

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

ALEX IS THE BEST, LLC

Patent Owner

Case IPR2017-02056

U.S. Patent No. 8,134,600

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page No.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT..... iv

II. INTER PARTES REVIEW IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL..... 3

III. PATENT OWNER IS ENTITLED TO EFFECTIVE FILING DATE OF JULY 26, 2005 4

IV. THE PETITION FAILS TO ESTABLISH A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD AT LEAST ONE OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS IS UNPATENTABLE 5

A. The Petition Fails to Establish a Motivation to Combine for Obvious Grounds 7

1. The Petition fails to provide a satisfactory motivation to combine Nicholas and Nair (Ground 2).....8

2. The Petition fails to provide a satisfactory motivation to combine Nicholas and Kusaka (Ground 3).....9

3. The Petition fails to provide a satisfactory motivation to combine Nicholas and Khedouri (Ground 4).....11

4. The Petition fails to provide a satisfactory motivation to combine Nicholas and Morris (Ground 5).....12

5. The Petition fails to provide a satisfactory motivation to combine Inoue and Nair (Ground 6).....13

6. The Petition fails to provide a satisfactory motivation to combine Inoue, Nair and Narayanaswami (Ground 7).....15

7. The Petition fails to provide a satisfactory motivation to combine Umeda and Inoue (Ground 8).....17

8. The Petition fails to provide a satisfactory motivation to combine Umeda, Inoue and Kusaka (Ground 9).....19

9. The Petition fails to provide a satisfactory motivation to combine Umeda, Inoue and Khedouri (Ground 10).....21

10. The Petition fails to provide a satisfactory motivation to combine Umeda, Inoue and Morris (Ground 11).....22

B. Ground 1: The Petition Fails to Establish That Claims 1-5, 8 and 9 are Anticipated by Nicholas 24

1. The Petition Relies on a Reference that Teaches Away from the Claimed Invention.....24

C. Ground 2: The Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood That Claims 10, 12 and 13 are Rendered Obvious in view of Nicholas and Nair..... 25

D. Ground 3: The Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood That Claims 10, 12 and 13 are Rendered Obvious in view of Nicholas and Kusaka..... 26

E. Ground 4: The Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood That Claim 10 is Rendered Obvious in view of Nicholas and Khedouri 26

F. Ground 5: The Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood That Claims 12 and 13 are Rendered Obvious in view of Nicholas and Morris..... 27

G. Ground 6: The Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood That Claims 1-5, 8-10, 12 and 13 are Rendered Obvious in view of Inoue and Nair..... 27

H. Ground 7: The Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood That Claim 2 is Rendered Obvious in view of Inoue, Nair and Narayanaswami..... 29

I. Ground 8: The Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood That Claims 1-5, 8 and 9 are Rendered Obvious in view of Umeda and Inoue 30

J. Ground 9: The Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood That Claim 10 is Rendered Obvious in view of Umeda, Inoue and Kusaka 31

K. Ground 10: The Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood That Claim 10 is Rendered Obvious in view of Umeda, Inoue and Khedouri 32

L. Ground 11: The Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood That Claims 12 and 13 are Rendered Obvious in view of Umeda, Inoue and Morris 32

V. CONCLUSION 34

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page No.
<u>Cases</u>	
<i>Ex Parte Ahlfeld</i> , APPEAL 2014-009272, 2016 WL 4775709 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 9, 2016)	7
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	7
<i>Jacobs Corp. v. Generis III, Inc.</i> , IP2014-01267, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 22, 2015)	7
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	7
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	7
<i>MaCormick Harvesting Mach. Co. v. Aultman & Co.</i> , 169 U.S. 606 (1898)	4
<i>Moses Lake Indus., Inc. v. Enthone, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00243, Paper 6 (P.T.A.B. June 18, 2014)	7
<i>Oil States Energy Services LLC v. Greene’s Energy Group, LLC.</i>	4
<i>Purdue Pharma L.P. v. Depomed, Inc.</i> , 643 F. App’x 960 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	8
<u>Other Authorities</u>	
37 C.F.R. §42.108(c)	7

EXHIBIT LIST

Ex. No.

Brief Description

2001

IPR2017-02058, Petition

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.