of memory storage elements in which programming operations may be performed independently," As Recited In Claim 87.....38
2. The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Niijima in View of Wells Discloses "linking the first and third blocks together as a metablock," As Recited In Claim 87. 40

D. The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Niijima and the Admitted Prior Art or Cappelletti Renders Obvious Claim 89 (Ground 3).....41

E. Grounds 4 and 5 43

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

F. The Petitioner Fails To Demonstrate That Niijima and Wells, and the Knowledge of One of Ordinary Skill in the Art, Hazen, or Dipert, Render Obvious Claims 87 and 88 (Ground 6) 43

G. Reservation of Argument Regarding Other Deficiencies 44

V. Conclusion 45

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Table of Authorities

Cases

Continental Can Co. v. Monsanto Co., 948 F.2d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 1991) 27
Corning Incorporated v. DSM IP Assets B.V., IPR 2013-00048, paper 94 (PTAB 5/9/2014) 28
Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966).....18
In re Oelrich, 666 F.2d 578 (CCPA 1981) 26
In re Rijckaert, 9 F.3d 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993) 26
In re Translogic Tech., Inc., 504 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2007) 11
KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007) 18
MEHL/Biophile Int'l Corp. v. Milgraum, 192 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....26
Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc., 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... 18, 19, 20
Nvidia Corp. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., IPR2015-01318, paper 8 (PTAB 12/7/2015) 19, 20
OSRAM Sylvania, Inc. v. Am. Induction Techs., Inc., 701 F.3d 698 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 18
SanDisk Corp. v. Kingston Tech. Co., 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 27696 (W.D. Wis. Mar. 15, 2011)..... vii, 21
Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987)....17
VMware, Inc. v. Electronics and Telecommunications Research Institute, IPR2014-00901, paper 7 (PTAB 7/14/2014) 14

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) 9
35 U.S.C. § 103(a) 9, 10
35 U.S.C. § 314(a) 1, 13, 45

Other Authorities

M.P.E.P. § 2112 (IV) 26
M.P.E.P. § 2131 17
Office Patent Trial Practice Guide,
77 Fed. Reg. 48756, 48766 (Aug. 14, 2012) 11, 28

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.