

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

WAHOO FITNESS LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

BLACKBIRD TECH LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-00275
Patent 6,434,212

**PATENT OWNER BLACKBIRD TECHNOLOGIES'
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 6

II. BACKGROUND 9

 A. Related Proceedings Bearing On This Proceeding9

 B. About The ‘212 Patent9

 C. Petitioner’s Grounds of Challenge14

 D. Response To Petitioner’s Proposed Claim Constructions15

III. OVERVIEW OF THE REFERENCES RELIED UPON BY
PETITIONER..... 19

 A. Amano19

 B. Kato20

IV. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION ON
GROUND 1 23

 A. Amano Does Not Disclose “Programmed To Calculate A Distance Travelled
 By Multiplying A Number Of Steps Counted By The Step Counter By A
 Stride Length”24

 B. Amano Does Not Disclose All Limitations In The Same Embodiment29

 C. Amano Does Not Disclose “A Step Counter Joined To The Strap” Under
 Petitioner’s Proposed Construction31

V. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION ON
GROUND 2 37

 A. Amano Does Not Disclose “Programmed To Calculate A Distance Travelled
 By Multiplying A Number Of Steps Counted By The Step Counter By A
 Stride Length”38

 B. Petitioner Does Not Establish A Motivation To Combine Embodiments 1
 and 239

 C. Amano Does Not Disclose “A Step Counter Joined To The Strap” Or A
 “Heart Rate Monitor Joined To The Strap” Under Petitioner’s Proposed
 Construction40

VI. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION ON
GROUND 3 42

A. Kato Does Not Disclose “Programmed To Calculate A Distance Traveled By Multiplying A Number Of Steps Counted By A Stride Length That Varies According To A Rate At Which Steps Are Taken”	44
B. Petitioner Does Not Establish Motivation To Combine Kato’s Components With Amano’s Speed Calculation Feature.....	46
C. Petitioner Does Not Establish Motivation To Combine Kato’s Components With Amano’s “Data Processing Steps”.....	50
VII. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION BECAUSE THE PRIOR ART RELIED UPON HAS BEEN CONSIDERED DURING PROSECUTION AND IS REDUNDANT OF OTHER IPRS.	55
VIII. CONCLUSION.....	57

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.,
832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016)37

Atofina v. Great Lakes Chem. Corp.,
441 F.3d 991 (Fed. Cir. 2006)34

Bayer Healthcare Pharm., Inc. v. Watson Pharm., Inc.,
713 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2013)43

ClearValue, Inc. v. Pearl River Polymers, Inc.,
668 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2012)36

Creative Integrated Sys., Inc. v. Nintendo of Am., Inc.,
526 F. App’x 927 (Fed. Cir. 2013)17

Cultec, Inc. v. Stormtech LLC,
IPR2017-00777 (PTAB Aug. 22, 2017) (Paper 7)56

Epistar Corp. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n,
566 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2009)16

FenF, LLC v. SmartThingz, Inc.,
601 F. App’x 950 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... 17, 18

In re Gleave,
560 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2009)35

In re Kahn,
441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)43

Karsten Mfg. Corp. v. Cleveland Golf Co.,
242 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2001)52

Kennametal, Inc. v. Ingersoll Cutting Tool Co.,
780 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2015) 35, 36

KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007).....43

MBO Labs., Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson & Co.,
474 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2007)17

Net MoneyIn, Inc. v. Verisign, Inc.,
545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008)29

IPR2018-00275 – Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response

<i>Nidec Motor Corp. v. Zhongshan Broad Ocean Motor Co. Ltd</i> , 851 F.3d 1270 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	35
<i>Perricone v. Medicis Pharm. Corp.</i> , 432 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	34
<i>Personal Web Technologies v. Apple</i> , 848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	40, 49
<i>Rambus Inc. v. Infineon Techs. Ag</i> , 318 F.3d 1081 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	17
<i>Securus Techs., Inc. v. Glob. Tel*Link Corp.</i> , 701 Fed. Appx. 971 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	49
<i>Symantec Corp. v. RPost Communications Limited</i> , IPR2014-00357 (PTAB July 15, 2014) (Paper 14)	29, 30
<i>Teleflex, Inc. v. Ficosa North America Corp.</i> , 299 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	43, 54
<i>Unified Patents, Inc. v. Berman</i> , IPR2016-01571 (PTAB Dec. 14, 2016) (Paper 10).....	55
<i>Unigene Laboratories, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 655 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	43
<i>Ventana Med. Sys., Inc. v. Biogenex Labs., Inc.</i> , 473 F.3d 1173 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	18
<i>Wm. Wrigley Jr. Co. v. Cadbury Adams USA LLC</i> , 683 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	34
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	57
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	8, 55, 56, 57
Rules	
37 C.F.R. § 42.107	6
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2).....	9

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.