

Filed on behalf of: Snap Inc.

By: Yar R. Chaikovsky (Snap-Blackberry-PH-IPR@paulhastings.com)  
Chad Peterman (Snap-Blackberry-PH-IPR @paulhastings.com)  
David Okano (Snap-Blackberry-PH-IPR@paulhastings.com)  
Paul Hastings LLP

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SNAP INC.,  
Petitioner

v.

BLACKBERRY LIMITED  
Patent Owner

---

IPR2019-00715  
U.S. Patent No. 8,326,327

---

**PETITIONER'S OPPOSITION TO PATENT OWNER'S  
MOTION TO AMEND**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| <b>I. Introduction</b> .....  | 1    |
| <b>II. Claim construction of the term “action spot”</b> .....   | 1    |
| <b>III. Substitute claim 21 does not comply with 35 U.S.C. § 316(d) because there is no written description support for a mobile device that can be configured to “provide a pop-up display of said posted video”</b> ..... | 2    |
| <b>IV. Substitute claim 21 is obvious</b> .....   | 6    |
| A. Prior art teaches or suggests a “touch sensitive display” [21b] .....  | 7    |
| B. Prior art teaches or suggests the claimed “interactive map” [21c].....   | 7    |
| C. Prior art teaches or suggests signifying “the current location of the mobile device as an icon on the interactive map” [21f].....  | 9    |
| D. Prior art teaches or suggests action spots and activity level corresponding to posted video and recording activity [21e & 21g].....  | 9    |
| 1. <i>Eyal and Jaffe</i> teach systems that process video posts .....   | 10   |
| 2. <i>Lemmela-Crowley</i> combined with <i>Eyal or Jaffe</i> teaches substitute claim 21’s action spots and activity level.....   | 11   |
| 3. <i>Winkler-Altman</i> combined with <i>Eyal or Jaffe</i> teaches substitute claim 21’s action spots and activity level.....  | 11   |
| E. Prior art teaches or suggests an action spot as a “selectable graphical item” that “provide[s] a pop-up display of posted video” [21i].....  | 12   |
| 1. <i>Eyal and Jaffe</i> teach a “selectable graphical item” “provid[ing] a pop-up display of” posted videos.....   | 12   |
| 2. <i>Lemmela</i> teaches selectable icons providing pop-up content display, and <i>Lemmela-Crowley</i> combined with <i>Eyal or Jaffe</i> ’s video posts teaches pop-up video content .....                                | 13   |
| 3. <i>Winkler-Altman</i> combined with <i>Eyal or Jaffe</i> teaches substitute claim 21’s “selectable graphical item” “provid[ing] a pop-up display of said posted video” .....   | 14   |
| F. Reasons to combine <i>Lemmela-Crowley</i> with <i>Eyal/Jaffe</i> video posts.....  | 14   |

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
(continued)

|  | <b>Page</b> |
|--|-------------|
| G. Reasons to combine <i>Winkler-Altman</i> with <i>Eyal</i> or <i>Jaffe</i> 's video posts and <i>selectable</i> icons providing a pop-up display ..... | 16          |
| <b>V. Like claim 2, substitute claim 21 is patent-ineligible under § 101 .....</b>   | <b>18</b>   |
| A. <i>Alice</i> step one.....  | 18          |
| B. <i>Alice</i> step two .....   | 23          |
| <b>VI. To the extent Patent Owner contends substitute claim 21 requires a large-scale network architecture, the claim lacks enablement .....</b>         | <b>25</b>   |
| <b>VII. Conclusion .....</b>   | <b>25</b>   |

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

**Page(s)**

### **Cases**

|   |               |
|---|---------------|
| <i>Aqua Prods., Inc. v. Matal</i> ,<br>872 F.3d 1290 (Fed. Cir. 2017) (en banc) (O’Malley, J.) .....  | 3, 6          |
| <i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly &amp; Co.</i> ,<br>598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (en banc) ..... | 3, 4          |
| <i>BSG Tech LLC v. Buyseasons, Inc.</i> ,<br>899 F.3d 1281 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....                     | 24            |
| <i>Elec. Power Grp. LLC v. Alstom, S.A.</i> ,<br>830 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....                 | 19            |
| <i>Interval Licensing LLC v. AOL, Inc.</i> ,<br>896 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....                  | 21, 22        |
| <i>Knowles Elecs. LLC v. Cirrus Logic, Inc.</i> ,<br>883 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....             | 6             |
| <i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> ,<br>550 U.S. 398 (2007).....                                   | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>Lockwood v. Am. Airlines, Inc.</i> ,<br>107 F.3d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1997) .....                       | 3             |
| <i>Trading Techs Int’l, Inc. v. IBG LLC</i> ,<br>921 F.3d 1084 (Fed. Cir. 2019) .....                 | 23            |

### **Statutes**

|                            |       |
|----------------------------|-------|
| 35 U.S.C. § 112.....       | 25    |
| 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1 ..... | 3     |
| 35 U.S.C. § 316(d) .....   | 2, 25 |
| 35 U.S.C. § 316(d)(3)..... | 3, 6  |

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**  
(continued)

**Page(s)**

**Other Authorities**

|                                   |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.20(c).....         | 2 |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(a)(2)(ii)..... | 3 |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(b)(1).....     | 3 |

# 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.