

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT LLC,
Patent Owner.

Patent No. 9,445,251
Issue Date: September 13, 2016
Title: METHOD TO PROVIDE AD HOC AND PASSWORD PROTECTED
DIGITAL AND VOICE NETWORKS

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

Case No. IPR2018-00817

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page(s)</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO PROVIDE A SUFFICIENT STATEMENT OF HOW THE CLAIMS SHOULD BE CONSTRUED	4
A. Petitioner’s proposed construction of the “device” terms conflict with positions it has taken in the District Court case and Petitioner has failed to meet its burden under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104	4
B. Petitioner improperly submits a conflicting construction for the “georeferenced map” term of the Challenged Claims.....	10
C. Petitioner’s conflicting positions violate 37 C.F.R. § 42.11, § 11.18(b)(2).....	11
III. PETITIONER HAS NOT ESTABLISHED THAT THE ’724 PATENT IS PRIOR ART.....	14
A. Petitioner fails to show that the “second georeferenced map” limitations are not supported by the disclosure of the ’410 Application	17
1. Petitioner proposes an incorrect construction for the term “georeferenced map”	17
2. The ’410 Application contains sufficient support to show possession of the “second georeferenced map”	18
B. The “group” limitations are adequately supported by the disclosure of the ’410 Application	25
C. The “based on receiving the message from the second device, participating in the group” limitations are adequately supported by the disclosure of the ’410 Application	31

D. The “wherein the first device does not have access to
respective Internet Protocol addresses of the second devices”
limitations are adequately supported by the disclosure of the
'410 Application.....36

IV. PETITIONER HAS NOT DEMONSTRATED A REASONABLE
LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS FOR THE GROUNDS
ADVANCED IN THE PETITION, AND THE PETITION
SHOULD BE DENIED39

A. Requirements for Showing Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C.
§ 10339

B. Petitioner has failed to demonstrate that the Challenged
Claims are Obvious in view of the '724 Patent.....42

V. CONCLUSION.....43

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Contentguard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00355 (P.T.A.B. June 26, 2015)	40
<i>Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.</i> , 732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	41
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	14
<i>In re Edwards</i> , 568 F.2d 1349 (CCPA 1978)	16, 18
<i>Fitbit, Inc. v. Bodymedia, Inc.</i> , Case No. IPR2016-00707 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 8, 2016)	14, 16, 18
<i>Fresenius USA, Inc. v. Baxter Int’l, Inc.</i> , 582 F.3d 1288 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	42
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966)	39
<i>ICU Medical, Inc. v. Alaris Medical Systems, Inc.</i> , 558 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	30, 31
<i>Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	41
<i>Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	40
<i>In re Johnson</i> , 558 F.2d 1008 (CCPA 1977)	39
<i>Key Pharm. v. Hercon Labs. Corp.</i> , 161 F.3d 709 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	12

<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	39
<i>Los Angeles Biomedical Research Inst. at Harbor-UCLA Med. Ctr. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 849 F.3d 1049 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	40
<i>N. Telecom Ltd. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 215 F.3d 1281 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	12
<i>Pers. Web Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	40
<i>Santarus, Inc. v. Par Pharm., Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	38
<i>Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.</i> , 713 F.2d 1530 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	40
<i>Toyota Motor Corp. v. Blitzsafe Texas, LLC</i> , Case IPR2016-00422 (P.T.A.B. July 6, 2016)	9
<i>In re Van Os</i> , 844 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	41, 43
<i>Yniguez v. State of Ariz.</i> , 939 F.2d 727 (9th Cir. 1991)	13

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102	14
35 U.S.C. § 103	39
35 U.S.C. § 112	<i>passim</i>
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	3
35 U.S.C. § 316(e)	14

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 11.18(b)(2).....	11
37 C.F.R. § 42.11	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.