

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

UNIFIED PATENTS INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

BRADIUM TECHNOLOGIES LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-00952
Patent No. 9,253,239

**BRADIUM TECHNOLOGIES LLC'S
PRELIMINARY PATENT OWNER RESPONSE PURSUANT TO
37 C.F.R. §42.107**

PUBLIC REDACTED VERSION

Preliminary Patent Owner Response, IPR2018-00952

U.S. Patent No. 9,253,239

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Institution Should Be Denied Because Unified Has Not Identified All Real-Parties-in-Interest	3
A. Unified Has Failed to Meet Its Burden to Provide Evidence that It Is the Sole Real-Party-in-Interest.....	3
B. Under the <i>Applications in Internet Time</i> Decision, Unified is Not the Only Real-Party-in-Interest	4
III. The Board Should Exercise its Discretion to Deny Institution	11
IV. The Board Lacks Constitutional Power to Decide this IPR Proceeding	14
A. PTAB Judges Are “Officers” Who Must Meet the Requirements of the Appointments Clause.....	16
B. PTAB Judges Do Not Satisfy Appointments Clause Requirements.....	17
C. The Only Possible Solution Is for the Board to Decline the Case	22
V. Petitioner Has Not Shown a Reasonable Likelihood of Success as to Claim 20.....	24
A. The ’239 Patent	24
B. The Asserted Prior Art	28
1. Reddy	28
2. Hornbacker.....	31
3. Rosasco	31
C. The Board Previously Declined to Institute for Claim 20 Based on the Combination of Reddy and Hornbacker.....	35
D. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art	39
E. Claim Construction	39
1. “data parcel” (Claim 1)	40

PUBLIC REDACTED VERSION

Preliminary Patent Owner Response, IPR2018-00952
U.S. Patent No. 9,253,239

F.	The Combination of Reddy and Hornbacker Does Not Teach or Suggest the Method Step of Claim 20.....	40
G.	Rosasco Does Not Cure the Deficiencies in the Reddy/Hornbacker Combination.....	41
1.	Rosasco Does Not Teach or Suggest the Method Step of Claim 20.....	41
2.	There Is No Motivation to Combine Rosasco with Reddy and Hornbacker to Achieve Claim 20 with a Reasonable Expectation of Success	42
VI.	Conclusion	46

PUBLIC REDACTED VERSION

Preliminary Patent Owner Response, IPR2018-00952
U.S. Patent No. 9,253,239

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page</u>
Cases	
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Contentguard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00457, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. June 30, 2015).....	43
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Realtime Data, LLC</i> , IPR2016-01738, Paper 59 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 16, 2018)	14
<i>Applications in Internet Time, LLC v. RPX Corp.</i> , 897 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	passim
<i>Ariosa Diagnostics, Inc. v. Illumina, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01093, Paper 81 (P.T.A.B. May 24, 2016).....	13
<i>Askeladden L.L.C. v. N5 Technologies, LLC</i> , IPR2017-00083, Paper 36 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 18, 2018).....	14
<i>Ass'n of Am. R.R. v. United States DOT</i> , 821 F.3d 19 (D.C. Cir. 2016)	20
<i>Buckley v. Valeo</i> , 424 U.S. 1 (1976)	16
<i>Collins v. United States</i> , 14 Ct. Cl. 568 (1878)	21
<i>Edmond v. United States</i> , 520 U.S. 651 (1997).....	15, 19
<i>Emerson Elec. Co. v. IPCO, LLC</i> , IPR2017-00008, Paper 42 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 29, 2018)	14
<i>Free Enterprise Fund v. PCAOB</i> , 561 U.S. 477 (2010)	20
<i>Freytag v. Commissioner</i> , 501 U.S. 868 (1991)	22

PUBLIC REDACTED VERSION

Preliminary Patent Owner Response, IPR2018-00952
U.S. Patent No. 9,253,239

<i>General Plastic Industrial Co., Ltd. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , IPR2016-01357, Paper 19 (P.T.A.B Sept. 6, 2017).....	12
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	41
<i>Hulu v. Sound View Innovations</i> , IPR2018-00017, Paper 14 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 14, 2018).....	14
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	41, 43
<i>In re Smith Int'l, Inc.</i> , 871 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	39
<i>InTouch Tech., Inc. v. VGo Commc'ns., Inc.</i> , 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	43
<i>Lucia v. S.E.C.</i> , 138 S. Ct. 2044, 585 U.S. ____ (2018).....	15, 16, 20, 22
<i>Ortho-McNeil Pharm. v. Mylan Labs</i> , 520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	43
<i>Procter & Gamble Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.</i> , 566 F.3d 989 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	43
<i>Riggin v. Office of Senate Fair Employment Practices</i> , 61 F.3d 1563 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	14
<i>Ryder v. United States</i> , 515 U.S. 177 (1995).....	22
<i>SAS Inst. Inc. v. Iancu</i> , 138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018).....	17
<i>Sophos Ltd. v. Iancu</i> , 727 F. App'x 656 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	40
<i>St. Jude Med., LLC v. Synders Heart Valve LLC</i> , IPR2018-00107, Paper 16 (P.T.A.B May 3, 2018).....	15

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.