

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

Apple Inc.,  
Petitioner,

v.

Qualcomm Incorporated,  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2018-01315  
U.S. Patent No. 8,063,674

---

**PATENT OWNER SUR-REPLY**

## Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Petitioner Does Not Disagree That AAPA Is Not Proper Prior Art In <i>Inter Partes</i> Review Proceedings .....	1
III.	Neither The Reply Nor Dr. Horst’s New Simulation Results Rebut Qualcomm’s Showing That The POSA Would Not Combine The Alleged AAPA And Majcherczak .....	2
A.	Petitioner’s Argument About The Alleged “Explicit” Motivation To Combine Is Erroneous.....	2
B.	The Reply’s Criticism Of Dr. Pedram’s Testimony Is Misplaced.....	7
C.	Dr. Horst’s Simulations Do Not Prove That The POSA Would Be Motivated To Combine The Alleged AAPA And Majcherczak .....	8
1.	The Simulation Results Are Unreliable And Should Be Disregarded .....	9
2.	Dr. Horst Selected Unrealistic Parameter Values That The POSA Would Never Use In The Proposed AAPA/Majcherczak Combination.....	11
3.	Dr. Horst Cherry Picked Parameter Values Favorable For Petitioner Without Providing Any Rationale For Their Selection.....	16
4.	The Simulations Fail To Show That The AAPA/Majcherczak Combination Does Not Result In Increased Leakage Current .....	17
5.	The Single Simulation Result For AAPA/Majcherczak Reported By Dr. Horst Does Not Rebut Dr. Pedram’s Showing .....	18
IV.	Petitioner’s Extensive New Evidence And Argument Cannot Cure The Petition’s Failure To Show That The POSA Would Be Motivated To Combine Steinacker, Doyle, and Park .....	19

A.	Petitioner’s New Reasons For Why The POSA Would Allegedly Combine The References Are Deficient .....	21
B.	Dr. Horst’s New Simulation Results Do Not Rebut Qualcomm’s Showing That The Hypothetical Steinacker/Doyle/Park Circuit Has Leakage And Glitch Current Problems.....	25
1.	Dr. Horst’s Simulation Results Contain Significant Errors.....	25
2.	The Parameter Values Selected For The Proposed Steinacker/Doyle/Park Combination Are Unrealistic.....	25
3.	Dr. Horst’s Cherry Picked Parameter Values Show That His Selections Are Biased.....	26
4.	The Simulations Fail To Show That The Proposed Steinacker/Doyle/Park Circuit Does Not Result In Increased Leakage Current .....	26
5.	The Single Reported Simulation Result Does Not Rebut Dr. Pedram’s Showing.....	27
V.	Conclusion.....	27

## **I. Introduction**

Petitioner's reply introduces unpersuasive and belated arguments and evidence that cannot salvage the petition. The Board should confirm the patentability of claims 1, 2, and 5-7.

## **II. Petitioner Does Not Disagree That AAPA Is Not Proper Prior Art In *Inter Partes* Review Proceedings**

Qualcomm's response showed that Grounds 2(a) and 2(b) are improper because the America Invents Act (AIA) does not permit IPR based on so-called applicants admitted prior art (AAPA). Paper 12 at 17-20.

The reply does not disagree that AAPA is not proper prior art for IPR proceedings. Paper 16 at 1-2. In fact, the reply never makes the affirmative statement that AAPA should be considered prior art in IPRs. *See id.* Instead, Petitioner merely points out that the Institution Decision followed the logic articulated in a previous IPR where a different panel found AAPA to be prior art.<sup>1</sup> *Id.* But Petitioner carefully avoids endorsing the previous panel's approach or ever stating affirmatively that AAPA is proper prior art. The reason for this is clear:

---

<sup>1</sup> The previous panel decision cited by Petitioner is distinguishable from the present case. In the cited case, AAPA was relied on as a secondary reference in an obviousness ground. *One World Techs., Inc. v. Chamberlain Group, Inc.*, IPR2017-00126, Paper 56 at 6 (PTAB Oct. 24, 2018). By contrast, in the present case, Petitioner attempts to rely on AAPA as a primary reference.

Counsel for Petitioner is currently taking the position before the Board and the Federal Circuit that AAPA is “not ‘prior art consisting of patents or printed publications’ and, thus is ineligible for *inter partes* review.” Ex. 2004 at 3.

Qualcomm agrees with the position taken by Petitioner’s counsel in these other proceedings.<sup>2</sup> Petitioner’s reliance on AAPA is improper, and the challenged claims should be held patentable over Grounds 2(a) and 2(b).

### **III. Neither The Reply Nor Dr. Horst’s New Simulation Results Rebut Qualcomm’s Showing That The POSA Would Not Combine The Alleged AAPA And Majcherczak**

#### **A. Petitioner’s Argument About The Alleged “Explicit” Motivation To Combine Is Erroneous**

The reply argues that a POSITA would have been motivated to integrate the feedback transistor M6 of Majcherczak’s voltage detector into the alleged AAPA to enable stabilizing of the detection device through hysteresis, as described in Majcherczak. Paper 16 at 2-6. But Petitioner is wrong because a POSA faced with

---

<sup>2</sup> Permitting petitioners to rely on AAPA in IPR proceedings is improper because, among other reasons, it dissuades patent applicants from including a background section in their patent applications. Further, Petitioner’s reliance on the alleged AAPA here is especially improper because it is being applied as a primary reference. Obviousness is judged by putting oneself in the mind of the POSA—and then asking whether that person, the POSA, would be motivated to combine the prior art to reach the claimed invention. Here, Petitioner puts itself not in the mind of the POSA, but rather in the mind of the inventor as a starting point. Applying the alleged AAPA as the primary reference inherently leads to hindsight bias because it starts the obviousness inquiry from the wrong context: the inventor’s mind, not the POSA’s.

# 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.