

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE LLC,
Petitioner

v.

CYWEE GROUP LTD.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2018-01257
Patent No. 8,552,978

PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

Table of Contents

I. SUMMARY	1
II. BACKGROUND	2
III. REFERENCES RELIED ON BY THE PETITIONER	9
A. U.S. Patent 7,089,148 to Bachmann (<i>Bachmann</i>, Exhibit 1004)	9
B. U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2004/0095317 to Zhang (<i>Zhang</i>, Exhibit 1005)	13
i. <i>Zhang</i> has been interpreted by the USPTO in various ex parte examinations against relevant parties	15
C. U.S. Patent 7,158,118 to Liberty (<i>Liberty</i>, Exhibit 1006)	16
i. <i>Liberty</i> has been interpreted by the USPTO in various ex parte examinations against relevant parties	17
IV. CHALLENGES	20
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	22
A. “3D pointing device”	24
B. “spatial reference frame”/ “spatial reference frame associated with the 3D pointing device”	26
C. “rotation output”	26
VI. <i>BACHMANN</i> DOES NOT QUALIFY AS ANALGOUS ART	27
VII. THE REFERENCES DO NOT DISCLOSE ALL LIMITATIONS OF THE CHALLENGED INVENTIONS	31
A. Ground 1 –<i>Zhang</i> in view of <i>Bachmann</i>	31
i. Claim 1	33
ii. Claim 12	38
B. Ground 2 –<i>Liberty</i> in view of <i>Bachmann</i>	38
i. Claim 10	40
ii. Claim 12	42
VIII. CONCLUSION	42

Table of Authorities

Cases

Graham v. John Deere Co.,
383 U.S. 1 (1966)..... 21

In re Clay,
966 F.2d 656 (Fed. Cir. 1992)..... 28

In re Dembiczak,
175 F.3d 994 (Fed. Cir. 1999)..... 21

In re Gurley,
27 F.3d 551 (Fed. Cir. 1994)..... 22

KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007)..... 21, 22

Personal Web Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc.
848 F.3d 987, 993-994 (Fed. Cir. 2017)..... 32, 39

Richardson-Vicks Inc. v. Upjohn Co.,
122 F.3d 1476 (Fed. Cir. 1997)..... 20

Smith & Nephew, Inc. v. Hologic, Inc.,
721 Fed. Appx. 943 (Fed. Cir. 2018)..... 28

W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.,
721 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983)..... 21

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 103..... 20, 28

List of Exhibits

2001	Declaration of Dr. Gary L. Blank
2002	<i>Curriculum Vitae</i> of Dr. Gary L. Blank CV
2003	Claim Construction Opinion and Order (Doc. 117), <i>Cywee Group Ltd. v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.</i> , C.A. No. 2:17-CV-00140-WCB-RSP (E.D. Tex., July 9, 2018)
2004	Expert Declaration of Dr. Joseph LaViola, Ph.D., in Support of Patent Owner Response
2005	<i>Curriculum Vitae</i> of Dr. Joseph LaViola, Ph.D.
2006	Order (Doc. 153), <i>Cywee Group Ltd. v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.</i> , C.A. No. 2:17-CV-00140-WCB-RSP (E.D. Tex., Aug. 14, 2018)
2007	Memorandum Opinion (Doc. 55), <i>CyWee Group Ltd. v. Motorola Mobility LLC</i> , C.A. No. 17-780-RGA (D. Del., Dec. 21, 2018)
2008	File History of U.S. Application No. 10/396,439
2009	File History of U.S. Application No. 12/413,722
2010	File History of U.S. Application No. 13/367,058
2011	Expert Declaration of Dr. Joseph LaViola, Ph.D., in Support of Motion to Amend
2012	File History of U.S. Provisional Application 61/292558

...

I. SUMMARY

Petitioner has challenged the patentability of Claims 10 and 12 of U.S. Patent No. 8,552,978 (the “‘978 Patent”) based solely on obviousness grounds. Petitioner cannot meet its burden of showing that any of the claims are unpatentable over the asserted combination for at least the following reasons:

- Petitioner’s challenges rely on two different combinations of references—*Zhang* in view of *Bachmann*, and *Liberty* in view of *Bachmann*—neither of which teaches or suggests all the claim limitations.
- The *Bachmann* (Ex. 1004) device is not a “3D pointing device;” it is not a handheld device used to control actions on a display and does not point to anything at all. *Bachmann* merely measures movements of an articulated rigid object such as limbs of a human body. Tellingly, neither Petitioner nor the Board alleges that *Bachmann* discloses a “3D pointing device.” As such, *Bachmann* is not analogous art to the ‘978 Patent. *See infra* Section VI.
- Petitioner’s challenges based on the combination of *Zhang* (Ex. 1005) and *Bachmann* and the combination of *Liberty* (Ex. 1006) and *Bachmann* rely on references that would not be combined by one of ordinary skill in the art. Dr. LaViola, a PHOSITA with extensive experience in the relevant art, has concluded that one of skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the references. *See infra* Section VII.A and VII.B.

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.