

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SONOS, INC.
Petitioner

v.

IMPLICIT, LLC
Patent Owner

IPR2018-00767
U.S. Patent No. 8,942,252

PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
TABLE OF EXHIBITS	vi
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. IMPLICIT’S SWEAR BEHIND IS LEGALLY DEFECTIVE	1
A. Balassanian Fails to Establish He Invented the Claimed Invention.....	1
B. The Swear Behind Lacks Independent Corroboration	5
C. Implicit Misunderstands Corroboration	9
D. The Swear Behind Relies on Improperly Incorporated Material.....	10
III. IMPLICIT’S SWEAR BEHIND IS SUBSTANTIVELY DEFECTIVE.....	12
A. The Code Fails to Meet “Render Time”	12
B. The Code Does Not Synchronize Between Master and Slave	15
IV. THE PRIOR ART INVALIDATES THE CLAIMS.....	20
A. Sonos’s Prior-Art Combinations Render the Claims Obvious	20
B. Implicit’s Objective Evidence Fails	24
C. The Evidence Shows Janevski Discloses “Master Device Time”	25
V. CONCLUSION.....	27

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>ABB Inc. v. ROY-G-BIV Corp.</i> , IPR2013-00062, -00282, 2014WL1478218 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 11, 2014)	7
<i>ABT Sys., LLC v. Emerson Elec. Co.</i> , 797 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	25
<i>Apator Miitors ApS v. Kamstrup A/S</i> , 887 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	6, 7, 8
<i>Apple Inc. v. California Institute of Technology</i> , IPR2017-00210, 2018WL6828779 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 27, 2018)	3
<i>Arctic Cat Inc. v. Bombardier Recreational Prod. Inc.</i> , 876 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	22
<i>Avant Technology, Inc. v. Anza technology, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00828, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 16, 2018)	11
<i>Bosch Auto. Serv. Sols., LLC v. Matal</i> , 878 F.3d 1027 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	25
<i>Chen v. Bouchard</i> , 347 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	5
<i>Cisco Systems, Inc. v. C-Cation Technologies, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 29, 2014).....	11
<i>Coleman v. Dines</i> , 754 F.2d 353 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	1
<i>Cooper v. Goldfarb</i> , 154 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	6
<i>Ecolochem, Inc. v. S. California Edison Co.</i> , 227 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	24
<i>Elbit Systems of America, LLC v. Thales Visionix, Inc.</i> , 881 F.3d 1354 (Fed.Cir. 2018).....	21

<i>Fina Oil & Chem. Co. v. Ewen</i> , 123 F.3d 1466 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	1
<i>Hahn v. Wong</i> , 892 F.2d 1028 (Fed. Cir. 1989).....	5
<i>IBG LLC v. Trading Technologies, Inc.</i> , CBM2016-00054, Paper 36 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 7, 2017).....	11
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	5
<i>KAYAK Software Corp. v. International Business Machines Corp.</i> , IPR2016–00608, 2017WL3425957 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 7, 2017).....	9
<i>Kridl v. McCormick</i> , 105 F.3d 1446 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	4
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	21
<i>Mahurkar v. C.R. Bard, Inc.</i> , 79 F.3d 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	5, 7
<i>Medichem, S.A. v. Rolabo, S.L.</i> , 437 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	5
<i>Ormco Corp. v. Align Technology, Inc.</i> , 463 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	25
<i>Panduit Corp. v. Corning Optical Commc’ns LLC</i> , IPR2017-01074, 2018 WL 4773429, at *8 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 1, 2018).....	8
<i>Perfect Surgical Techniques, Inc. v. Olympus Am., Inc.</i> , 841 F.3d 1004 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	5
<i>Singh v. Brake</i> , 222 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	4
<i>Slip Track Sys. v. Metal-Lite, Inc.</i> , 304 F.3d 1256 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	12

<i>Tavory v. NTP, Inc.</i> , 297 F. App'x 976 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	10
<i>TV Management, Inc. v. Perdiemco LLC</i> , IPR2016-01278, 2017WL6418915 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 15, 2017)	4
<i>Weaver v. Houchin</i> , 467 F. App'x 878 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	10
<i>ZTE (USA), Inc. v. Electronics and Telecommunications Research Institute</i> , IPR2015-00028, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 20, 2015).....	10
REGULATIONS	
37 C.F.R. §42.24(b)(2).....	11
37 C.F.R. §42.6(a)(3).....	11

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.