UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD APPLE INC., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., and SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., Petitioners, v. FIRSTFACE CO., LTD., Patent Owner. Case IPR2019-00612 U.S. Patent No. 8,831,557

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTR	RODUCTION1				
II.	THE '557 PATENT AND THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS					
	A.	Problem Presented				
	B.	Claim Construction				
		1.	"simultaneously"	7		
		2.	"inactive state" and "active state"	.10		
		3.	"user identification unit"	.12		
III.	LEVE	EL OF	SKILL IN THE ART	.15		
IV.	SUMMARY OF THE REFERENCES16					
	A.	Fadell1				
	B.	Gagneraud19				
	C.	iOS20				
	D.	Goertz				
	E.	Herfet22				
V.	APPL	ICAB	LE LEGAL STANDARDS	.23		
VI. THE PETITION DOES NOT DEMONSTRATE THAT THE						
CHA	LLEN	GED C	CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE UNDER GROUND 1	.25		
	A. The cited art, even when combined, does not disclose performance user identification simultaneously with switching the display to an active state. 26					
		1. with S	Fadell Does Not Perform User Identification Simultaneously Switching the Display to an Active State.	.26		
		2.	The deficiencies of Fadell are not resolved by Gagneraud	.31		
	B. claim	A POSITA would not combine Fadell with Gagneraud to arrive at the led invention				
		1.	Petitioners have not adequately articulated a motivation to			



		combine Fadell with Gagneraud.				
		2. Combining Fadell and Gagneraud would alter the fundamental operation of Fadell				
		3. from	Power management considerations would dissuade a POSITA combining Fadell with Gagneraud			
VII. CHA			TION DOES NOT DEMONSTRATE THAT THE CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE UNDER GROUND 24	10		
	A. from	Goertz does not disclose an activation button that switches the display an inactive state to an active state				
	B. simul	The cited references do not disclose performing user identification taneously with switching the display to an active state42				
		1. switch	Goertz does not perform user identification simultaneously withing the display to an active state4			
		2.	The deficiencies of Goertz are not resolved by Herfet4	13		
	C.	There is no motivation to combine Goertz with Herfet46				
		1.	Petitioners have not adequately articulated a motivation to ine Goertz with Herfet4	1 6		
		2. restric	Herfet teaches away from the proposed combination by eting its application to the power-on sequence4	19		
VIII.	NO P	RIOR	ART REFERENCE DISCLOSES A DEVICE THAT			
			GERPRINT RECOGNITION AND SIMULTANEOUSLY			
			E DISPLAY SCREEN "BY A PRESS OF THE ACTIVATION			
BUT	ΓON."	•••••	5	50		
IX.	CON	CLUSI	[ON5	51		



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases:

<i>3M Innovative Props. Co. v. Tredegar Corp.</i> , 725 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2013)
Advanced Fiber Techs. Trust v. J&L Fiber Servs., 674 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2012)
Affymetrix, Inc. v. Hyseq, Inc., 123 F. Supp. 1212 (N.D. Cal. 2001)
Apex Inc. v. Raritan Computer, Inc., 325 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2003)
Cardiac Pacemakers, Inc. v. St. Jude Medical, Inc., 381 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2004)
CCS Fitness, Inc. v. Brunswick Corp., 288 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2002)
CFMT, Inc. v. YieldUp Int'l Corp., 349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003)
Digital Biometrics, Inc. v. Identix, Inc., 149 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 1998)
Garmin Int'l, Inc. v. Patent of Cuozzo Speed Techs. LLC, Case No. IPR2012-00001, Paper 15 (PTAB Jan. 9, 2013)
Greenberg v. Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc., 91 F.3d 1580 (Fed. Cir. 1996)
Hill-Rom Servs. v. Stryker Corp., 755 F.3d 1367, 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2014)
<i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPO 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984)



In re Rijckaert, 9 F.3d 1531, 1534 (Fed. Cir. 1993)	24
<i>In re Royka</i> , 490 F.2d 981 (C.C.P.A. 1974)	24
<i>K/S HIMPP v. Hear-Wear Techs., LLC,</i> 751 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	33, 45, 46
Kara Tech. Inc. v. Stamps.com Inc., 582 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	7
Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc., 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	36, 48
KSR Int'l. Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	24, 33
Linear Tech. Corp. v. Impala Linear Corp., 379 F.3d 1311 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	14
Nidec Motor Corp. v. Zhongshan Broad Ocean Motor Co., 868 F.3d 1013 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	12
Personalized Media Commc'ns, L.L.C. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n, 161 F.3d 696 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	13
Phillips v. AWH Corp., 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	5
Power Integrations, Inc. v. Fairchild Semiconductor Int'l, Inc., 711 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	6
Rexnord Corp. v. Laitram Corp., 274 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	6
Teleflex, Inc. v. Ficosa N. Am. Corp.,	



DOCKET A L A R M

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.

