

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FACEBOOK, INC., INSTAGRAM, LLC, and WHATSAPP INC.,
Petitioners,

v.

BLACKBERRY LIMITED,
Patent Owner

IPR2019-00516
U.S. Patent No. 8,279,173

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 313 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	2
A. Patent Owner BlackBerry’s Innovations Have Transformed the Way We Communicate	2
B. The ’173 Patent Discloses and Claims One of BlackBerry’s Many Innovations.....	4
C. None of the Alleged Prior Art Discloses the Innovative Solutions Claimed by the ’173 Patent	8
1. Zuckerberg	8
2. Rothmuller	11
3. Plotkin	13
4. MacLaurin	15
(a) Tagging Mode – Displaying a Single, “Best Guess” Suggested Tag	16
(b) Browsing Mode – Displaying a List of Previously Applied Tags.....	18
5. Ortega.....	20
6. Matthews	21
III. LEGAL STANDARDS	23
IV. ARGUMENT	25
A. Grounds 1-7 Should Be Denied Because They Are Redundant of Petitioners’ Grounds in IPR2019-00528.....	26
1. The -516 Petition Relies Largely on the Same Art and Arguments Presented in the -528 Petition	27
2. Petitioners Provide No Reason Why the Board Should Institute Two IPRs on Redundant Petitions	30
B. Grounds 1-5 Fail Because Zuckerberg Does Not Disclose “Displaying a Tag Type Indicator . . . Indicative of a Tag Source”	32

1.	All Challenged Claims Require “Displaying a Tag Type Indicator . . . Indicative of a Tag Source”	32
2.	Petitioners Fail to Show that Zuckerberg’s Line Meets the “Indicative of a Tag Source” Limitation.....	33
3.	Petitioners’ References to Obviousness Are Based on Nothing More Than Conclusory Statements	36
4.	Petitioner’s Other Arguments Cannot Cure These Deficiencies.....	37
C.	Grounds 1-5 Fail Because Petitioners’ Allegation of “Tag Sources” in Zuckerberg Are Based on Hindsight	38
D.	Grounds 6-7 Fail Because Petitioners’ Allegation of “Tag Sources” in Rothmuller Is Conclusory and Based on Hindsight	42
V.	CONCLUSION.....	45

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
Cases	
<i>Am. Honda Motor Co., Inc. v. Blitzsafe Texas, LLC</i> , IPR2016-01473, Paper 9 (Jan. 24, 2017)	24
<i>Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	24
<i>Bungie, Inc. v. Acceleration Bay, LLC</i> , IPR2016-00934, Paper 11 (Jul. 8, 2016)	30
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	23
<i>Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc. v. Covidien AG</i> , IPR2016-00944, Paper 8 (Oct. 24, 2016)	30
<i>Facebook, Inc. v. Uniloc USA, Inc.</i> , IPR2017-01524, Paper 7 (Dec. 4, 2017)	37
<i>General Plastic Indus. Co., Ltd. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , IPR2016-01357, Paper 19 (Sept. 6, 2017).....	26, 27
<i>Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	23, 35, 43
<i>InfoBionic, Inc. v. Braemar Mfg., LLC</i> , IPR2015-01704, Paper 11 (Feb. 16, 2016).....	36
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	25, 36, 43
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	23
<i>In re Nuvasive, Inc.</i> , 842 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	36
<i>K/S Himpp v. Hear-Wear Techs., LLC</i> , 751 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	24
<i>KSR Int’l. Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	25, 36, 41, 43
<i>LG Elecs., Inc. v. ATI Techs., ULC</i> , IPR2015-00327, Paper 15 (Sept. 2, 2015).....	27, 29, 31
<i>Nichia Corp. v. Document Sec. Sys.</i> , IPR2018-01167, Paper 10 (Nov. 30, 2018).....	27

*Securus Techs., Inc. v. Global Tel*Link Corp.*,
IPR2016-00267, Paper 10 (Sept. 12, 2016).....24

Sirona Dental Sys. GmbH v. Institut Straumann AG,
892 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2018)24

Tech. Licensing Corp. v. Videotek, Inc.,
545 F.3d 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2008)23

Unified Patents Inc. v. Berman,
IPR2016-01571, Paper 10 (Dec. 14, 2016)30

Unigene Labs., Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.,
655 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2011) 24, 25

Statutory Authorities

35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3).....2, 23

35 U.S.C. § 3131

35 U.S.C. § 325(d)27

Rules and Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a).....36

37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a).....1

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.