Trials@uspto.gov 571-272-7822

DOCKET

Paper 25 Entered: August 31, 2020

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC., Petitioner,

v.

MPH TECHNOLOGIES OY, Patent Owner.

IPR2019-00823 (Patent 9,712,494 B2) IPR2019-00824 (Patent 9,712,502 B2) IPR2019-00826 (Patent 9,838,362 B2)

> Record of Oral Hearing Held: August 11, 2020

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY, KAMRAN JIVANI, and JOHN HAMANN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

APPEARANCES:

DOCKET

ALARM

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:

DANIEL BLOCK, ESQUIRE Sterne, Kessler, Goldstein & Fox 1100 New York Avenue, N.W. Suite 600 Washington, D.C. 20005

ON BEHALF OF PATENT OWNER:

STEPHEN T. SCHREINER, ESQUIRE Carmichael IP, PLLC 8000 Towers Crescent Drive 13th Floor Tysons Corner, VA 22182

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Tuesday, August 11, 2020, commencing at 9:31 a.m., EDT, at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, by video/by telephone, before Donna Jenkins, Notary Public.

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	
3	JUDGE HAMANN: This is the consolidated hearing for
4	IPR 2019-00823, 824, and 826. The hearing's been consolidated
5	but the cases remain separate. I'm Judge Hamann on the panel
6	also are Judges Medley and Jivani. I'd like to begin by having
7	the parties introduce themselves and I'd like to begin if
8	Petitioner could please introduce who's on the line on its behalf.
9	MR. BLOCK: Good morning, Your Honors. This is Daniel
10	Block on behalf of Petitioner Apple from the law firm of Sterne,
11	Kessler, Goldstein & Fox. With me today is Michael Specht and
12	Steven Pappas also of Sterne Kessler.
13	JUDGE HAMANN: Thank you. And for Patent Owner, if
14	you could please introduce who's on the line for Patent Owner's
15	behalf. You may need to unmute yourself, Patent Owner.
16	MR. SCHREINER: Thank you, Your Honor. Good
17	morning, Your Honors. My name is Stephen Schreiner from
18	Carmichael IP hear on behalf of MPH Technologies OY and I'm
19	joined here by my colleague, Jim Carmichael.
20	MR. CARMICHAEL: Good morning, Your Honors.
21	JUDGE HAMANN: Good morning. Thank you and good
22	morning to everyone. I'd also like to note there is a public audio
23	line today so we welcome the folks that may be listening in on
24	that. To begin, a reminder we're obviously participating via

3

1 video conference and so when you begin speaking certainly if 2 you're going to reference -- when you begin speaking make 3 certain that you're unmuted and if you could mute yourself when 4 you're not speaking, that would be helpful. Also please try to 5 endeavor to identify in the record if you're -- a specific cite if 6 you're referring to something or certainly by slide number, if 7 you're -- what slide if you're referring to a slide that'll make for 8 a clear record and allow us to follow along more readily.

9 The Hearing Order sets 90 minutes for arguments for each side. That includes rebuttal and surrebuttal. Petitioner bears the 10 burden for unpatentability and so we're going to begin with 11 12 Petitioner and then Patent Owner will have an opportunity to 13 respond and then any rebuttal and surrebuttal. I'm going to ask when each party begins their initial presentation, if how much 14 15 time they would like to reserve, if any, for rebuttal or surrebuttal. So let's begin, again with Petitioner bearing the 16 17 burden. We'll begin with Petitioner and Mr. Block, how much 18 time would you like to reserve for rebuttal?

MR. BLOCK: Thank you, Your Honor. I would like toreserve 40 minutes for rebuttal.

- 21 JUDGE HAMANN: Forty of your ninety?
- 22 MR. BLOCK: That's correct, Your Honor.

RM

- 23 JUDGE HAMANN: Thank you, and we'll certainly
- 24 endeavor to give you a time warning when you're towards the

4

end but to the extent you can track your time yourself too, I
 think that would be helpful. With that, please proceed.

MR. BLOCK: May it please the Board. As I mentioned earlier, my name is Daniel Block on behalf of Petitioner Apple. The Board should find unpatentable all of the challenged claims in the 494, 502, and 362 patents because they are rendered obvious by the combination of RFC3104 and Grabelsky.

8 The primary dispute between the parties here is whether or 9 not RFC3104 discloses a mobile computer. But RFC3104 10 explicitly discloses a laptop which is used in a Roadwarrier scenario. In other words, a situation where a laptop is travelling. 11 12 MPH tries to avoid this teaching by taking a shifting sands 13 approach with respect to the construction for a mobile computer 14 but the Board should reject all of MPH's constructions as they 15 are simply unsupported by the specification and contradicted by the claims and, more importantly, even if the Board adopted 16 MPH's incorrect constructions the references still teach a mobile 17 18 computer, even under their constructions.

With respect to MPH's remaining arguments for the
dependent claims, MPH primarily relies on its improper
constructions for a mobile computer or raises hyper-technical
distinctions that are meaningless under an obviousness-type
challenge like we have here.

24

So with that, Your Honors, I would like to turn to slide 2 of

5

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.