

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

UNILOC LUXEMBOURG, S.A.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-00394
Patent 6,622,018 B1

PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....1

II. BEN-ZE’EV TEACHES THE “BROADCASTING” LIMITATION OF THE ’018 PATENT2

 A. There is no dispute about the plain and ordinary meaning of “broadcasting” 2

 B. Ben-Ze’ev teaches transmitting a singular interrogation signal to multiple appliances 4

 C. Patent Owner narrowly focuses on the word “interrogation” while ignoring the actual teachings of Ben-Ze’ev that describe broadcasting 5

 1. It was well known that an “interrogation” signal could be broadcast6

 2. Ben-Ze’ev’s disclosure confirms that its interrogation signal is broadcast to all devices in the vicinity9

III. THE UNCHANGED EVIDENTIARY RECORD SUPPORTS THE COMBINATION OF BEN-ZE’EV AND THE IDIOT’S GUIDE12

 A. PalmRemote illustrates the knowledge a POSITA would bring to bear in reading Ben-Ze’ev and the Idiot’s Guide 13

 B. The advantages of using Graffiti commands would motivate a skilled artisan to pursue the proposed combination 16

 C. Any modifications to the teachings of Ben-Ze’ev to accommodate the Idiot’s Guide would have been within the skill of a POSITA 17

IV. CONCLUSION.....21

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Aevoe Corp. v. Racing Optics, Inc., IPR2016-01164, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 7, 2016)8

Agilysys, Inc. v. Ameranth, Inc., CBM2014-00016, Paper 35 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 20, 2015)7

Ariosa Diagnostics v. Verinata Health, Inc., 805 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....14

Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC, 805 F. 3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015)17

In re Mouttet, 686 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2012)19

In re Sneed, 710 F.2d 1544 (Fed. Cir. 1983)19

KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007)17

Medichem, S.A. v. Rolabo, S.L., 437 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....20

Mobile Tech., Inc. v. InVue Security Prod’s, Inc., IPR2017-00344, Paper 41 (P.T.A.B. May 24, 2018)19

Nat’l Steel Car, Ltd. v. Can. Pac. Ry., Ltd., 357 F.3d 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....15

Shaw Indus. Group, Inc. v. Automated Creel Sys., Inc., IPR2013-00132, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Jul. 25, 2013).....19

Travelers Indemnity Co. v. Integrated Claims Sys., LLC., IPR2016-00660, Paper 21 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 29, 2017).....7

Veeam Software Corp. v. Veritas Techs. LLC, IPR2014-00090, Paper 48 (P.T.A.B. Jul. 17, 2017).....7

Statutes

37 C.F.R. § 42.63(a).....7
37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a).....8

I. INTRODUCTION

Patent Owner's Response demonstrates that there are only two issues in dispute: (i) whether the Ben-Ze'ev reference teaches the "broadcasting" limitation recited in the independent claims of the '018 Patent, and (ii) whether the Petition provides sufficient motivation to combine the Ben-Ze'ev and the Idiot's Guide references.

With respect to the first issue, there is no dispute over the plain and ordinary meaning of "broadcasting"—sending a singular message receivable by multiple devices. In that regard, Ben-Ze'ev explicitly teaches that its remote controller sends a singular interrogation signal to all appliances in the vicinity. APPL-1007, 10:57-58 ("The interrogation signal is generally sent periodically to all appliances..."). Ben-Ze'ev further teaches that the purpose of the signal is to discover the *existence* of nearby appliances—not communicate with individual, already-known recipients. Patent Owner attempts to avoid this explicit disclosure by instead focusing solely on the word "interrogation." This strategy fails because it was well known in the art that an "interrogation" signal could be broadcast, and Patent Owner's citations to evidence not in the record do not outweigh the explicit teachings of Ben-Ze'ev.

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.