

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
PATENT OWNER SUR-REPLY**

TABLE OF CONTENTS


	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Unified Failed to Identify All RPIs	2
A. Unified Relies on an Erroneous Legal Standard.....	2
B. Unified Has Not Shown That it is the Only RPI.....	4
1. Unified and ██████████ Had a Pre-Existing Relationship	4
2. ██████████ Receive Specific Benefits From the Filing of This IPR	6
III. The Board Should Exercise Its Discretion to Terminate This IPR.	9
IV. This IPR Is Unconstitutional Under the Appointments Clause.....	12
V. Petitioner has Not Shown that Reddy Teaches or Suggests Claim 20.....	12
A. Petitioner’s New Theory is Unsupported and Contradicts the Explicit Disclosure of Reddy	13
B. Petitioner Mischaracterizes the Patent Owner Response.....	16
C. Reddy Does Not Teach or Suggest Determining Priority of a First <i>and a Second</i> Request Based on <i>Different</i> User- Controlled Image Viewpoints as Required by Claim 20	16
1. Claim 20 Requires Determining Priority of a First and a Second Request	16
a) Plain Language of the Claim	17
b) The Preferred Architecture Supports Patent Owner’s Plain-Meaning Claim Interpretation.....	18

2.	Reddy Retrieves Tiles Based on a Single User- Controlled Viewpoint.....	21
a)	The Claimed “User-Controlled Image Viewpoint” Must be a Viewpoint that is Controlled by the User.....	22
b)	“Prefetching” is Based on a Single User- Controlled Viewpoint	22
c)	“Flyover” is Also Based on a Single User- Controlled Viewpoint	22
VI.	A POSITA Would Not Combine the Asserted Prior Art to Achieve the Invention.....	23
A.	Petitioner’s Combination is Based on Hindsight	23
B.	Petitioner Has Not Shown a Benefit to Combining the Asserted Art.....	24
C.	The State of the Art Would Not Lead a POSITA to Combine the Asserted Art to Achieve the Claimed Invention.....	25
VII.	Conclusion	28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page</u>
Cases	
<i>Apple Inc. v. Uniloc</i> , IPR2018-00282 (P.T.A.B June 4, 2019).....	8
<i>Bausch Health Cos. Inc. v. Actavis Labs. Fl. Inc.</i> , No. CV 16-9038 (SRC), 2019 WL 3214550 (D.N.J. July 17, 2019)	27
<i>In re NuVasive, Inc</i> , 842 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	11
<i>Polaris Indus. v. Arctic Cat</i> , 882 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	25
<i>Unified Patents Inc. v. Realtime Adaptive Streaming, LLC</i> , IPR2018-00883 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 11, 2018)	7
<i>Valve Corp. v. Electronic Scripting</i> , IPR2019-0062 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 2, 2019).....	9
<i>Ventex Co. v. Columbia Sportswear N. Am., Inc.</i> , IPR2017-00651 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 24, 2019).....	3, 4
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	9, 10, 11
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	9, 11

EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit	Description
2001	USPTO Public PAIR screen capture for Correspondence Address and Attorney/Agent Information for Application No. 14/547,148 ('239 Patent)
2002	Notice of Acceptance of Power of Attorney, Date Mailed 03/11/2016, for Application No. 14/547,148 ('293 Patent)
2003	Declaration of Michael N. Zachary in Support of Patent Owner's Motion for <i>Pro Hac Vice</i>
2004	PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL: Transcript of Deposition of Unified Patents CEO, Kevin Jakel dated September 10, 2018
2005	<i>Team</i> , Unified Patents, https://www.unifiedpatents.com/team/#
2006	<i>Join</i> , Unified Patents, https://www.unifiedpatents.com/join/
2007	<i>Join</i> , Unified Patents (May 17, 2018), https://web.archive.org/web/20180517015601/https://www.unifiedpatents.com/join/
2008	PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL: Unified Patents Membership Agreement
2009	PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL: Exhibit A:  Internet of Things (IoT) Zone
2010	Belcher, Marta, et al., "Hacking the Patent System: A guide to Alternative Patent Licensing for Innovators," <i>Juelsgaard Intellectual Property & Innovation Clinic Stanford Law School</i> , dated May 2014
2011	<i>Protected Zones</i> , Excerpt of United Patents (Oct. 27, 2016), https://web.archive.org/web/20161027135832/http://www.unifiedpatents.com:80/zones/
2012	U.S. Patent No. 9,253,239, "Optimized Image Delivery Over Limited Bandwidth Communication Channels," issued Feb. 2, 2016 ("'239 Patent") (Not filed)
2013	PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL: Petitioner's Voluntary Interrogatory Response

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.