

Filed: January 22, 2018

Filed on behalf of:

Patent Owner Voip-Pal.com Inc.
By: Kevin N. Malek
MALEK MOSS PLLC
340 Madison Avenue, 19th Floor
New York, NY 10173
Tel.: +1-212-812-1491
Tel.: +1-855-291-7407
Fax: +1-561-910-4134
Email: kevin.malek@malekmoss.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.

Petitioner,

v.

VOIP-PAL.COM, INC.,

Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2016-01198
U.S. Patent 9,179,005

**PATENT OWNER'S OPPOSITION TO APPLE'S REQUEST FOR
REHEARING PURSUANT TO BOARD ORDER OF DECEMBER 21, 2018**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. LEGAL STANDARD ON REVIEW	2
III. ARGUMENT	3
A. The Board Reviewed and Rejected Petitioner’s Motivation to Combine the Prior Art References.	4
1. The Board considered and rejected all of Petitioner’s arguments.	4
2. The Second Panel relied on evidence from Patent Owner’s expert to reject Petitioner’s interpretation of Chu ‘684	6
3. The Second Panel did not “overlook” or “ignore” Petitioner’s motivation to combine arguments.....	10
B. The Second Panel Understood the Proposed Combination And Rejected It As Unsupported	12
1. The Second Panel did not misunderstand the combination; it rejected Petitioner’s underlying assumptions about Chu ‘684 .	13
2. Petitioner’s reliance on Chu ‘684’s alleged “infrastructure” for applying calling attributes was refuted by expert evidence.....	15
3. Petitioner’s proposal ignores corruption of private numbers ...	16
4. The Petitioner distorts the record in alleging that the Patent Owner “mischaracterized” its Proposed Combinations.....	17
C. Petitioner’s Arguments Are Moot Due to Reliance on Uncitable Prior Art.....	20
IV. CONCLUSION.....	21

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page No(s).

<i>Amerigen Pharm. Ltd. v. Janssen Oncology, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00286, 2018 WL 6317959 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 3, 2018)	3
<i>Arnold P'ship v. Dudas</i> , 362 F.3d 1338, 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	3
<i>Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC</i> , Nos. 2014-1575, -1576 (Fed. Cir. Nov. 5, 2015)	9, 20
<i>Dynamic Drinkware v. National Graphics</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	5
<i>In re Gartside</i> , 203 F.3d 1305, 1315–16 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	3
<i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	16
<i>Intelligent Biosystems v. Illumina Cambridge</i> , 821 F.3d 1359, 1367-1368 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	5
<i>PTAB Trial Guide</i> 77 Fed. Reg. 48763 (Aug. 14, 2012)	6
<i>Star Fruits S.N.C. v. United States</i> , 393 F.3d 1277, 1281 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	3

OTHER AUTHORITIES

35 U.S.C. § 102	2, 20
35 U.S.C. § 312	19
35 U.S.C. § 316	5

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(cont'd)

Page No(s).

37 C.F.R. § 42.65	6
37 C.F.R. § 42.71	1, 3, 7, 13
37 C.F.R. § 42.104	5, 6

Patent Owner Voip-Pal.com, Inc. (“Voip-Pal”) hereby opposes Petitioner Apple’s Motion for Rehearing (Paper 71) and respectfully requests denial thereof.

I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner alleges that, following institution of *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent 9,179,005 (“the ‘005 Patent”) (Paper 6) by an original panel of the Board (“First Panel”), a replacement panel of the Board (“Second Panel”) erred in ruling against Petitioner in a Final Written Decision (“FWD,” Paper 53), specifically because it misapprehended or overlooked Petitioner’s arguments. In the present Motion (Paper 71), Petitioner seeks rehearing under 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d) of the FWD before a new panel (“Third Panel”) of the Board as authorized in Paper 70.

Through blanket speculation and mischaracterization of the record, Petitioner tries to mislead the Board into finding error where there has been none. Petitioner mischaracterizes the scope of review by the Board in arriving at the FWD in order to create the illusion that the Board misapprehended and overlooked its arguments. But the evidence shows that the FWD was based on a full review of the entire record, and that Petitioner’s attempt at a do-over should be denied—for *multiple* reasons:

First, the Second Panel did *not* misapprehend or overlook Petitioner’s motivation to combine argument or the related testimony of Petitioner’s expert, but rather, *rejected* it as insufficient and/or implausible in light of the well-supported evidence of Patent Owner’s expert evidence—which was *not before the First Panel*;

Second, the Second Panel did *not* misapprehend or overlook the Proposed

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.