

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PANASONIC CORPORATION OF NORTH AMERICA *ET AL.*
Petitioners,

vs.

CELLSPIN SOFT, INC.,
Patent Owner

CASE: PR2019-00131
Patent No. 9,258,698

PATENT OWNER'S SUR-REPLY TO PETITIONER'S REPLY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. PANASONIC’S ALLEGATIONS ABOUT THE FOLEY DECLARATION ARE GROUNDLESS. THE DECLARATION SHOULD BE GIVEN FULL WEIGHT2

III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION2

 A. “Pairing” is different from “Authentication,” and both are different from “Encryption”2

 B. Cellspin’s Construction of “Paired Connection” is Correct3

 C. Cellspin’s Construction of “Cryptographically Authenticating” is Correct4

 D. Cellspin’s Construction of GUI is Correct4

 E. Cellspin’s Construction of “A Software Application” is Correct5

IV. THE V2.1+EDR BLUETOOTH CORE SPECIFICATION LIST MANY OPTIONAL ACTIVITIES. THE MERE MENTION OF “BLUETOOTH CONNECTION” IN MASHITA, ONISHI OR HIRAISHI DOES NOT ESTABLISH PAIRED CONNECTIONS6

V. LIMITATION C (I.E., A PAIRED CONNECTION) IS NOT DISCLOSED IN MASHITA, ONISHI or HIRAISHI. FURTHER, PANASONIC AND DR. STRAWN’S NEW OBVIOUSNESS THEORY IS UNFOUNDED7

 A. Mashita, Onishi or Hiraishi Does Not Disclose Establishing a Paired Connection Between a Cellular Phone and Digital Camera7

 B. Mashita Does Not Disclose the “Cryptographically Authenticating Identity” Portion of Limitation C15

 C. Cellspin’s Arguments Apply to the Non-Method Challenged Claims.20

VI. LIMITATION G IS NOT OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF THE COMBINATION, INCLUDING BECAUSE THE COMBINATION LACKS THE PATENTED FEATURE20

VII. LIMITATION J IS NOT OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF THE ALLEGED COMBINATION22

 A. Cellspin’s “Teaching Away” Contention is Correct22

B.	The Disadvantage of HTTP Acknowledged by Mashita is Relevant to the Challenged Claims.....	24
VIII.	LIMITATION K IS NOT OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF THE COMBINATION	25
IX.	CELLSPIN’S ANTECEDENT BASIS ARGUMENT FOR “APPLICATION” FOR CLAIMS 5 AND 8 IS DISPOSITIVE OF THOSE AND THEIR DEPENDENT CLAIMS. FURTHER, PANASONIC’S NEW “MODULE” THEORY IS IMPROPERLY NEW AND FACTUALLY MERITLESS	26
X.	THESE PROCEEDINGS ARE UNCONSTITUTIONAL	26

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

O2 Micro Int’l v. Beyond Innovation Tech., 521 F.3d 1351 (Fed.Cir. 2008)4,5

Baldwin Graphic Sys. v. Siebert, 512 F.3d 1338, 1342 (Fed.Cir.2008)5

01 Communique Lab. v. LogMeIn, 687 F.3d 1292, 1297 (Fed.Cir.2012)5

Otsuka Pharmaceutical Co. v. Sandoz, 678 F.3d 1280, (Fed.Cir. 2012).....19

Dippin' Dots v. Mosey, 476 F.3d 1337 (Fed.Cir. 2007).....25

Power Mosfet Tech. v. Siemens AG, 378 F.3D 1396 (Fed.Cir. 2004)25

McClurg v. Kingsland, 42 U.S. (1 How.) 202 (1843).....26

James v. Campbell, 104 U.S. 356 (1881)26

Usery v. Turner Elkhorn Minin, 428 U.S. 1 (1976).....26

Edmond v. U.S., 520 U.S. 651 (1997).....26

Free Enterprise Fund v. Public Company Accounting Oversight Board, 561 U.S. 477, 510 (2010).....26

...

I. INTRODUCTION

Panasonic's Reply brazenly attempts to assert improper new theories, evidence and other matters in what should be a reply. This Sur-Reply is subject to, and without waiving, Cellspin's objections at Doc 25.

Panasonic at least tacitly admits that neither Onishi nor Hiraishi disclose a paired Bluetooth connection. Panasonic's erroneous assertion that Mashita discloses a paired connection relies upon improper new theories and assertions, but it is nonetheless groundless.

Panasonic's erroneous new theory of Bluetooth/pairing obviousness is improper. Irrespective, **Panasonic fails to cite prior disclosure of a device that has performed any claimed method or a device that would be capable of the claimed functions.** Panasonic's assumption that all "Bluetooth" devices are capable of performing *every* function described in the Bluetooth specification is incorrect. Ex. 2026, ¶18.

Panasonic fails to show to show teachings to render obvious at least:

- (1) a paired wireless connection between a camera and mobile device;
- (2) cryptographic authentication of the mobile device by the camera;
- (3) none of the proposed combinations disclose limitation G;
- (4) using HTTP to upload received files and additional data, e.g., Mashita teaches away from a cellular phone using HTTP;
- (5) combining Mashita with Hirashi would not work;
- (6) GUI's in general and specifically not for image deletion on the wirelessly connected camera; and
- (7) for claims 5 and 8, a single mobile application performing all the required functions.

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.