Filed on Behalf of Valencell, Inc.

By: Sanford E. Warren Jr. (SWarren@wriplaw.com)

R. Scott Rhoades (SRhoades@wriplaw.com)

Warren Rhoades LLP

1212 Corporate Drive, Suite 250

Irving, Texas 75038

Telephone: 972-550-2955

Fax: 469-442-0091

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE, INC. and FITBIT, INC. Petitioners

V.

VALENCELL, INC. Patent Owner

-

Case IPR2017-00321¹ U.S. Patent No. 8,923,941

REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S CONDITIONAL MOTION TO AMEND UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.121

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD Patent Trial and Appeal Board U.S. Patent & Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

¹ IPR2017-01556 has been joined to this current proceeding.



-

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	PETITIONERS DESPERATE ATTEMPT TO CHANGE THE CLAIM	
	CONSTRUCTION FOR APPLICATION-SPECIFIC INTERFACE	
	(API)	1
III.	THE SUBSTITUTE CLAIMS ARE NOT OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF THE	3
	CITED PRIOR ART	4
IV.	THE SPECIFICATION SUPPORTS THE NEW LIMITATIONS OF	
	THE SUBSTITUTE CLAIMS	0
V.	THE PATENT OWNER HAS DEMONSTRATED PROPER	
	INSTITUTED GROUNDS	1
VI	CONCLUSION 1	2



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Google Inc. v. B.E. Tech. L.L.C., IPR2014-00038, Final Written Decision, Paper 36, at 27 (P.T.A.B. March 31, 2015)	11
Idle Free Systems, Inc. v. Bergstrom, Inc., IPR2012-00027, Final Written Decision, Paper 26 (P.T.A.B. June 11, 2013)	12
Int'l Flavors & Fragrances Inc. v. U.S., IPR2013-00124, Final Written Decision, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. May 20, 2014)	10
Nike, Inc. v. Adidas AG, 812 F.3d 1326, 1350-51 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	1
Respironics, Inc. v. Zoll Med. Corp., IPR2013-00322, Final Written Decision, Paper 46, (P.T.A.B September 17, 2014)	11
Shinn Fu Co. of Am., Inc. and. Shinn Fu Corp. v. The Tire Hanger Corp., IPR2015-00208, Final Written Decision, Paper 24, (P.T.A.B. April 22, 2016)	10
Rules	
37 C.F.R. § 42.121(a)(2)	12



TABLE OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit No.	Description
2108	U.S. Patent Application No. 12/691,388, now U.S. Patent No. 8,700,111, original specification, claims, and figures.
2109	Provisional Application No. 61/274,191, filed on August 14, 2009, original specification, claims, and figures.
2115	U.S. Patent No. 8,923,941 to LeBoeuf et al., issued December 30, 2014
2116	U.S. Patent Application No. 14/184,396, now U.S. Patent No. 8,923,941, original specification, claims, and figures.
2126	U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2008/0200774 to Luo, published August 21, 2008
2127	U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2008/0133699 to Craw et al., published June 5, 2008
2136	U.S. Patent No. 6,513,532 to Mault <i>et al.</i> , issued February 4, 2003
2137	U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0181798 to Al-Ali, published September 25, 2003
2138	R.G. Lee <i>et al.</i> "A Mobile Care System With Alert Mechanism" IEEE Transactions on Information Technology in Biomedicine, Vol. 11, Issue 5, September 2007



I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioners Apple, Inc. ("Apple") and FitBit, Inc. ("FitBit") (collectively, "Petitioners") have chosen to ignore the claim construction of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board ("the Board") in their opposition to Patent Owner's, Valencell, Inc. ("Valencell" or "Patent Owner") Conditional Motion to Amend. Instead, the Petitioners developed their own construction and applied that construction to the prior art. Petitioners make no attempt and do not apply the Board's construction for the claim term "application-specific interface (API)" in its opposition; instead Petitioners repeatedly disregarded or attempted to modify the construction set forth by the Board. Accordingly the references asserted in Petitioners' opposition fail to anticipate or render the substitute claims obvious. *See Nike, Inc. v. Adidas AG*, 812 F.3d 1326, 1350-51 (Fed. Cir. 2016).

II. PETITIONERS DESPERATE ATTEMPT TO CHANGE THE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION FOR APPLICATION-SPECIFIC INTERFACE (API).

Petitioners set forth a variety of arguments in their desperate attempt to change the construction for the claim term "application-specific interface (API)." Specifically, Petitioners set forth **EACH** of the following arguments:

1. "PO did not present any specific construction for the term "application-specific interface (API)." *See* Petitioner's Opposition ("Opp.") at pgs. 2-3. Patent Owner discussed the Board's construction of this term for the '941 patent at length in the Motion to Amend (*see* pgs. 7-10). As the Board has already construed this



DOCKET

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.

