

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AMIT AGARWAL,
Petitioner,

v.

IMMERSION CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00807
Patent No. 8,773,356

**IMMERSION CORPORATION'S
CORRECTED PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION OF THE PETITION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....	2
A. The Same Exact Prior Art and Similar Arguments Were Considered by the Examiner During Original Prosecution	2
B. The Petition Does Not Present Any New Evidence.....	5
C. Section 325(d) Authorizes The Board To Reject Petitions That Reargue Positions The Office Previously Considered.....	5
III. THE '356 PATENT.....	7
IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	9
V. PERSON HAVING ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART (PHOSITA).....	10
VI. SUMMARY OF PETITIONER'S CHALLENGES	11
A. Ground 1: Anticipation of Claims 1-3, 9-13, 19-23, 25 and 26 Based on the Rosenberg '737 Application.....	11
B. Ground 2: Obviousness of Claims 5, 7, 15, and 17 Based on the Rosenberg '737 Application and IBM Simon.....	11
VII. THE ROSENBERG '737 APPLICATION DOES NOT ANTICIPATE CLAIMS 1-3, 9-13, 19-23, 25, AND 26 OF THE '356 PATENT.....	11
A. Petitioner Has Not Shown an Embodiment Arranged in the Same Way as Recited in the Claims of the '356 Patent.....	12
1. The Petition Relies on Portions of Different Embodiments for Anticipation.....	14

	<u>Page</u>
2. The Petition Provides No Evidence of How to Combine the Multiple Embodiments as Arranged in the Claims of the '356 Patent.....	16
B. Petitioner Has Not Established That the Rosenberg '737 Application Discloses “determining an interaction between the object contacting the touch-sensitive input device and the graphical object”.....	20
C. Petitioner Has Not Established That the Rosenberg '737 Application Discloses “generating an actuator signal based at least in part on the interaction and haptic effect data in a lookup table”	22
1. The Portion of the Rosenberg '281 Application Relating to a Lookup Table Was Not Incorporated by Reference in the Rosenberg '737 Application.....	22
2. The Rosenberg '281 Application Does Not Disclose the Claimed Lookup Table.....	26
VIII. PETITIONER’S OBVIOUSNESS GROUND FOR CLAIMS 5, 7, 15, AND 17 FAILS.....	32
A. Ground 2: Obviousness of Claims 5, 7, 15, and 17 Based on Rosenberg '737 and Simon	32
IX. CONCLUSION.....	33

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Advanced Display Sys., Inc. v. Kent State Univ.</i> , 212 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	22
<i>In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech Ctr.</i> , 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	10
<i>Application of Saunders</i> , 444 F.2d 599 (C.C.P.A. 1971)	26
<i>Blue Calypso LLC v. Groupon, Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	18, 19
<i>Callaway Golf Co. v. Acushnet Co.</i> , 576 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	22
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Michelle K. Lee</i> , __ S. Ct. __, 2016 WL 3369425 (June 20, 2016)	9
<i>Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , IPR2013-00324, Paper No. 19 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 21, 2013)	6
<i>Medtronic, Inc. v. Nuvasive, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00487 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 11, 2014)	7
<i>Medtronic, Inc. v. Robert Bosch Healthcare Sys., Inc.</i> , IPR2014- 0436 (P.T.A.B. June 19, 2014)	7
<i>Microboards Tech., LLC d/b/a Afinia v. Stratasy Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00287 (P.T.A.B. May 28, 2015)	6
<i>Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. Verisign, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	11, 13, 14, 18
<i>Prism Pharma Co., Ltd. v. Choongwae Pharma Corp.</i> , IPR2014-00315 (P.T.A.B. July 8, 2014)	6

SK Hynix Inc. v. DSS Tech. Management, Inc.,
IPR2016-00192 (Judge Minn Chung May 11, 2016)18, 22

Unified Patents, Inc. v. PersonalWeb Techs., LLC,
IPR2014-00702 (P.T.A.B. July 24, 2014)6

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 10213

35 U.S.C. § 314(a)19, 33

35 U.S.C. §316(e)11

35 U.S.C. § 325(d)*passim*

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)9, 10

157 Cong. Rec. S1042 (daily ed. Mar. 1, 2011)6

U.S. Patent No. 6,429,846.....2, 4

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.