

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

APPLE INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

IMMERSION CORPORATION,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2016-01381  
Patent No. 8,773,356

---

**IMMERSION CORPORATION'S  
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**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. THE '356 PATENT.....	2
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	5
A. Immersion’s Construction is Consistent With the Specification and Claim Language .....	6
B. The File History Requires Immersion’s Construction .....	9
C. Petitioner’s Construction Reads Out “interaction” From the Claims.....	10
IV. PERSON HAVING ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART (POSITA).....	11
V. SUMMARY OF PETITIONER’S CHALLENGES .....	12
A. Ground 1: Obviousness of Claims 1-3, 9-13, 19-23, 25 And 26 Based on the Combination of Rosenberg 737 and Rosenberg 281 .....	12
B. Ground 2: Obviousness of Claims 5, 7, 15, and 17 .....	13
VI. INSTITUTION SHOULD BE DENIED ON PETITIONER’S GROUNDS 1-2 BECAUSE ROSENBERG 737 IS NOT PRIOR ART UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) or 102(b) .....	13
VII. INSTITUTION SHOULD BE DENIED ON PETITIONER’S GROUND 1 BECAUSE ROSENBERG 737 IN VIEW OF ROSENBERG 281 DOES NOT RENDER OBVIOUS CLAIMS 1- 3, 9-13, 15, 17, 19-23, OR 25-26.....	16
A. Background of Asserted References .....	16
1. Rosenberg 737.....	16

	<u>Page</u>
2. Rosenberg 281.....	17
B. Neither Rosenberg 737 Nor Rosenberg 281 Discloses “generating an actuator signal based at least in part on the interaction and haptic effect data in a lookup table” Under the Appropriate Construction. ....	18
C. A Combination Incorporating Rosenberg 281’s Lookup Table Would Not “generat[e] an actuator signal based at least in part on the interaction” Under Either Proposed Construction. ....	21
D. A POSITA Would Not Have Had a Reason to Combine Rosenberg 737 and Rosenberg 281 to Satisfy the Challenged Claims.....	24
1. A POSITA Would Not Have Had a Reason to Combine Rosenberg 737 and Rosenberg 281 to Implement a Touch-Screen System. ....	24
2. A POSITA Would Not Have Had a Reason to Combine Rosenberg 737’s Touchpad and Touchscreen Embodiments in the Manner Petitioner Suggests.....	27
3. A POSITA Would Not Have Had a Motivation to Use Lookup Tables to Implement the Teachings of Rosenberg 737.....	32
VIII. PETITIONER’S OBVIOUSNESS GROUND FOR CLAIMS 5, 7, 15, AND 17 FAILS.....	33
IX. CONCLUSION.....	34

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech Ctr.</i> , 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	5
<i>Bruckelmeyer v. Ground Heaters, Inc.</i> , 445 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	14
<i>In re Cronyn</i> , 890 F.2d 1158 (Fed. Cir. 1989) .....	13, 14
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131, 195 L. Ed. 2d 423 (2016).....	5
<i>In re Hall</i> , 781 F.2d 897 (Fed. Cir. 1986) .....	14
<i>Kyocera Wireless Corp. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 545 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	14
<i>Rapoport v. Dement</i> , 254 F.3d 1053 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....	24
<i>In re Warsaw Orthopedic, Inc.</i> , No. 2015-1050, 2016 WL 4191193 (Fed. Cir. Aug. 9, 2016) .....	24
<b>Statutes</b>	
35 U.S.C. § 102(a) .....	12, 13, 15
35 U.S.C. § 102(b) .....	12, 13, 14, 15
35 U.S.C. § 103(c)(1).....	1, 12, 15
35 U.S.C. § 314(a) .....	34
35 U.S.C. §316(e) .....	12

**Rules**

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) .....5

**Other Authorities**

Microsoft Computer Dictionary 5th ed. (2002) .....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.