

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. 8,213,970  
Issue Date: July 3, 2012  
Title: METHOD OF UTILIZING FORCED ALERTS FOR INTERACTIVE  
REMOTE COMMUNICATIONS

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

Case No. IPR2018-00821

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page(s)</u></b>
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 “forced message” and means-plus-function 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 “forced message alert,” “forced message alert software packet,” and “forced message alert software application program” terms and phrases of the Challenged Claims .....	18
C. Petitioner’s conflicting positions violate 37 C.F.R. § 42.11, § 11.18(b)(2).....	19
III. PETITIONER HAS NOT DEMONSTRATED A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS FOR THE GROUNDS ADVANCED IN THE PETITION, AND THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED .....	23
A. Requirements for Showing Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 .....	23
B. Petitioner fails to show how the prior art discloses “PDA/cell phone” as recited in 6[p] and 6[a]-[h] .....	26
C. Petitioner fails to show where the prior art discloses “periodically resending”as recited in 6[f] .....	31
D. Petitioner fails to show where the prior art discloses the “response”as recited in 6[g]-[i] .....	33
E. Claims 1-5 and 10-13 are not obvious for similar reasons .....	38

IV. CONCLUSION.....40

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Contentguard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00355 (P.T.A.B., June 26, 2015) .....	23
<i>Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.</i> , 732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	24
<i>Fresenius USA, Inc. v. Baxter Int’l, Inc.</i> , 582 F.3d 1288 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	25
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	23, 32
<i>Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	25
<i>Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	24
<i>Key Pharm. v. Hercon Labs. Corp.</i> , 161 F.3d 709 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....	21
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	23, 32
<i>Los Angeles Biomedical Research Inst. at Harbor-UCLA Med. Ctr. v. Eli Lilly &amp; Co.</i> , 849 F.3d 1049 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	24
<i>N. Telecom Ltd. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 215 F.3d 1281 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	21
<i>Pers. Web Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	24
<i>Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.</i> , 713 F.2d 1530 (Fed. Cir. 1983) .....	23

*Toyota Motor Corp. v. Blitzsafe Texas, LLC*,  
IPR2016-00422 (P.T.A.B., July 6, 2016) .....18

*In re Van Os*,  
844 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....25

*Yniguez v. State of Ariz.*,  
939 F.2d 727 (9th Cir. 1991) .....21

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 103 .....23

35 U.S.C. § 112.....*passim*

35 U.S.C. § 314(a) .....3

**Other Authorities**

37 C.F.R. § 11.18(b)(2).....19

37 C.F.R. § 42.11 .....2, 19

37 C.F.R. § 42.104 .....4

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3).....*passim*

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4).....25

*Trial Practice Guide*, 77 Fed. Reg. at 48,764 .....22

# 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.