

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APPLE INC.,  
Petitioner

v.

QUALCOMM INCORPORATED,  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2018-01280  
Patent No. 7,844,037

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. OVERVIEW OF THE '037 PATENT .....	3
III. OVERVIEW OF THE PROSECUTION HISTORY OF THE '037 PATENT .....	4
IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	11
A. “prompting” .....	12
V. PETITIONER FUNDAMENTALLY MISCONSTRUES ITS PRIMARY REFERENCE ( <i>BROWN</i> ) .....	17
VI. PETITIONER FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT ANY OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE.....	24
A. Petitioner Fails to Demonstrate that the Combination of <i>Brown</i> and <i>Moran</i> Discloses Every Limitation of Independent Claim 1 (Grounds 2A and 2B: Claims 1–16 and 18).....	24
1. The combination of <i>Brown</i> and <i>Moran</i> does not disclose “in response to receiving the incoming call, <u>prompting</u> a user of the first computing device to enter user input that instructs the first computing device to handle the incoming call by composing, while not answering the incoming call, a message to a user of the second computing device.” .....	24
a) “prompting” .....	25
2. The combination of <i>Brown</i> and <i>Moran</i> does not disclose “responsive to receiving the incoming call and the user entering the user input, <u>automatically addressing</u> the message to the second computing device using the message identifier determined from the incoming call.” .....	27
B. Petitioner Fails to Establish a Motivation to Combine or Reasonable Expectation of Success.....	31

VII. THE BOARD SHOULD EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(D) TO DENY REVIEW .....34

A. Similarity of the asserted art and the prior art involved during examination: *Brown* was substantially considered during prosecution .....35

B. The extent to which the asserted art was considered during examination: *Brown* was the basis for a rejection during prosecution and it was substantively considered .....36

C. The cumulative nature of the asserted art and the prior art considered during examination: *Moran* is cumulative to other references cited during prosecution .....39

D. Whether Examiner erred in its consideration of the asserted prior art: Petitioner fails to show how Examiner erred in its consideration of *Brown* .....41

E. Extent of the overlap between the arguments made during examination and the manner in which Petitioner relies on the prior art or Patent Owner’s arguments during examination: Petitioner relies on *Brown* in substantially the same manner as the Examiner.....42

F. The extent to which additional evidence and facts presented in the Petition warrant reconsideration of the prior art: Petitioner’s “additional evidence” does not warrant reconsideration of the art .....43

VII. THE BOARD SHOULD EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 315(D) TO DENY REVIEW OF DUPLICATIVE PROCEEDINGS.....45

VIII. CONCLUSION.....46

**EXHIBIT LIST**

<b>Patent Owner's Exhibits</b>	
2001	Disclaimer in Patent Under 37 CFR 1.321(a)
2002	U.S. Patent No. 6,219,413 to <i>Burg</i>
2003	U.S. Publication No. 2002/0187794 to <i>Fostick</i>

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Arctic Cat Inc. v. Bombardier Recreational Prod. Inc.</i> , 876 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	33
<i>Arctic Cat, Inc. v. Polaris Indus., Inc.</i> , No. IPR2017-00199, 2017 WL 1394062 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 17, 2017) .....	39
<i>Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	23, 29, 44
<i>Baker Hughes Inc. v. LiquidPower Specialty Prods. Inc.</i> , No. IPR2016-01905, 10 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 10, 2017).....	11, 13, 14
<i>Becton, Dickinson &amp; Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG</i> , No. IPR2017-01587, 23 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 15, 2017) (designated informative Mar. 21, 2018).....	39, 41
<i>Becton, Dickinson and Company v. B. Braun Melsungen AG</i> , No. IPR2017-01586, 17–18 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 15, 2017) .....	35
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	11
<i>Echostar Corporation v. Realtime Data LLC</i> , No. IPR2018-00614, 2018 WL 4232406 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 5, 2018) .....	39
<i>In re Bigio</i> , 381 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	33
<i>In re Kotzab</i> , 217 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	23, 31
<i>In re Smith Int’l, Inc.</i> , 871 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	12
<i>In re Translogic Tech., Inc.</i> , 504 F.3d 1250 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	12

# 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.