UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK

OFFICE BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND

APPEAL BOARD

FACEBOOK, INC and WHATSAPP INC.,
Petitioners
v.
UNILOC LUXEMBOURG S. A.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2018-00747
U.S. Patent 7,535,890

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §42.107(a)

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART 2

III. THE '890 PATENT 2

A. Effective Filing Date of the '890 Patent 2

B. Overview of the '890 Patent 4

IV. PROCEDUAL BACKGROUND 6

V. PETITIONER FAILS TO PROVE ANY OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS IS UNPATENTABLE 6

A. Claim Construction 7

1. The Board Should Construe "Transmitting the Selected Recipients and the Instant Voice Message" as "Transmitting the Selected Recipients (in Response to the Selecting) and Separately Transmitting the Instant Voice Message" 8

2. The Board Should Construe "Receiving the Selected Recipients and the Instant Voice Message" as"Receiving the Selected Recipients and Separately Receiving the Instant Voice Message." 11

3. The Board Should Construe "Delivering the Instant Voice Message to the Selected Recipients" as "Delivering the Instant Voice Message (from the Server) to (a Subset of) the Selected Recipients that areDetermined by the Server to be Available." 13

4. The Board Should Construe "Storing the Instant Voice Message if a Selected Recipient is Unavailable" as "Storing the Instant Voice Message for a Selected Recipient Determined by the Server to be Unavailable." 14

5. The Board Should Construe "Temporarily Storing . . . and Delivering the Stored Instant Voice Message" as "Temporarily Storing . . . until Delivering the Stored Instant Voice Message." 15

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

B. Ground 1 Fails Because Petitioner Fails to Provide *Prima Facie* Evidence that *Griffin* plus *Zydney* Renders Obvious Claims 1, 3–6, 9, and 40–43. 17

1. The Board Already Rejected Petitioner's Argument Concerning *Zydney* Alleged Disclosure of the Claim Feature 17

2. Combining *Zydney* with *Griffin* Frustrates the Purpose of Griffin of a Server-Based Messaging Paradigm. 19

3. The Combination of Griffin and Zydney is also Inoperable for Text-only Buddies. 24

4. The Combination of *Griffin* and *Zydney* Is Also Inoperable Because it would Result in Messages Being Lost. 26

5. The Combination of *Griffin* and *Zydney* Would Require Changing the Principle of Operation of One or the Other. 27

6. *Griffin* plus *Zydney* Does Not Disclose or Render Obvious a Client "Transmitting the Selected Recipients and the Instant Voice Message" or a Server "Receiving the Selected Recipients and the Instant Voice Message." 29

7. *Griffin* plus *Zydney* Does Not Disclose or Render Obvious a Server "Delivering the Instant Voice Message to the Selected Recipients Over the Network" and "Storing the Instant Voice Message if a Selected Recipient is Unavailable." 33

8. Independent Claims 1 and 40 are not Obvious Over *Griffin* plus *Zydney* 35

9. Dependent Claims 3–6, 9, and 41–43 are Not Obvious Over *Griffin* plus *Zydney*. 36

C. Ground 2 Fails Because Petitioner Fails to Provide *Prima Facie* Evidence that *Griffin* plus *Zydney* and *Malik* Renders Obvious Claims 2, 14, 15, 17–20, 23, 51–54, and 57. 37

1. *Malik* is Cumulative with a Continuation Application Thereof Previously Considered by the Examiner During Prosecution. 37

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

2. Independent Claims 14 and 51 are not Obvious Over *Griffin* plus *Zydney* and *Malik*.....39
3. Dependent Claims 2, 15, 17–20, 23, 52–54, and 57 are not Obvious Over *Griffin* plus *Zydney* and *Malik*.....40

VI. CONCLUSION 41

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

List of Exhibits

Exhibit No.	Description
2001	Declaration of William C. Easttom II
2002	Invalidity Contentions Submitted on December 16, 2016 in the underlying consolidated case of *Uniloc USA, Inc. v. Samsung Electronic America's, Inc.*, Case No. 2:16-cv-642
2003	U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No 2004/0128356 (*Bernstein*)
2004	U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2007/0112925 (*Malik II*)

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.