By: William D. Belanger
Pepper Hamilton LLP
125 High Street
19th Floor, High Street Tower
Boston, MA 02110
(617) 204-5100 (telephone)
(617) 204-5150 (facsimile)
belangerw@pepperlaw.com

APPLE INC. Petitioner

V.

ANDREA ELECTRONICS CORPORATION
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2017-00626 U.S. Patent 6,363,345

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE



TABLE OF CONTENTS

				Page(s)	
Tabl	e of A	uthori	ities	iii	
I.	INT	RODU	UCTION	1	
II.	OVE	ERVIE	EW OF THE '345 PATENT	3	
III.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AND LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART				
	A.	A P	Person Having Ordinary Skill In The Art		
	B.	Clai	Claim Construction		
IV.	THE '626 PETITION FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT CERTAIN CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE OBVIOUS OVER <i>HIRSCH</i> AS ALLEGED				
	A.	Gro	ound Based on the Combination of Hirsch and Martin	12	
		1.	Summary of <i>Hirsch</i>	12	
		2.	Summary of <i>Martin</i>	14	
		3.	Hirsch and Martin do not render obvious claims 4-11 at 39-42		
	B.	Gro	ound Based on the Combination of Hirsch and Boll	31	
		1.	Summary of Boll	31	
		2.	Apple Fails to Establish That A Skilled Artisan Would Have Been Motivated to Combine <i>Hirsch</i> and <i>Boll</i>	32	
	C.	Gro	ound Based on the Combination of Hirsch, Martin, and Bol	<i>!1</i> 35	
		1.	Apple Fails to Establish That A Skilled Artisan Would Have Been Motivated to Combine <i>Hirsch</i> , <i>Martin</i> , and <i>Boll</i>		
	D.	Ground Based on the Combination of <i>Hirsch</i> , <i>Boll</i> , and <i>Arsla</i> .			
		1.	Summary of Arslan		
		2.	Apple fails to establish that a skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine <i>Hirsch</i> , <i>Boll</i> , and <i>Arslan</i>	2	
	E.	E. Grounds Based on the Combinations of <i>Hirsch</i> and <i>Uesugi</i> , a <i>Hirsch Martin</i> and <i>Uesugi</i>		nd 42	



	1. Summary of <i>Ue</i>	sugi	42
	been motivated	stablish that a skilled artisan would have to combine <i>Hirsch</i> and <i>Uesugi</i> , or and <i>Uesugi</i>	42
V.		27 PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED	45
VI	CONCLUSION		48



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES Page	<u> (s)</u>
Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC, 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	41
Canon Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC, IPR2014-00535, Paper 9 (PTAB Sep. 24, 2014)	.46
CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Int'l Corp., 349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	.11
Dominion Dealer Solutions, LLC v. Autoalert, Inc., IPR2013-00220, Paper 8 (PTAB Aug. 5, 2013)	40
Endo Pharmaceuticals v. Depomed, IPR2014-00652, Paper 12 (PTAB Sep. 29, 2014)	, 12
Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v Illumina Cambridge Ltd., 821 F.3d 1359, (Fed. Cir. 2016)	.12
Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd., IPR2013-00324, Paper 19 (PTAB Nov. 21, 2013)	46
InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGO Communications, Inc., 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014).	2
KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	sim
LG Display, Ltd. v. Innovative Display Technologies LLC., IPR2014-01094, Paper 10 (PTAB Jan. 13, 2015)	.44
LG Display, Ltd. v. Innovative Display Technologies LLC., IPR2014-01094, Paper 18 (PTAB April 9, 2015)	.44
LG Electronics, Inc. v. ATI Technologies, IPR2015-00327, Paper 13 (PTAB Jul. 10, 2015)	.45
Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casualty Ins. Co., CBM2012-00003, Paper 7 (PTAR Oct. 25, 2012)	Δ 7



Medtronic, Inc. v. Robert Bosch Healthcare Sys., Inc., IPR2014-00436, Paper 17 (PTAB June 19, 2014)	46
Oracle v. Clouding IP, LLC, IPR2013-00075, Paper 15 (PTAB June 13, 2013)	48
Personal Web Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc., 848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	passim
In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981 (CCPA 1974)	11
In re Translogic Tech., Inc., 504 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	9
TRW Automotive U.S., LLC v. Magna Electronics, Inc., IPR2015-00949, Paper 7 (PTAB Sep. 17, 2015)	9
Unilever, Inc. d/b/a Unilever v. Proctor & Gamble Co., IPR2014-00506, Paper 17 (PTAB July 7, 2014)	46
In re Van Os, 844 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	34, 36
STATUTES	
35 U.S.C. § 313	1
35 U.S.C. § 314	45
35 U.S.C. § 325	3
OTHER AUTHORITIES	
37 C.F.R. § 42.1	45
37 C.F.R. § 42.100	9
37 C.F.R. § 42.104	34
37 C.F.R. § 42.107	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.108	3
Office Patent Trial Practice Guide 77 Fed Rev 48 756 (Aug 14 2012)	9 20



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.

