

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

LG Electronics, Inc.,
Petitioner

v.

Core Wireless Licensing S.a.r.l.,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2015-01984

Patent No. 8,434,020

Title: Computing Device with Improved User Interface for
Applications

**PETITIONER'S RESPONSE TO OBSERVATIONS ON
CROSS-EXAMINATION OF DR. RHYNE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF EXHIBITSIII

I. RESPONSE TO OBSERVATIONS ON CROSS-EXAMINATION..... 1

 A. Patent Owner’s Observations 1-4..... 1

 B. Patent Owner’s Observations 5-11..... 1

 C. Patent Owner’s Observation 12.....2

 D. Patent Owner’s Observation 13.....2

 E. Patent Owner’s Observation 14.....3

 F. Patent Owner’s Observation 15.....3

 G. Patent Owner’s Observation 16.....4

 H. Patent Owner’s Observation 17.....4

 I. Patent Owner’s Observation 18.....5

 J. Patent Owner’s Observation 19.....5

 K. Patent Owner’s Observation 20.....5

 L. Patent Owner’s Observation 21.....6

 M. Patent Owner’s Observation 22.....6

 N. Patent Owner’s Observation 23.....6

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE8

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit	Description
1010	Excerpt from 12/99 issue of Popular Science
1011	User's Guide for Ericsson R380s
1012	Press release dated 3/18/99 from Open Mobile Alliance
1013	Article dated 3/18/199 from EE Times
1014	Excerpts from Authoritative Dictionary of IEEE
1015	Rebuttal Declaration Of Dr. Vernon Thomas Rhyne, III
1016	Transcript of September 7, 2016 Deposition of Scott Denning

I. RESPONSE TO OBSERVATIONS ON CROSS-EXAMINATION**A. Patent Owner's Observations 1-4**

Patent Owner's observations numbered 1-4 identify Dr. Rhyne's testimony that he received Exhibits 1010-1013 from counsel for LG. Patent Owner argues that this testimony suggests that Dr. Rhyne cannot authenticate these exhibits. As explained in LG's Opposition to Patent Owner's Motion to Exclude (filed concurrently) nothing in Fed. R. Evid. 901 suggests that Dr. Rhyne cannot authenticate these exhibits because he received them from counsel.

B. Patent Owner's Observations 5-11

In these observations, Patent Owner identifies portions of Dr. Rhyne's testimony that identifies different programming schemes. Patent Owner points out that Dr. Rhyne acknowledged that other programming schemes were available (observation #5); that one would have to choose a programming scheme in order to implement Blanchard (observations 6-8); and that one of ordinary skill in the art would have known how to write monolithic software (observation 9). Dr. Rhyne explained clearly that the applications-plus-operating-system programming scheme was the preferred approach of those of ordinary skill by July 2000 for use in a typical cell phone. Ex. 2011 at 61:8-62:1 (testifying that, as of July 2000, use of a "monolithic operating program" was not a "good strategy" and that "I don't think one of ordinary skill in the art, if able to have the typical amount of resources for,

say, a cell phone or something like that, would have taken that approach, as Oommen makes clear"). Dr. Rhyne also explained that while a cell phone could be implemented by creating applications without an operating system, that approach "is a miasma. That's just not the way to do it..." Ex. 2011 at 59:2-3; *see generally* Ex. 2011 at 58:2-59:14.

C. Patent Owner's Observation 12

Patent Owner points out that Dr. Rhyne agreed that all the challenged claims of the '020 and '476 patents require "applications." It is not in dispute that the term "application" appears in all the claims. Dr. Rhyne also testified that the scope of patent includes "systems which do not have a concept of separate applications as such" but "that approach is dedicated to the public." Ex. 2011 at 45:7-12.

D. Patent Owner's Observation 13

Patent Owner mis-cites Dr. Rhyne's testimony and attempts to attribute it to all applications disclosed in Blanchard. Patent owner identifies and then changes testimony from Dr. Rhyne that Blanchard is silent whether after "the phonebook application is launched," a user "would be able to access all of the five disclosed functions of that phonebook application." Ex. 2011 at 53:14-54:14. In answering the questions, Dr. Rhyne assumed that he was already in the "view all" screen of the phonebook and that Blanchard was silent after that point. Ex. 2011 at 54:15-55:15. As such, it supports a finding of obviousness, because it shows that

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.