

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

Case IPR2019-00925
Patent 8,209,634

PATENT OWNER'S SUR-REPLY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	THE REPLY DOES NOT CURE THE SHORTCOMINGS OF PETITIONER’S ALLEGED MOTIVATION TO COMBINE (ELEMENT 1[a]).....	1
	A. Petitioner ignores its burden to expressly articulate the motivation for modifying Ording’s computer hardware to store “the e-mail program of Abiko”	1
	B. The Reply belatedly attempts to recast its original purported motivations for incorporating “wireless capability” (Preamble) or modifying Ording’s “icon” display (Element 1[c]) into a distinct showing for modifying Ording’s computer to store/execute the “e-mail program of Abiko” (Element 1[a]).....	4
	C. Even if the purported motivation to “automatically display messages by sender” was tethered to the Petition’s modification proposed in Element 1[a] (which it was not), it fails to satisfy Petitioner’s burden	8
II.	THE REPLY DOES NOT CURE THE PETITION’S FAILURE TO SATISFY ITS BURDEN OF DEMONSTRATING WHY A POSITA WOULD HAVE MODIFIED ORDING’S ICON (ELEMENT 1[c]).....	12
	A. Dr. Surati’s testimony regarding the significance of numbers in the first column of Abiko’s FIG. 8 is uncontroverted.	12
	B. Petitioner ignores “tradeoffs” without properly analyzing the prior art’s stated preferences and evidence of reasons not to modify Ording’s numeral.	14
III.	THE REPLY DOES NOT CURE THE PETITION’S FAILURE TO DEMONSTRATE WHY A POSITA WOULD HAVE FURTHER MODIFIED ABIKO IN THE PROPOSED MANNER (ELEMENT 1[c])..	16
	A. The Reply fails to cure errors in the Petition’s further modifications to Abiko’s e-mail program based on Crumlish’s description of “Pegasus mail” (Element 1[c]).....	16
	B. The Reply does not cure the Petition’s deficiencies with respect to fourth and fifth proposed modifications—modifying Abiko’s e-mail program “to separately store new messages” and create the sender information menu using only unread messages (Pet., 44).	20

IV.	LACK OF PRIOR ART DISCLOSURE OF THE CRITICAL METHOD ELEMENT HIGHLIGHTS PETITIONER’S LEGALLY-DEFICIENT OBVIOUSNESS THEORIES.	22
V.	THE REPLY FAILS TO CURE MULTIPLE DEFECTS IN THE PETITION’S ANALYSIS OF DEPENDENT CLAIMS 6, 12, AND 18 IN GROUND 2.	24
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	26

EXHIBITS

- EX2001 Declaration of Rajeev Surati, Ph.D.
- EX2002 Corrected Final Ruling on Claim Construction/*Markman* Hearing, *BlackBerry Limited v. Snap Inc.*, Case Nos. CV 18-1844-GW & 18-2693-GW (C.D. Cal. April 5, 2019) (“*Markman* Order”)
- EX2003 Defendant’s Notice and Motion to Stay Pending *Inter Partes* Review, *BlackBerry Limited v. Facebook, Inc. et al.*, Case Nos. 2:18-cv-01844-GW & 2:18-cv-02693-GW (C.D. Cal. April 16, 2019)
- EX2004 Minutes of Status Conference, Initial Thoughts re Joint Report, *BlackBerry Limited v. Facebook, Inc. et al.*, Case Nos. 2:18-cv-01844-GW & 2:18-cv-02693-GW (C.D. Cal. April 22, 2019)
- EX2005 Notice Withdrawing Pre-Institution Motion to Stay In View of Court’s Guidance, *BlackBerry Limited v. Facebook, Inc. et al.*, Case Nos. 2:18-cv-01844-GW & 2:18-cv-02693-GW (C.D. Cal. April 26, 2019)
- EX2006 Minutes of Order In Chambers, Trial Schedule, *BlackBerry Limited v. Facebook, Inc. et al.*, Case Nos. 2:18-cv-01844-GW & 2:18-cv-02693-GW (C.D. Cal. May 15, 2019)
- EX2007 BlackBerry Limited’s Final Election of Asserted Claims, *BlackBerry Limited v. Facebook, Inc. et al.*, Case Nos. 2:18-cv-01844-GW & 2:18-cv-02693-GW (C.D. Cal. May 31, 2019)
- EX2008 Defendant’s Final Election of Asserted Prior Art, *BlackBerry Limited v. Facebook, Inc. et al.*, Case Nos. 2:18-cv-01844-GW & 2:18-cv-02693-GW (C.D. Cal. June 14, 2019)
- EX2009 RESERVED
- EX2010 RESERVED

- EX2011 Order Modifying Scheduling Order *BlackBerry Limited v. Facebook, Inc. et al.*, Case Nos. 2:18-cv-01844-GW & 2:18-cv-02693-GW (C.D. Cal. July 12, 2019)
- EX2012 Order Denying Renewed Motion for Stay, The California Institute of Technology v. Broadcom Ltd. et al., Case No. 2:16-cv-03714-GW (C.D. Cal. October 5, 2017)
- EX2013 Second Declaration of Rajeev Surati, Ph.D.
- EX2014 Apple iMac User's Guide (2002)
- EX2015 Chapter 3 of Crumlish (missing from EX110)
- EX2016 Chapter 20 of McPherson (missing from EX1112)
- EX2017 Transcript of Deposition of Dr. Sandeep Chatterjee (February 5, 2020)
- EX2018 Transcript of Deposition of Dr. Sandeep Chatterjee (May 8, 2020)

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.