

Filed: September 21, 2016

Filed on behalf of:

Patent Owner Voip-Pal.com Inc.

By: Kerry Taylor

John M. Carson

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

2040 Main Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

Irvine, CA 92614

Tel.: (858) 707-4000

Fax: (858) 707-4001

Email: BoxDigifonica@knobbe.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 PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION  
FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page No.</b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. ARGUMENT.....	3
A. Introduction to Claimed Subject Matter.....	3
B. Petitioner’s two obviousness grounds are redundant.....	5
C. Chu ‘366 is not prior art under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. 102(e).....	6
D. The Petition is flawed and inadequate .....	8
1. The claim charts fall well below the requirement to explain the grounds of unpatentability “with particularity” .....	9
E. Ground 1 fails because the combination of Chu ‘684 and Chu ‘366 does not disclose all claim elements and because the combination is not obvious.....	14
1. Chu ‘684 and Chu ‘366 are completely unrelated documents naming completely different inventors.....	14
2. Overview of Chu ‘684 .....	14
3. Overview of Chu ‘366 .....	15
4. The combination of Chu ‘684 and Chu ‘366 fails to render obvious meeting different “classification criteri[a]” as claimed.....	16
5. The combination of Chu ‘684 and Chu ‘366 fails to render obvious “using a caller identifier ... to locate a caller dialing profile” as recited in [1a] and “using a first participant identifier to locate a first participant profile” as recited in [74a].....	25

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
*(cont'd)*

	<b>Page No.</b>
6. Petitioner fails to articulate a proper reason to combine the references and overlooks reasons why the combination is undesirable.....	37
F. Ground 2 fails because the combination of Chu ‘684 and Chen does not disclose all claim elements and because the combination is not obvious.....	47
1. Overview of Chen .....	47
2. The combination of Chu ‘684 and Chen fails to render obvious meeting different “classification criteri[a]” as recited in the claims .....	48
3. The combination of Chu ‘684 and Chen fails to render obvious “using a caller identifier ... to locate a caller dialing profile” as recited in [1a] and “using a first participant identifier to locate a first participant profile” as recited in [74a].....	52
4. Petitioner fails to articulate a proper reason to combine the references and overlooks that the combination is undesirable .....	58
III. CONCLUSION.....	65

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

**Page No(s).**

<i>Apple Inc. v. Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute</i> , IPR2014-00077, Paper 14 (P.T.A.B. June 13, 2014) .....	13, 40, 61
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 29, 2014).....	13, 14
<i>Eaton v. Evans</i> , 204 F.3d 1094 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	7
<i>Globespanvirata, Inc. v. Tex. Instruments, Inc.</i> , 2005 WL 3077915 (D. N.J. 2005) .....	13
<i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984) .....	23, 51
<i>K-TEC, Inc. v. Vita-Mix Corp.</i> , 696 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	39
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Liberty Mutual Insurance Company v. Progressive Casualty Insurance Company</i> CBM2012-00003, Paper 7 (Representative Order) .....	6
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd.</i> , No. 2015-1300, 2016 WL 3974202 (Fed. Cir. July 25, 2016) .....	11, 12
<i>In re McLaughlin</i> , 443 F.2d 1392 (C.C.P.A. 1971) .....	46, 47, 51, 64
<i>Mformation Techs., Inc. v. Research in Motion Ltd.</i> , 764 F.3d 1392 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	17
<i>Nautilus Hyosung Inc. v. Diebold Inc.</i> , e IPR2016-00633, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 22, 2016) .....	11, 12

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**  
*(cont'd)*

**Page No(s).**

*Unified Patents, Inc. v. William Grecia,*  
IPR2016-00789, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 9, 2016).....39, 59, 60

**OTHER AUTHORITIES**

37 C.F.R. § 42.1 .....6  
37 C.F.R. § 42.6 .....10, 13, 40, 61  
37 C.F.R. § 42.22 .....8  
37 C.F.R. § 42.65 .....41, 61, 62  
37 C.F.R. § 42.104 .....*passim*  
37 C.F.R. § 42.107 .....1  
35 U.S.C. §102.....6, 7  
35 U.S.C. § 312.....*passim*  
35 U.S.C. § 313.....1  
35 U.S.C. § 314.....2, 4  
35 U.S.C. § 316.....6

# 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.