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 PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

Case No. IPR2018-01079

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page(s)

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 means-plus-function terms conflict with positions it has taken in the District Court Litigation 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 software application program," "manual response," and "the repeating voice alert" terms and phrases of the Challenged Claims 19

C. Petitioner's conflicting positions violate 37 C.F.R. § 42.11, § 11.18(b)(2).....20

III. PETITIONER HAS NOT ESTABLISHED THAT THE KUBALA REFERENCE IS PRIOR ART 24

IV. PETITIONER HAS NOT DEMONSTRATED A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS FOR THE GROUNDS ADVANCED IN THE PETITION, AND THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED 28

A. Requirements for Showing Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 28

B. Kubala Is Directed to a Completely Different Technological Field.....31

C. No Motivation Exists to Combine Kubala With Hammond 32

D. Ground 1 Is Deficient Because Kubala Does Not Disclose a "forced message alert software packet" 34

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

E. Ground 1 Is Deficient Because Kubala Does Not Disclose Automatically Acknowledging Receipt of the Forced Message Alert 35

F. Ground 1 Is Deficient Because Kubala Does Not Disclose *Clearing* the Display *Only* in Response to Selection of the Manual Response 39

G. Grounds 2 and 3 Are Deficient Because Hammond Does Not, By Itself, Disclose or Suggest Any Single Limitation of the Challenged Claims 41

H. Grounds 2 and 3 Are Deficient Because Petitioner Fails to Submit Any Motivation to Combine the References to Disclose or Suggest "a data transmission means. . ." 43

I. Grounds 2 and 3 Are Deficient Because Petitioner Does Not Identify Which Elements in Hammond, Johnson, and Pepe Correspond to the "forced message alert software packet" 45

J. Grounds 2 and 3 Are Deficient Because The Combination of Hammond, Johnson, and Pepe Does Not Disclose or Suggest *Clearing* the Display *Only* in Response to Selection of the Manual Response 47

V. CONCLUSION 49

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

Apple, Inc. v. Contentguard Holdings, Inc.,
IPR2015-00355 (P.T.A.B., June 26, 2015) 28

Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.,
732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 30

In re Donaldson Co.,
16 F.3d 1189 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (*en banc*) 18

Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat'l Graphics, Inc.,
800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015) 24

In re Edwards,
568 F.2d 1349 (CCPA 1978) 25

Facebook, Inc. v. Sound View Innovations, LLC,
Case Nos. IPR2017-00998 & IPR2017-01002 (P.T.A.B., Sept. 5, 2017) 17

Fitbit, Inc. v. Bodymedia, Inc.,
Case No. IPR2016-00707 (P.T.A.B., Sept. 8, 2016) 24, 25

Fresenius USA, Inc. v. Baxter Int'l, Inc.,
582 F.3d 1288 (Fed. Cir. 2009) 30

Graham v. John Deere Co.,
383 U.S. 1 (1966) 28

Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbott Labs.,
512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008) 30

Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.,
821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 29

Key Pharm. v. Hercon Labs. Corp.,
161 F.3d 709 (Fed. Cir. 1998) 23

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007).....28

Los Angeles Biomedical Research Inst. at Harbor-UCLA Med. Ctr. v. Eli Lilly & Co., 849 F.3d 1049 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....29

N. Telecom Ltd. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.,
215 F.3d 1281 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....23

Pers. Web Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc.,
848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....29

Sanofi-Aventis U.S. v. Immunex Corporation,
Case No. IPR2017-01129 (P.T.A.B., Oct. 4, 2017).....18

Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.,
713 F.2d 1530 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....28

In re Van Os,
844 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....30

Yniguez v. State of Ariz.,
939 F.2d 727 (9th Cir. 1991).....23

Statutes

35 U.S.C. 102.....24

35 U.S.C. § 103.....28

35 U.S.C. § 112.....*passim*

35 U.S.C. § 314(a).....3

35 U.S.C. § 316(e).....24

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 11.18(b)(2).....3, 20

37 C.F.R. § 42.11.....3, 20

37 C.F.R. § 42.104.....4

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.