

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Department of Justice,
Petitioner,
v.

EnvisionIT, LLC,
Patent Owner

Trial No.: IPR2017-00160

Patent 8,438,221

Filed: February 7, 2017

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR
INTER PARTES REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,438,221**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. U.S. Patent No. 8,438,221	1
II. The Petition should be rejected for failure to name a Real Party in Interest (RPI).....	3
A. Background	5
B. IBM could have exercised control over Petitioner's participation in this proceeding.	6
C. Petitioner admitted that IBM was involved.	9
D. IBM has an interest in the outcome of this proceeding because of its relationship with Petitioner.	10
E. The Petition should be denied because IBM is an RPI.	10
III. Claim Construction.....	11
A. Legal Framework	12
B. Petitioner Has Not Properly Construed "Broadcast."	13
1. The claim language and the specification support Patent Owner's proposed construction and refute Petitioner's.....	14
2. Petitioner's proposed inclusion of examples is confusing and unnecessary.	16
3. Petitioner's construction is indefinite and inaccurate.....	17
IV. The Board should not institute on Grounds I through IV, because Petitioner has failed to establish that the two central references are prior art.	18
A. Petitioner bears the burden of showing that alleged prior art was authentic and publically accessible.	19
B. Petitioner has not authenticated Gundlegård or established that it was publicly accessible in order to constitute prior art.....	19
C. Petitioner has failed to authenticate 3GPP and to establish that it was publically accessible.	26
V. There is no reasonable likelihood that Petitioner will prevail on Ground I.	28
A. The combination does not disclose, suggest, or teach the limitation of claim 19[c].....	30

B.	Petitioner has not provided any rational underpinning for combining Gundlegård, Zimmers, and Rieger.	36
VI.	There is no reasonable likelihood that Petitioner will prevail on Ground III.	39
A.	The Petition fails to provide a basis for the specific combination of five references.	40
B.	Mani cannot render the '221 patent claims obvious because Mani presents exactly the problem that the '221 patent solves – in prior art systems, overhead scales with the number of recipients of an alert.	41
C.	Mani cannot be combined with 3GPP, because cell broadcast is incompatible with the per-recipient customization of Mani	42
VII.	Conclusion	43

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases	Page(s)
<i>In re Abbott Diabetes Care, Inc.</i> , 696 F.3d 1142 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	12, 13, 15
<i>ACTV, Inc. v. Walt Disney Co.</i> , 346 F.3d 1082 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	13
<i>In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr.</i> , 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	12
<i>In re Bond</i> , 910 F.2d 831 (Fed. Cir. 1990)	12
<i>Cheese Sys. Inc. v. Tetra Pak Cheese and Powder Sys., Inc.</i> , 725 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	40, 43
<i>Cisco Systems, Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> , Case IPR2014-00454 (PTAB Aug. 29, 2014) (Paper 12)	20
<i>Cordis Corp. v. Boston Scientific Corp.</i> , 561 F.3d 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	19
<i>In re Cronyn</i> , 890 F.2d 1158 (Fed. Cir. 1989)	19
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	12
<i>EMC Corp. v. Personalweb Techs., LLC</i> , Case IPR2013-00084, slip op. (PTAB May 15, 2014).....	21, 27
<i>First Data Corp. v. Cardsoft (Assignment for the Benefit of Creditors), LLC</i> , Case IPR2014-00715 (PTAB October 17, 2014) (Paper 9)	8
<i>Gonzalez v. Banco Central Corp.</i> , 27 F.3d 751 (1st Cir. 1994).....	6
<i>In re Gorman</i> , 933 F.2d 982 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	43

<i>Grain Processing Corp. v. American-Maize Prods. Co.</i> , 840 F.2d 902 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	39
<i>Groupon, Inc. v. Blue Calypso, LLC</i> , Case CBM2013-00033, (PTAB Dec. 17, 2014) (Paper 51)	22
<i>Hockerson-Halberstadt, Inc. v. Converse Inc.</i> , 183 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	13
<i>Ideavillage Products, Corp., v. Choon’s Design, LLC</i> , Case IPR2015-01143 (PTAB Nov. 9, 2015) (Paper 6)	28
<i>In re Slominski</i> , Inter Partes Reexamination No. 95/001,852, Dismissal of Reexam Petition Decision at 4 (January 23, 2013)	9
<i>Interactive Gift Express, Inc. v. Compuserve, Inc.</i> , 256 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	13
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	29, 36, 40
<i>KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	29
<i>In re Lister</i> , 583 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	28
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , Case No. IPR2012-00026 (PTAB Dec. 21, 2012) (Paper 17)	29
<i>Novak v. Tucows, Inc.</i> , No. 06-CV-1909 (JFB) (ARL), 2007 WL 922306 (E.D.N.Y. Mar. 26, 2007), <i>aff’d</i> , 330 F. App’x 204 (2d Cir. 2009)	21, 27
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (<i>en banc</i>)	13
<i>Servicenow, Inc., v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , Case IPR2015-00716 (PTAB Aug. 26, 2015) (Paper 13)	18, 19, 27, 28
<i>Shenzhen Huiding Technology Co., Ltd. v. Synaptics Inc.</i> , Case IPR2015-01741, (PTAB Aug. 7, 2015) (Paper 8)	20

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.