

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  
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|      |   |    |
|------|---|----|
| I.   | INTRODUCTION .....  | 1  |
| II.  | OVERVIEW OF THE ‘608 PATENT AND APPLE’S CHALLENGES TO THE CLAIMS .....  | 2  |
| A.   | The ‘608 Patent.....  | 2  |
| B.   | Apple’s Challenges to the ‘608 Patent .....   | 4  |
| C.   | Claim Construction.....   | 7  |
| III. | THE PETITION FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS .....  | 8  |
| A.   | The Petition Fails to Demonstrate that Every Limitation of Each Challenged Claim is Found in the Prior Art Identified in Grounds 1-4 .....  | 8  |
| 1.   | The prior art identified in Grounds 1-4 fails to disclose numerous claim elements .....   | 10 |
| 2.   | Apple attempts to fill in the holes in the prior art through improper incorporation by reference .....  | 17 |
| B.   | The Petition Fails to Establish That the Claims Are Obvious .....   | 20 |
| 1.   | The Petition uses impermissible hindsight to combine Sukegawa and Dye .....   | 20 |
| 2.   | A POSITA would not have combined Sukegawa and Dye.....  | 25 |
| 3.   | Even if the combination of Sukegawa and Dye were proper, the combination does not render obvious “preloading” “compressed boot data” from the “boot device,” as recited in independent Claims 1, 7, 22, and 27..... | 28 |
| 4.   | The Petition fails to demonstrate the challenged claims are obvious over Sukegawa and Dye and in further view of Settsu or Burrows.....   | 30 |
| C.   | Sukegawa Does Not Disclose “Preloading... Boot Data...Prior to Completion of Initialization of [a/the] Central Processing Unit” .....   | 32 |

|     |   |    |
|-----|---|----|
| D.  | The Petition Fails to Address All Limitations Recited in Independent Claim 27 .....   | 36 |
| IV. | THE PETITION FAILS TO COMPLY WITH REQUISITE STATUTORY AND RULE REQUIREMENTS .....   | 37 |
| A.  | The Petition Impermissibly Uses Cross-Referencing, Nested Citations, and Incorporation by Reference in Violation of the Board’s Rules ..... | 37 |
| B.  | The Petition Incorporates an Expert Declaration by Reference in Violation of the Board’s Rules .....  | 44 |
| C.  | Grounds 2-4 Are Redundant of Ground 1 and Violate the Board’s Rules ...   | 48 |
| V.  | CONCLUSION .....  | 51 |

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <i>Am. Megatrends, Inc. v. Kinglite Holdings, Inc.</i> ,<br>IPR2015-01188, Paper 15 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 20, 2015).....                | 25, 26, 28 |
| <i>Apple, Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> ,<br>725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....   | 9, 17      |
| <i>Apple, Inc. v. ContenGuard Holdings, Inc.</i> ,<br>IPR2015-00453, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. July 13, 2015).....                       | passim     |
| <i>ATD Corp. v. Lydall, Inc.</i> ,<br>159 F.3d 534 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....  | 43         |
| <i>Bettcher Indus., Inc. v. Bunzl USA, Inc.</i> ,<br>661 F.3d 629 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....   | 34         |
| <i>Cisco Systems, Inc. v. C-Cation Technologies, LLC</i><br>IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 29, 2014).....                | 45, 48     |
| <i>Conopco, Inc. d/b/a Unilever v. The Proctor &amp; Gamble Comp.</i> ,<br>IPR2013-00510, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 12, 2014) ..... | 35, 36     |
| <i>Ex parte Carlucci</i> ,<br>Appeal 2010-006603, 2012 WL 4718549 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 28, 2012).....                                 | 9          |
| <i>Gambro Lundia AB v. Baxter Healthcare Corp.</i> ,<br>110 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1997) .....                                     | 44         |
| <i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> ,<br>383 U.S. 1 (1966) .....   | 21, 24, 43 |
| <i>Grain Processing Corp. v. Am. Maize-Prod. Co.</i> ,<br>840 F.2d 902 (Fed. Cir. 1988) .....                                    | 21         |
| <i>Helicos Biosciences Corp. v. Illumina, Inc.</i> ,<br>888 F. Supp. 2d 519 (D. Del. 2012) .....                                 | 19         |
| <i>In re Irani</i> ,<br>427 F.2d 806 (C.C.P.A. 1970).....  | 23         |

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <i>In re Kahn</i> ,<br>441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....   | 20         |
| <i>In re Robertson</i> ,<br>169 F.3d 743 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....  | 34         |
| <i>Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbott Labs.</i> ,<br>512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....  | 20         |
| <i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith &amp; Nephew, Inc.</i> ,<br>688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....                          | 20         |
| <i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> ,<br>550 U.S. 398 (2007) .....  | 21, 24     |
| <i>Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.</i> ,<br>CBM2012-00003, Paper 7 (PTAB Oct. 25, 2012) .....             | 44, 49, 50 |
| <i>Mintz v. Dietz &amp; Watson, Inc.</i> ,<br>679 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....   | 32         |
| <i>Oxford Nanopore Techns. Ltd. v. University of Washington</i> ,<br>IPR2014-00512, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 15, 2014) ..... | 18, 19     |
| <i>Round Rock Research, LLC v. Sandisk Corp.</i> ,<br>81 F. Supp. 3d 339 (D. Del. 2015) .....                                | 9, 18      |
| <i>Sanofi-Aventis U.S. LLC v. Astrazeneca Pharm. LP</i> ,<br>IPR2016-00348, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. June 28, 2016) .....          | 42         |
| <i>Smart Modular Techs. Inc. v. Netlist, Inc.</i> ,<br>IPR2014-01370, Paper 13 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 13, 2015) .....                | 37         |
| <i>Spansion Inc. v. Macronxi Int’l Co.</i> ,<br>IPR2014-01116, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 22, 2014) .....                       | 35         |
| <i>Toshiba Corp. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC</i> ,<br>IPR2014-00201, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. May 21, 2014) .....              | 36         |
| <i>W.L. Gore &amp; Associates v. Garlock</i> ,<br>721 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983) .....                                       | 24, 31     |

# 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.