

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

VALVE CORPORATION,

Petitioner,

v.

IRONBURG INVENTIONS LTD.,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-00136

Patent 8,641,525

PETITIONER'S REPLY TO THE PATENT OWNER'S 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

	<u>Page</u>
Exhibit List	iv
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	1
A. The statement of intended use “for a game console,” in the preamble of claim 20, is not limiting.	1
1. Statements of intended use are not limiting, unless used during prosecution to distinguish prior art.	1
2. The general rule applies here to the statement of intended use “for a game console.”	3
3. The ’525 patent specification is directed to an ergonomic improvement that also applies to hand-held controllers for purposes other than video games.	3
B. The rest of the preamble of claim 20 is also not limiting.	5
1. The body of claim 20 is readily understood without consulting the preamble.	5
2. The preamble does not recite essential structure, or breathe life, meaning, and vitality into claim 20.	6
3. Contrary to Ironburg’s misrepresentation, the Petitioner does not agree that the preamble is limiting.	7
C. The broadest reasonable interpretation of “for a	

game console” is not exclusive.8

D. The ordinary meaning of hand-held does not require “without the need for external support.”10

III. PATENT OWNER’S ARGUMENTS DO NOT NEGATE ANTICIPATION BY WÖRN.12

A. Wörn does not need to expressly disclose use “for a game console,” because that statement of intended use in the preamble of claim 20 is not limiting.12

B. Wörn discloses a hand-held controller that can be used with a game console.....13

IV. CONCLUSION14

EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit No.	Description
1001	U.S. Patent 8,641,525 to Burgess et al.
1002	U.S. Patent 9,089,770 to Burgess et al.
1003	U.S. Patent 6,362,813 to Wörn et al.
1004	U.S. Patent App. Pub. 2010/0073283 to Enright
1005	U.S. Patent 6,153,843 to Date, et al.
1006	U.S. Patent 6,364,771 to Lee
1007	U.S. Patent 4,032,728 to Oelsch
1008	UK Search and Examination Report for Patent App. No. GB1011078.1, 16 May 2011, at 2.
1009	Expert Declaration of David Rempel, M.D., in Support of Valve Corporation's Second Petition for Inter-Partes Review of U.S. Patent 8,641,525.
1010	Curriculum Vitae of David Rempel, M.D. (also denominated as Ex. 1 to Ex. 1009).
1011	- not used -
1012	Declaration of Reynaldo C. Barceló.
1013	Expert Declaration of David Rempel, M.D., in Support of Petitioner's Replies to the Patent Owner Responses in IPR2017-00136 and IPR2017-00136. (Rempel Reply Declaration)
1014	Prosecution history of U.S. Patent 8,641,525.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the Patent Owner Response in IPR2017-00136 (“PO Response”), the Patent Owner (“Ironburg”) interprets its own patent narrowly – attempting to effectively carve away a substantial portion of the scope of claim 20 of U.S. Pat. No. 8,641,525 (the “’525 patent”) because of alleged limitations in the claim’s short preamble. In this reply, the Petitioner exposes that as an improper result-oriented tactic, rather than being a fair reading of the subject patent under the law.

II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION

A. **The statement of intended use “for a game console,” in the preamble of claim 20, is not limiting.**

As explained fully below, the language “for a game console” in the preamble of claim 20 of the ’525 patent is merely a statement of intended use that is not exclusive or properly limiting in this case.

1. **Statements of intended use are not limiting, unless used during prosecution to distinguish prior art.**

The Federal Circuit has explained why longstanding and consistent precedent holds that statements of intended use are almost never limiting in apparatus or composition claims, as follows:

[P]reambles describing the use of an invention generally do not limit the claims because the patentability of apparatus or composition claims depends on the claimed structure, not on the use or purpose of that

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.