

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

BLACKBERRY LTD.,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR 2017-01620
U.S. Patent No. 8,489,868

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	The ’868 Patent.....	1
	A. Overview of the ’868 Patent.....	1
	B. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art	5
III.	Claim Construction.....	5
	A. “Determining, at the Mobile Device, Whether the Software Application Is Signed, Wherein a Signed Software Application Includes a Digital Signature Generated Using a Private Key of a Private Key-Public Key Pair” (All Claims)	6
	B. “Abridged Version of a Software Application” (Claim 86)	8
IV.	The Challenged Claims Are Patentable Over Lin	10
	A. Overview of Lin (Ex.1011)	10
	i. Lin’s Proposed Solution for Authenticating Applications on Devices With Limited Resources	10
	ii. Components of Lin’s Signed ADF	11
	iii. Lin’s Method of Separately Downloading a Signed ADF and Associated Application	14
	B. Petitioner Improperly Combines Lin’s Distinct Embodiments	17
	C. Lin Fails to Expressly or Inherently Disclose “Based Upon Verifying the Digital Signature at the Mobile Device, the Mobile Device Allowing the Software Application Access to the Sensitive API”	25
	D. Lin Fails to Expressly or Inherently Disclose “Wherein the Private Key Is Not Accessible to the Mobile Device”	32

V. Lin Fails to Disclose How Its System Would Behave If the Signed ADF Did Not Include a Digital Signature or the Digital Signature Is Not Successfully Verified (Claims 78 and 81)37

VI. Lin’s Developer Signature Is Not Generated by Applying a Private Key to a Hash of the Software Application and Cannot Be Verified by Generating a Hash of the Software Application (Claims 85 and 104)40

VII. Lin’s Developer Signature Fails to Provide an Audit Trail to the Developer (Claim 95).....43

VIII. Lin in View of Garst Fails to Render Obvious Claims 13, 88, and 9845

A. There Is No Reason to Use Garst’s Denied Access Messages After Lin’s System Has Already Determined Access Should Be Granted (Claims 13 and 88)45

B. Verifying Lin’s Developer Signature Each Time the Software Application Is Loaded for Execution Does Not Verify the Integrity of the Application Code and Runs Counter to Lin’s Concern for Devices With Limited Resources (Claim 98)47

IX. Lin Fails to Disclose Any Embodiment Where the Signed ADF Does Not Include a Digital Signature and There Is No Reason in Lin to Purge the Software Application Upon Unsuccessful Verification of a Digital Signature (Claims 77, 79, and 82)48

X. Lin’s Developer Signature In Petitioner’s Proposed Modification Is Not Generated by Applying a Private Key to an Abridged Version of the Software Application and Cannot Be Verified by Generating an Abridged Version of the Software Application (Claim 86)51

XI. Lin in View of Gong Fails to Render Obvious Claims 93, 100, 112, and 13956

A. The Petition Fails to Show Gong is a Printed Publication (Claims 93, 100, 112, and 139).....56

i. Petitioner Fails to Show When Gong Was Publicly Accessible58

ii. Petitioner Fails to Show Gong Was Sufficiently Indexed61

B. Lin in View of Gong Fails to Render Obvious Claim 112 Because
Gong Grants Access to Non-Sensitive APIs Regardless of Whether a
Digital Signature Is Verified63

XII. Reservation of Rights64

XIII. Conclusion64

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Abiomed, Inc. v. Maquet Cardiovascular, LLC</i> , IPR2017-01204, IPR2017-01205, Paps. 8,9, 10-11 (PTAB Oct. 23, 2017)	23
<i>ABS Glob., Inc. v. Inguran, LLC</i> , IPR2016-00927, Pap.33 (PTAB Oct. 2, 2017)	59, 62
<i>Bettcher Indus. v. Bunzl USA, Inc.</i> , 661 F.3d 629 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	36
<i>Blue Calypso, LLC v. Groupon, Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	57, 61
<i>In re Cronyn</i> , 890 F.2d 1158 (Fed. Cir. 1989)	61
<i>Elec. Frontier Found. v. Pers. Audio</i> , LLC, IPR2014-00070, Pap.21, 20-24 (PTAB Apr. 18, 2014).....	56
<i>Ex parte Gundrum</i> , Appeal No. 2015-7620.....	51
<i>In re Klopfenstein</i> , 380 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	56
<i>L-3 Commc'n Holdings, Inc. v. Power Survey, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00832, Pap.9, 12 (PTAB Nov. 14, 2014).....	56
<i>In re Lister</i> , 583 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	57, 61, 62, 63
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Biscotti, Inc.</i> , 878 F.3d 1052 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	22
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015), <i>overruled on other grounds</i> , <i>Aqua</i> <i>Prods., Inc. v. Matal</i> , 872 F.3d 1290 (Fed. Cir. 2017) (en banc)	5

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.