

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 IPR2016-01738
Patent 8,880,862

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	BACKGROUND.....	3
A.	The ‘862 Patent	3
B.	The Instituted Prior Art	6
1.	Sukegawa.....	7
2.	Dye.....	8
3.	Zwiegincew.....	10
4.	Settsu.....	14
5.	Burrows.....	15
III.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	16
A.	Proper Interpretation of “Boot Data List”	18
B.	Proper Interpretation of “Non-Accessed Boot Data”	23
IV.	ARGUMENT	27
A.	Each Ground is Defective Because Petitioner’s Combinations Do Not Disclose or Render Obvious the “Boot Data List” Limitations.	27
1.	Sukegawa does not disclose a “boot data list.”	27
2.	Zwiegincew does not teach a “boot data list.”	34
3.	Sukegawa does not render obvious “disassociating non-accessed boot data from the boot data list.”	39
B.	Each Ground is Defective Because Petitioner’s Combinations Fail to Disclose “Accessing Boot Data” Before “Loading the Boot Data” and “Servicing a Request for the Boot Data.”	43

C.	Each Ground is Defective Because Petitioner’s Combinations Fail to Disclose “Loading” or “Accessing” Boot Data “That is Associated with a Boot Data List.”	47
1.	The prior art fails to disclose claim 14, which requires “accessing boot data... wherein a portion of the boot data is associated with a boot data list” before the boot data is loaded into memory.	47
2.	The prior art fails to disclose claims 8 and 11, which requires boot data be “associated with a boot data list” at the time the boot data is loaded into memory.	49
D.	Each Ground is Defective Because Petitioner’s Combinations Rest on Impermissible Hindsight	56
E.	Each Ground is Defective Because Sukegawa Does Not Disclose “Boot Data Compris[ing] a Program Code Associated with...an Application Program.”	67
F.	Each Ground is Defective Because Dye Does Not Teach “a Plurality of Encoders.”	68
G.	Ground 1 is Defective Because Apple Improperly Relies on Dye ‘284 for the “Compressed Data” Residing on “the Boot Device” Element. ..	73
H.	Each Ground is Defective Because Sukegawa Does Not Teach or Suggest “the Utilizing Comprises: Utilizing the Stored Additional Portion of the Operating System to at Least Further Partially Boot the Computer System.”	78
I.	An Invalidity Ruling in This Case Constituted an Impermissible Taking of a Private Right Without Article III Oversight.....	79
V.	CONCLUSION	82

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Apple, Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00453, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. July 13, 2015).....	59
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	78
<i>Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Grp., LP</i> , 616 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	32, 52
<i>CAE Screenplates Inc. v. Heinrich Fiedler GmbH & Co. KG</i> , 224 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	32, 52
<i>Cammeyer v. Newton</i> , 94 U.S. 225 (1876)	82
<i>CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Int’l Corp.</i> , 349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	1
<i>Chicago Bd. Options Exch., Inc. v. Int’l Sec. Exch., LLC</i> , 677 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	32, 52
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs. LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016)	17
<i>Ex parte Carlucci</i> , Appeal 2010-006603, 2012 WL 4718549 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 28, 2012).....	78
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966)	58, 62
<i>Grain Processing Corp. v. Am. Maize-Prod. Co.</i> , 840 F.2d 902 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	58
<i>In re Abbott Diabetes Care, Inc.</i> , 696 F.3d 1142 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	18

<i>In re Cortright</i> , 165 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	18
<i>In re Irani</i> , 427 F.2d 806 (C.C.P.A. 1970).....	59
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	58, 61
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	78
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	18
<i>In re Royka</i> , 490 F.2d 981 (CCPA 1974).....	1
<i>James v. Campbell</i> , 104 U.S. 356 (1881)	82
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	58
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	58, 62
<i>McCormick Harvesting Mach. Co. v. Aultman</i> , 169 U.S. 606 (1898)	81, 82
<i>Mich. Land & Lumber Co. v. Rust</i> , 168 U.S. 589 (1897)	82
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	18
<i>Moore v. Robbins</i> , 96 U.S. 530 (1877)	82
<i>PPC Broadband, Inc. v. Corning Optical Comms. RF, LLC</i> , 815 F.3d 747 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	17, 18, 19

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.