

[Trials@uspto.gov](mailto:Trials@uspto.gov)

571-282-7822

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

**GARMIN INTERNATIONAL, INC. AND GARMIN USA,  
INC.,**

Petitioner

v.

**LOGANTREE, LP,**

Patent Owner

---

**Case IPR2018-00565**

**Patent 6,059,576**

---

**PATENT OWNER'S SUR-REPLY TO PETITIONER'S REPLY**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|     |   |   |
|-----|---|---|
| I.  | INTRODUCTION .....  | 1 |
| II. | ARGUMENT.....   | 1 |
|     |   |   |
| A.  | GROUND 1: <i>STEWART</i> IN VIEW OF <i>RUSH</i> DOES NOT RENDER CLAIMS<br>1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 10, AND 12 OBVIOUS .....   | 1 |
| 1.  | Ground 1, Claim 1: The Cited Prior Art Does Not Teach the Claimed a<br>movement sensor capable of measuring data associated with unrestrained<br>movement in any direction and generating signals indicative of said<br>movement..... | 4 |
| 2.  | Ground 1, Claim 1: The Cited Prior Art Does Not Teach the Claimed a<br>microprocessor receiving, interpreting, storing and responding to<br>movement data based on user-defined operational<br>parameters.....                        | 5 |
| 3.  | Ground 1, Claim 1: The Cited Prior Art Does Not Teach the Claimed “a<br>memory for storing said movement<br>data”.....  | 6 |
| 4.  | Ground 1, Claim 1: The Cited Prior Art Does Not Teach the Claimed a   |   |

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| microprocessor detecting a first user-defined event based on the movement data and at least one of the user-defined operational parameters regarding the movement data.....   | 11        |
| 5. Ground 1, Claim 1: The Cited Prior Art Does Not Teach the Claimed storing first event information related to the detected first user-defined event along with first time stamp information reflecting a time at which the movement data causing the first user-defined event occurred..... | 12        |
| <b>B. GROUND 3: <i>RICHARDSON</i> IN VIEW OF <i>STEWART</i> DOES NOT RENDER CLAIMS 1, 7, 8, 13, 14, 56-58, 140, 144, AND 146 OBVIOUS.....</b>   | <b>14</b> |
| 1. Ground 3, Claims 1 and 13: The Cited Prior Art Does Not Teach the Claimed a microprocessor capable of receiving, interpreting, storing and responding to said movement data based on user-defined operational parameters.....  | 14        |
| 2. Ground 3, Claims 1 and 13: The Cited Prior Art Does Not Teach the Claimed “a memory for storing said movement data”.....   | 16        |
| 3. Ground 3, Claims 1 and 13: The Cited Prior Art Does Not Teach the  |           |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Claimed “a memory for storing said movement data”.....  | 16 |
| 4.    Ground 3, Claims 1 and 13: The Cited Prior Art Does Not Teach the Claimed a microprocessor storing first event information related to the detected first user-defined event along with first time stamp information reflecting a time at which the movement data causing the first user-defined event occurred..... | 18 |
| III. Patent Owner Does Not Consent to the PTAB Adjudicating the Patentability or Validity of the Challenged Claims of the ‘576 Patent.....  | 21 |
| IV. CONCLUSION.....   | 22 |

## I. INTRODUCTION

In an *inter partes* review, the burden of persuasion is on the petitioner to prove “unpatentability by a preponderance of the evidence,” 35 U.S.C. § 316(e), and that burden never shifts to the patentee. “Failure to prove the matter as required by the applicable standard means that the party with the burden of persuasion loses on that point—thus, if the fact trier of the issue is left uncertain, the party with the burden loses.” *Tech. Licensing*, 545 F.3d at 1327. See *Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.*, 800 F.3d 1375, 1378 (Fed. Cir. 2015) (citing *Tech. Licensing Corp. v. Videotek, Inc.*, 545 F.3d 1316, 1326–27 (Fed. Cir. 2008)) (discussing the burden of proof in *inter partes* review).

Garmin failed to meet its burden in its Petition, and does not remedy this failure in its Petitioner’s Reply to Patent Owner’s Response (“Reply”). In particular, Garmin has failed to show by a preponderance of the evidence that all of the claim limitations are taught by or obvious in view of either a combination of Stewart and Rush or a combination of Richardson and Stewart, and Garmin’s arguments in its Reply continue to fail to show that all of the claim limitations have been met by the foregoing combinations.

## II. ARGUMENT

### A. GROUND 1: STEWART IN VIEW OF RUSH DOES NOT RENDER CLAIMS 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 10, AND 12 OBVIOUS

# 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.