

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ZTE CORPORATION AND ZTE (USA) INC.,
Petitioners,

v.

MAXELL, LTD.,
Patent Owner

Case: IPR2018-00235

U.S. Patent No. 6,748,317

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
TO PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,748,317**

Mail Stop **Patent Board**
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	3
A. Technology Background	3
B. Overview of the ’317 Patent Invention	3
C. Summary of Petitioner’s Proposed Grounds of Unpatentability and the References Cited.....	5
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	6
A. Petitioner Fails to Properly Apply the Broadest Reasonable Interpretation	8
1. “Inputting a Destination” (Claim 1).....	8
2. “said display changes according to a change of said direction of said portable terminal orientation for walking navigation” (Claims 1, 10)”	9
B. The Term “said device connected to said server outputting said location information and said direction information and receiving retrieved information based on said outputted information at said server” (claim 6) is a Means-Plus-Function Term For Which Petitioner Has Failed to Provide A Proposed Construction	11
IV. LEGAL STANDARD	12
V. THE PETITION DOES NOT SHOW A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF PREVAILING WITH RESPECT TO ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM	13
A. Ground 1: Petitioner Failed To Establish That Claims 1-3, 10, and 15-16 are Obvious Over Norris.	13
1. Ground 1 Has No Reasonable Likelihood of Succeeding Because Norris Does Not Disclose or Suggest Each and Every Element of the Challenged Claims.....	14

**Table of Authorities
(continued)**

	Page(s)
2. Ground 1 Has No Reasonable Likelihood of Succeeding Because Petitioner Does Not Articulate Any Rational Underpinning for Petitioner's Obviousness Arguments for Norris Alone.	22
B. Ground 2: Petitioner Failed to Establish That Claims 1-3, 10, and 15-16 are Anticipated By Norris.	26
C. Ground 3: Petitioner Failed to Established That Claims 1-3, 10, and 15-16 are Rendered Obvious By Norris in view of Lauro.	27
1. Ground 3 Has No Likelihood of Succeeding Because Norris in View of Lauro Does Not Disclose or Suggest Each and Every Element of the Challenged Claims.	28
2. Ground 3 Has No Reasonable Likelihood of Succeeding Because Petitioner Does Not Articulate Any Rational Underpinning for Petitioner's Obviousness Combination of Norris With Lauro.	30
D. Ground 4: Petitioner Failed to Established That Claims 17 and 20 are Rendered Obvious By Norris in view of Colley.	32
1. Ground 4 Has No Reasonable Likelihood of Succeeding Because Norris in view of Colley Does Not Disclose or Suggest Each and Every Element of the Challenged Claims.	32
2. Ground 4 Has No Reasonable Likelihood of Succeeding Because Petitioner Does Not Articulate Any Rational Underpinning for Petitioner's Obviousness Combination of Norris With Colley.	35
E. Ground 5: Petitioner Failed to Established That Claims 17 and 20 are Rendered Obvious by Norris in view of Lauro and Colley.	38
F. Ground 6: Petitioner Failed to Established That Claims 6-8 are Rendered Obvious By Nojima.	40

**Table of Authorities
(continued)**

	Page(s)
1. Ground 6 Has No Likelihood of Succeeding Because Nojima Does Not Disclose or Suggest Each and Every Element of the Challenged Claims.	40
2. Ground 6 Has No Likelihood of Succeeding Because Petitioner Does Not Articulate Any Rational Underpinning for Petitioner's Obviousness Modifications to Nojima.....	43
G. Ground 7: Petitioner Failed to Established That Claims 6-8 are Anticipated By Nojima.....	45
H. Ground 8: Petitioner Failed to Established That Claims 6-8 are Rendered Obvious by Behr in view of Bertrand.....	46
1. Ground 8 Has No Likelihood of Succeeding Because Behr in view of Bertrand Does Not Disclose or Suggest Each and Every Element of the Challenged Claims.	47
2. Ground 8 Has No Likelihood of Succeeding Because Petitioner Does Not Articulate Any Rational Underpinning for Petitioner's Obviousness Combination of Behr With Bertrand.	47
I. Ground 9: Petitioner Failed to Established That Claims 1-3, 15-17, and 20 are Rendered Obvious Ohmura in view of Colley.	48
1. Ground 9 Has No Likelihood of Succeeding Because Ohmura in View of Colley Does Not Disclose or Suggest Each and Every Element of the Challenged Claims.	49
2. Ground 9 Has No Likelihood of Succeeding Because Petitioner Does Not Articulate Any Rational Underpinning for Petitioner's Obviousness Combination of Ohmura With Colley.	51
J. The Board Should Disregard Mr. Andrews's Conclusory Declaration	55
VI. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE IT EXCEEDS THE WORD LIMIT BY IMPROPERLY INCORPORATING ARGUMENTS BY REFERENCE.....	57

**Table of Authorities
(continued)**

	Page(s)
VII. CONCLUSION.....	58

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.