

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT LLC,
Patent Owner.

Patent No. 8,213,970
Filing Date: November 26, 2008
Issue Date: July 3, 2012

Inventor: Malcolm K. Beyer, Jr.
Title: METHOD OF UTILIZING FORCED ALERTS FOR INTERACTIVE
REMOTE COMMUNICATIONS

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

Case No. IPR2018-01079

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page(s)</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE STATE OF THE ART PRIOR TO THE '970 PATENT	1
A. Summary of the Alleged Prior Art	2
1. Kubala	2
2. Hammond.....	4
III. THE LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	7
IV. THE RELEVANT LAW	7
A. Obviousness.....	7
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	9
A. The Relevant Law and Related Proceedings.....	9
B. “data transmission means. . .”	10
C. “means for attaching”	10
D. “means for requiring. . .”	11
E. “means for receiving and displaying a listing of which recipient PDA/cell phones have automatically acknowledged. . .”	12
F. “means for periodically resending. . .”	13
G. “means for receiving and displaying a listing of which recipient PDA/cell phones have transmitted a manual response. . .”	13
VI. GROUND 1: PETITIONER HAS NOT PROVEN BY A PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE OBVIOUS OVER KUBALA AND HAMMOND.....	14

A.	Kubala and Hammond Do Not Disclose a “forced message alert”	14
B.	Kubala Does Not Disclose “requiring a required manual response from the response list by the recipient in order to clear recipient’s response list from recipient’s cell phone display”	18
C.	Kubala and Hammond Do Not Disclose “displaying a listing” of Which Phones Have Automatically Acknowledged and Have Not Acknowledged the Forced Message Alert.....	22
D.	Kubala and Hammond Do Not Disclose “displaying a listing which recipient PDA/cell phones have transmitted a manual response to said forced message alert”	27
VII.	FOUNDATIONS 2-3: PETITIONER HAS NOT PROVEN BY A PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE OBVIOUS OVER HAMMOND, JOHNSON, PEPE, AND BANERJEE	28
A.	Hammond, Johnson, Pepe, and Banerjee Do Not Disclose a “forced message alert”	28
B.	Hammond, Johnson, Pepe, and Banerjee Do Not Disclose “requiring a required manual response from the response list by the recipient in order to clear recipient’s response list from recipient’s cell phone display”	31
C.	Hammond Does Not Disclose “displaying a listing” of Which Phones Have Automatically Acknowledged and Have Not Acknowledged the Forced Message Alert	34
D.	Hammond Does Not Disclose “displaying a listing which recipient PDA/cell phones have transmitted a manual response to said forced message alert”	38
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	39

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Abiomed v. Maquest Cardiovascular</i> , Case IPR2017-01204 (P.T.A.B., October 23, 2017)	21
<i>Application of Arkley</i> , 455 F.2d. 586, 587-88 (C.C.P.A. 1972)	20
<i>Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.</i> , 732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	9
<i>Cordis Corp. v. Boston Sci. Corp.</i> , 658 F.3d 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	27
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	9
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	7
<i>Homeland Housewares, LLC v. Whirlpool Corp.</i> , 865 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2017), <i>cert. denied</i> , 138 S. Ct. 2602 (2018).....	27
<i>Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	8
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	7
<i>Los Angeles Biomedical Research Inst. at Harbor-UCLA Med. Ctr. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , 849 F.3d 1049 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	8
<i>NantKWest, Inc. v. Lee</i> , 686 Fed.Appx. 864 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	27
<i>Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	20

Pers. Web Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc.,
848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017)8

In re Stepan Co.,
868 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2017)21

Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.,
713 F.2d 1530 (Fed. Cir. 1983)8

Trivascular, Inc. v. Samuels,
812 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2016)9

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.