

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 BLACKBERRY LIMITED'S  
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**I. INTRODUCTION.....1**

**II. THE '634 PATENT.....3**

A. Background of the Invention .....3

B. Overview of the Prosecution History.....6

**III. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL .....9**

**IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....9**

A. “wireless communication device” (All challenged claims).....10

B. “messaging correspondent” (All challenged claims).....10

C. “a numeric character representing a count of the plurality of different message correspondents for which one or more of the electronic messages have been received and remain unread” (All challenged claims) .....11

**V. THE BOARD SHOULD EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION UNDER §314(a) TO DENY INSTITUTION.....12**

A. As to the two Facebook (-00924, -00925) petitions, institution of multiple, concurrent proceedings would not promote efficient administration of the Office or the integrity of the system.....12

B. As between the multiple Snap petitions and the multiple Facebook petitions, Snap’s petitions (-00938, -00939) are duplicative follow-on petitions that place undue burden on the Board and Patent Owner and lead to undue harassment.....16

C. The Board should exercise its discretion under §314(a) to deny institution because IPR would be an inefficient use of Board resources in view of the advanced stage of the related District Court case.....20

**VI. ALL CITED REFERENCES IN THE PETITION—INCLUDING THE PRIMARY AND ALL SECONDARY REFERENCES—ARE ADMITTEDLY LACKING A REQUIRED CLAIM ELEMENT (ALL GROUNDS) .....25**

A. The Petition failed to identify a prior art document that discloses “a numeric character representing a count of the plurality of different messaging correspondents,” according to the appropriate construction.....27

B. The Petition failed to identify any description that the numbers in Abiko’s sender table are represented as “a count” of the plurality of different messaging correspondents .....29

C. The Petition failed to identify any description that the numbers in Abiko’s sender table are represented as “a count” of the plurality of different

messaging correspondents for which one or more of the electronic messages have been received and “remain unread” .....31

**VII. THE PETITION FAILS TO SHOW A POSITA WOULD HAVE BEEN MOTIVATED TO MODIFY ORDING IN VIEW OF ABIKO, CRUMLISH, AND DVORAK TO ARRIVE AT THE CLAIMED INVENTION. (ALL GROUNDS) .....34**

A. The Petition fails to show that a POSITA would have been motivated to modify Abiko to create the “sender information” menu using only “unread” messages. ....35

1. The Petition’s proposed modification to Abiko ignores Abiko’s teachings regarding its “sender selection” menus. ....36

2. The Petition fails to show that the proposed modification based on Abiko alone would have been obvious. ....42

3. The Petition fails to show that the claimed invention would have resulted even if Ording, Abiko, and Dvorak were combined with Crumlish. .44

4. The Petition fails to explain that the proposed modification would have been obvious at the time of the invention. ....47

B. The Petition fails to show that a POSITA would have been motivated to modify Ording’s icon to identify a number of senders who have sent unread messages.....48

1. The Petition fails to show that a POSITA would have been prompted to modify Ording’s icon in the manner proposed at the time the invention was made.....49

2. The Petition’s alternative theory that the proposed modification to Abiko and Ording would have been “obvious to try” is unsupported by any sufficient evidence. ....56

**VIII. THE PETITION FAILS TO SHOW THAT CLAIMS 6, 12, AND 18 WERE OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF ORDING, ABIKO, CRUMLISH, DVORAK, AND MCPHERSON (GROUNDS 2 AND 4) .....57**

**IX. CONCLUSION.....61**

## LIST OF 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)

# 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.