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 IPR2016-01739 Patent 8,880,862

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



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	. 1
II.	OVERVIEW OF THE '862 PATENT AND APPLE'S CHALLENGES TO THE CLAIMS	
A.	The '862 Patent	. 3
B.	Apple's Challenges to the '862 Patent	. 4
C.	Claim Construction	. 8
III.	THE PETITION FAILS TO SHOW A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS	
A.	Apple's Petition is Cumulative and Duplicative of Prior Art and Issues Previously Considered by the PTO	. 9
B.	Ground 1: Challenged Claims Are Not Rendered Obvious by Settsu	17
1	Settsu does not teach "storing boot data in compressed form that is associated witha boot data list"	17
2	Apple uses impermissible hindsight to modify Settsu to render obvious "updating the boot data list"	25
C.	Ground 2: Challenged Claims Are Not Rendered Obvious by Settsu in view of Zwiegincew	
1	. Zwiegincew Does Not Cure Apple's Deficiencies for Claim Element 5.1	30
2	The combination of Settsu and Zwiegincew does not render obvious "updating the boot data list"	32
D.	Grounds 3-4: Challenged Claims Are Not Rendered Obvious by Settsu in view of Dye	34
1	. Apple uses impermissible hindsight to combine Settsu and Dye	35
2	J 1 1 7	37



IV.	THE PETITION FAILS TO COMPLY WITH REQUISITE STATUTORY
	AND RULE REQUIREMENTS
A.	The Petition Violates the Board's Rules to Specify Statutory Grounds and Governing Laws and Precedent
B.	Grounds 2-4 Are Redundant of Ground 1 and Violate the Board's Rules 42
C.	The Board Should Exercise Its Discretion to Deny Additional Petitions that Present Same Arguments as Those Presented Here
V.	CONCLUSION47



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases Apple, Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc., IPR2015-00453, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. July 13, 2015)	44
ATD Corp. v. Lydall, Inc., 159 F.3d 534 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	40
Bettcher Indus., Inc. v. Bunzl USA, Inc., 661 F.3d 629 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	24
Butamax Advanced Biofuels LLC, v. Gevo, Inc., IPR2014–00581, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 14, 2014)	45
Ceramtec GmbH v. Cermedic, LLC, IPR2015-00424, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. July 7, 2105)	11
Conobco, Inc. dba Unilever, Inc. v. The Proctor & Gamble Co., IPR2014- 00506, Paper 17 (P.T.A.B. July 7, 2014)	10
Conopco, Inc. v. Proctor & Gamble Co., IPR2013-00510, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 12, 2014)	25
Ford Motor Co. v. Paice LLC & Abell Found., Inc., IPR2015-00767, Paper 14 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 18, 2015)	47
Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1 (1966)	27, 30, 40, 41
Grain Processing Corp. v. Am. Maize-Prod. Co., 840 F.2d 902 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	27
<i>In re Chaganti</i> , 2014 WL 274514 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	19
<i>In re Kahn,</i> 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	17, 26
In re Robertson, 169 F 3d 743 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	24



Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbott Labs., 512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	26
Integrated Global Concepts, Inc. v. Advanced Messaging Techs., Inc., IPR2014-01027, Paper 16 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 22, 2014)	1, 2, 14
Jacobs Corp. v. Genesis III, Inc., IPR2014-01267, Paper 12 (Jan. 22, 2015)	19
Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc., 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	26
KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	9, 27, 29, 36
LG Elecs., Inc. v. ATI Techs. ULC, IPR2015-00327, Paper 13 (P.T.A.B. July 10, 2015)	47
Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co., CBM2012-000003, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 25, 2012)	42, 44
Microboards Tech., LLC v. Startasys Inc., IPR2015-00287, Paper 13 (P.T.A.B. May 28, 2015)	11
Prism Pharma Co., Ltd. v. Choongwae Pharma Corp., IPR2014-00315, Paper 14 (P.T.A.B. July 8, 2014)	11
Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. v. Affinity Labs of Tex., LLC., IPR2015-00820, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 16, 2016)	46
Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. v. Rembrandt Wireless Techs., LP, IPR2015–00114, Paper 14 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 28, 2015)	46
SAS Inst. Inc. v. Complementsoft, LLC, IPR2013-00581, Paper 15 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 30, 2013)	10
Spansion Inc. v. Macronix Int'l Co., IPR2014-01116, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 22, 2014)	23, 25
Symantec Corp. v. RPost Comm'ns Ltd., IPR2014-00355 Paper 12 (July 15, 2014)	19. 20. 21



DOCKET A L A R M

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.

