

trials@uspto.gov

571-272-7822

IPR2015-01984, Paper No. 39

IPR2015-01985, Paper No. 40

January 12, 2017

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 IPR2015-01984 (Patent 8,434,020 B2)
Case IPR2015-01985 (Patent 8,713,476 B2)

Held: December 14, 2016

BEFORE: JAMESON LEE, DAVID C. McKONE, and KEVIN
W. CHERRY, Administrative Patent Judges.

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Wednesday,
December 14, 2016, commencing at 3:32 p.m., at the U.S. Patent
and Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia.

Case IPR2015-01984 (Patent 8,434,020 B2)

Case IPR2015-01985 (Patent 8,713,476 B2)

APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:

NICHOLAS A. BROWN, ESQUIRE

HERBERT H. FINN, ESQUIRE

Greenberg Traurig, LLP

Four Embarcadero Center

Suite 3000

San Francisco, California 94111

ON BEHALF OF PATENT OWNER:

WAYNE HELGE, ESQUIRE

WALTER D. DAVIS, Jr., ESQUIRE

Davidson, Berquist, Jackson & Gowdey, LLP

8300 Greensboro Drive

Suite 500

McLean, Virginia 22102

Case IPR2015-01984 (Patent 8,434,020 B2)

Case IPR2015-01985 (Patent 8,713,476 B2)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

P R O C E E D I N G S

- - - - -

JUDGE CHERRY: Good afternoon. This is the consolidated hearing in IPRs 2015-1984 and 1985, LG Electronics Inc versus Core Wireless Licensing S.A.R.L. Counsel, will you please make your appearances.

MR. BROWN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Nick Brown and with me is Herb Finn both from Greenberg Traurig on behalf of LG.

MR. HELGE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Wayne Helge and Walter Davis here for the patent owner.

JUDGE CHERRY: Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Judge Cherry. And with me are Judges Lee and McKone. Judge McKone, as you know, is in our Midwest regional office in Detroit and is appearing remotely. So please speak into the microphone, as I am being reminded, so that he can hear us.

LG, you may begin.

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Your Honor. I have copies, hard copies of the demonstratives. Would you like me to bring them forward?

JUDGE CHERRY: Yes, please.

MR. BROWN: May it please the Board, the challenged patents in this case, the '020 and '476 patents, describe an improvement to a user interface. You can see that's on slide 2, an improved user interface is in the title of both of the patents. You can see on slide 3 the field of the invention explains that the

Case IPR2015-01984 (Patent 8,434,020 B2)

Case IPR2015-01985 (Patent 8,713,476 B2)

1 invention is about an improved user interface. You can see in the
2 description of the prior art that the problem being addressed is a
3 user interface problem, how to allow the use to navigate quickly
4 and efficiently to access data and activate a desired function.
5 And you can see on slide 5 in the abstract that the solution
6 described is a user interface solution. The present invention
7 offers a snapshot view which brings together in one summary
8 window a limited list of common functions and commonly
9 accessed stored data.

10 So we are talking here about a user interface patent.
11 The patents are not about what is under the hood. They don't
12 provide any specifics about how the user interface improvement
13 that they describe should be implemented. They don't describe
14 any improvement to software architecture. They don't describe
15 any improvement to any hardware. To the contrary, what the
16 patents say is that the claimed user interface improvement can be
17 implemented in, quote, any computing environment.

18 If you look at slide 6, we have relied on the Blanchard
19 reference. Figure 2 of the Blanchard reference is on the screen.
20 You can see that the Blanchard reference describes the user
21 interface for a phone with a small screen. And in particular, on
22 the next slide, slide 7, Blanchard describes a specific menu
23 structure to be used on a small screen device and it explains that it
24 is describing this menu structure to provide flexibility and
25 efficiency in navigating through the phone. Blanchard, like the
26 '020 and '476 patents, is not about what is under the hood. It

Case IPR2015-01984 (Patent 8,434,020 B2)

Case IPR2015-01985 (Patent 8,713,476 B2)

1 specifically states that it makes no attempt to describe the
2 software that is used to implement the user interface in a
3 particular menu structure that is shown.

4 The user interface that Blanchard describes, I'm now on
5 slide 8, is virtually identical to the user interface that's described
6 in the '020 patents. In both Blanchard and the '020 patent, the
7 user begins in a main menu of icons where the icons represent
8 applications available on the phone. For example, in the '020
9 patent, you have an envelope that represents the messages
10 application. In Blanchard, you have a mailbox that represents the
11 mailbox application.

12 In both Blanchard and the '020 patent, I'm now on the
13 next slide, the next step from the main menu is to access a
14 summary window that collects in one quickly accessible place
15 commonly used functions and data from the application. You can
16 see on the left, the '020 patent, this window drops down from the
17 messages application icon. You can see on the right in Blanchard
18 it's exactly the same thing. The window appears immediately
19 beneath the mailbox icon when the mailbox icon is selected.

20 Now, patent owner's response to this overwhelming
21 similarity between these two user interfaces is to go under the
22 hood of the user interface and to argue about what the term
23 "application" means. They have focused their attention on the
24 single word, "application" and they are arguing that an
25 application must first be something which is separate and distinct
26 from an operating system and be implemented on top of an

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.