

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APPLE, INC.,  
Petitioner

v.

REALTIME DATA, LLC D/B/A/ IXO  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2016-01365  
Patent 7,181,608

---

**PATENT OWNER REALTIME DATA, LLC D/B/A IXO'S RESPONSE**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	BACKGROUND.....	3
A.	THE '608 PATENT.....	3
B.	THE INSTITUTED PRIOR ART.....	7
1.	Sukegawa.....	7
2.	Dye.....	9
3.	Settsu and Burrows.....	10
III.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	11
A.	PROPER INTERPRETATION OF “PRELOADING”.....	12
IV.	ARGUMENT.....	16
A.	GROUND 1-4 ARE EACH DEFECTIVE BECAUSE PETITIONER’S COMBINATIONS FAIL TO DISCLOSE “PRELOADING.”.....	16
1.	Sukegawa Does Not Disclose “Preloading,” But Rather Discloses Permanent Storage in Flash Memory for Later Access.....	16
2.	The '608 Claims Distinguish “Preloading” from Other Types of Data Transfer and Storage.....	26
B.	GROUND 1-4 ARE EACH DEFECTIVE BECAUSE PETITIONER’S COMBINATIONS FAIL TO DISCLOSE PRELOADING “PRIOR TO COMPLETION OF INITIALIZATION.”.....	27
1.	Sukegawa Discloses “Initializing” and “Preloading” Occur During the Different Power-On Cycles.....	28
2.	'608 Claim 1 Requires “Initializing” and “Preloading” Occur During the Same Power-On Cycle.....	29
3.	Sukegawa Fails to Disclose “Prior to Completion of Initialization of the Central Processing Unit.”.....	33

4.	Sukegawa Fails to Disclose Claims 7, 22, and 27 for the Same Reasons.....	35
C.	GROUNDS 1-4 ARE EACH DEFECTIVE BECAUSE DYE DOES NOT TEACH “A PLURALITY OF ENCODERS.” .....	37
D.	GROUND 1 IS DEFECTIVE BECAUSE APPLE IMPROPERLY RELIES ON DYE ’284 FOR THE “COMPRESSED DATA” RESIDING ON “THE BOOT DEVICE” ELEMENT.....	42
V.	CONCLUSION.....	48

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Apple Inc. v. Memory Integrity, LLC</i> , IPR2015-00161, Paper 18 (PTAB May 8, 2015) .....	30
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	46
<i>Applied Med. Res. Corp. v. U.S. Surgical Corp.</i> , 448 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	26
<i>Augme Tech., Inc. v. Yahoo! Inc.</i> , 755 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	26
<i>Bicon, Inc. v. Straumann Co.</i> , 441 F.3d 945 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	36
<i>CAE Screenplates Inc. v. Heinrich Fiedler GmbH</i> , 224 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	26
<i>CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Int’l Corp.</i> , 349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	1
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs. LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016) .....	11
<i>Ex parte Carlucci</i> , Appeal 2010-006603, 2012 WL 4718549 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 28, 2012) .....	47
<i>Ex Parte Chen</i> , Appeal 2014-005461, 2016 WL 3877149 (PTAB July 13, 2016) .....	27
<i>Ex Parte Fenner Investments, Ltd.</i> , Appeal 2015-006923, 2015 WL 5317395 (PTAB Aug. 27, 2015) .....	27
<i>Helmsderfer v. Bobrick Washroom Equipment, Inc.</i> , 527 F.3d 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	26

<i>In re Abbott Diabetes Care, Inc.</i> , 696 F.3d 1142 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	12
<i>In re Cortright</i> , 165 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....	11
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	47
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	11
<i>In re Royka</i> , 490 F.2d 981 (CCPA 1974).....	1
<i>Inpro II Licensing, S.A.R.L. v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.</i> , 450 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	31
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Blue Sky Med. Grp., Inc.</i> , 554 F.3d 1010 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	32
<i>Kingston Technology Co., Inc. v. Imation Corp.</i> , IPR2015–00066, Paper 19 (PTAB Mar. 24, 2016) .....	26
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxycorr, Inc.</i> , 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	11
<i>NTP, Inc. v. Research in Motion, Ltd.</i> , 418 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	30
<i>PPC Broadband, Inc. v. Corning Optical Comms. RF, LLC</i> , 815 F.3d 747 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	11, 12
<i>Round Rock Research, LLC v. Sandisk Corp.</i> , 81 F. Supp. 3d 339 (D. Del. 2015) .....	47
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. v. Koninklijke KPN N.V.</i> , IPR2016-00808, Paper 6 (PTAB Sep. 19, 2016) .....	30
<i>Trivascular, Inc. v. Samuels</i> , 812 F.3d 1056, 1062 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	11, 12

# 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.