

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.
Petitioner

v.

PERSONALIZED MEDIA COMMUNICATIONS, LLC
Patent Owner

Case No.: IPR2016-00754
Patent No.: 8,559,635

**PETITIONER'S OPPOSITION
TO PATENT OWNER'S CONTINGENT MOTION TO AMEND**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. The Substitute Claims Do Not Satisfy § 101.1

II. The Substitute Claims Do Not Satisfy § 112.5

A. PMC Did Not Satisfy 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(b)(1) and (2).....5

B. Substitute Claims 34 and 35 Are Not Supported by the Specification.....7

C. Substitute Claim 36 Is Not Supported by the Specification.9

D. Substitute Claims 37-40 Are Not Supported by the Specification.....11

III. Substitute Claims 34-40 Would Have Been Obvious to a Person of Ordinary Skill In the Art13

A. PMC Failed to Show That Its Substitute Claims Are Patentable..... 13

B. Claim Construction 14

C. The Substitute Claims Are Unpatentable Over Guillou..... 14

1. Substitute Claim 34 Is Obvious in Over Guillou..... 14

2. Substitute Claim 35 Is Obvious Over Guillou 16

3. Substitute Claim 36 Is Obvious Over Guillou 17

4. Substitute Claims 37-39 Are Obvious Over Guillou..... 18

5. Substitute Claim 40 Is Obvious Over Guillou 19

D. Substitute Claims 37-40 Are Unpatentable Over Aminetzah 19

1. Substitute Claims 37-39 Are Obvious Over Aminetzah..... 19

2. Substitute Claim 40 Is Obvious Over Aminetzah..... 21

E. The Substitute Claims Are Unpatentable Over Seth-Smith..... 21

1. Claim 2 Is Anticipated By Seth-Smith 22

2. Substitute Claim 34 Is Obvious Over Seth-Smith 22

3. Substitute Claim 35 Is Anticipated by Seth-Smith 24

4. Substitute Claim 36 Is Obvious Over Seth-Smith 24

IV. PMC Has Not Met Its Burden.25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Affinity Labs of Tex., LLC v. DIRECTV, LLC</i> , 838 F.3d 1253 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	4
<i>Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int’l</i> , 134 S.Ct 2347 (2014).....	3
<i>B.E. Tech., L.L.C. v. Google, Inc.</i> , No. 2015-1827, 2016 WL 6803057 (Fed. Cir. Nov. 17, 2016)	6
<i>Digitech Image Techs., LLC v. Elecs. for Imaging, Inc.</i> , 758 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	4
<i>Elec. Power Grp., LLC v. Alstom S.A.</i> , 830 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	3
<i>Facebook, Inc. v. EveryMD LLC</i> , IPR2014-00242, 2015 WL 2268210 (P.T.A.B. May 12, 2015)	5, 6
<i>In re Chu</i> , 66 F.3d 292 (Fed. Cir. 1995)	9
<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. Symantec Corp.</i> , 838 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	3, 4
<i>MasterImage 3D, Inc. v. RealD Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00040, 2015 WL 4383224 (P.T.A.B. July 15, 2015).....	14
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	13
<i>Nichia Corp. v. Emcore Corp.</i> , IPR2012-00005, 2013 WL 8352845 (P.T.A.B. June 3, 2013)	5, 6, 8
<i>Novozymes A/S v. DuPont Nutrition Biosciences APS</i> , 723 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	7

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (CONT'D)

	Page(s)
<i>PMC v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , 161 F.Supp.3d 325 (D. Del. 2015), <i>aff'd</i> Case No. 2015-2008, 2016 WL 7118532 (Fed. Cir. Dec. 7, 2016)	1, 2
<i>PowerOasis, Inc. v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.</i> , 522 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	9
<i>Reiffin v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 214 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	8
<i>Respironics, Inc. v. Zoll Med. Corp.</i> , IPR2013-00322, 2014 WL 4715644 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 17, 2014)	6, 7
<i>Respironics, Inc. v. Zoll Med. Corp.</i> , No. 2015-1485, 2016 WL 4056094 (Fed. Cir. July 29, 2016).....	6
<i>Ultramercial, Inc. v. Hulu, LLC</i> , 772 F.3d 709 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	3, 4
Statutes	
37 C.F.R. § 42.121(b)(1).....	5, 6

PMC's Contingent Motion to Amend the claims of the '635 patent does not come close to satisfying the legal requirements for such a motion. The Motion is filled with conclusory statements, unsupported by any citations to the evidence or expert testimony, and fails on any one of multiple independent grounds. First, PMC does not meet its burden to show that the Substitute Claims are directed to patent-eligible subject matter, despite the fact that the Federal Circuit has affirmed the invalidity of dozens of highly-related PMC claims on this basis. Second, PMC does not establish that the Substitute Claims, each of which add multiple limitations, find support in the specification to satisfy 35 U.S.C. § 112. Third, PMC does not analyze the prior art with any specificity, failing even to distinguish the references on which this IPR was instituted, let alone additional relevant prior art. For any one of these reasons, PMC's Motion must be denied.

I. THE SUBSTITUTE CLAIMS DO NOT SATISFY § 101.

Not only must PMC establish the Substitute Claims claim patent-eligible subject matter under § 101, but it must do so against the backdrop of dozens of related and highly-similar PMC claims being found invalid on this basis by the Federal Circuit. A Delaware district court, in a decision affirmed by the Federal Circuit, found the claims of seven PMC patents invalid under § 101. *PMC v. Amazon.com, Inc.*, 161 F.Supp.3d 325 (D. Del. 2015), *aff'd* Case No. 2015-2008, 2016 WL 7118532 (Fed. Cir. Dec. 7, 2016). One of these patents in particular, U.S.

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.