UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SNAP, INC.
Petitioner

v.

BLACKBERRY LIMITED
Patent Owner

Case IPR2019-00939
Patent 8,209,634

PATENT OWNER BLACKBERRY LIMITED'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

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 Snap 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 Facebook petitions and the multiple Snap petitions, Facebook's petitions are duplicative 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. 19

VI. THE BOARD SHOULD EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION UNDER §325(D) TO DENY INSTITUTION, BECAUSE THE PETITION PRESENTS THE SAME PRIOR ART ARGUMENTS PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED BY THE EXAMINER 24

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

VII. ALL CITED REFERENCES IN THE PETITION—INCLUDING THE PRIMARY AND ALL SECONDARY REFERENCES—ARE ADMITTEDLY LACKING A REQUIRED CLAIM ELEMENT (ALL GROUNDS) 32

A. The Petitioner failed to show that Canfield discloses the claimed "numeric character representing a count of the plurality of different messaging correspondents." 33

B. The Petitioner failed to show that Ording/Canfield/Schwartz discloses the claimed "numeric character representing a count of the plurality of different messaging correspondents." 43

VIII. THE PETITION FAILS TO SHOW A POSITA WOULD HAVE BEEN MOTIVATED TO MODIFY ORDING IN VIEW OF CANFIELD AND SCHWARTZ TO ARRIVE AT THE CLAIMED INVENTION. (ALL GROUNDS) 44

A. The Petition's proposed modifications ignore Canfield's teachings and what they achieve 45

B. The Petition fails to acknowledge additional problems posed by its modification of Canfield to prohibit all sessions except one-on-one sessions.....50

C. The Petition fails to show that the proposed modification based on Canfield alone would have been obvious.....53

D. The Petition's alternative theory that proposed modifications to Ording/Canfield/Schwartz would have been "obvious to try" is unsupported by any sufficient evidence. 54

IX. CONCLUSION 56

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

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	RESERVED
EX2008	RESERVED
EX2009	BlackBerry Limited's Final Election of Asserted Claims, *BlackBerry Limited v. Snap, Inc.*, Case Nos. 2:18-cv- 01844-GW & 2:18-cv-02693-GW (C.D. Cal. May 31, 2019)
EX2010	Defendant's Final Election of Asserted Prior Art, *BlackBerry Limited v Snap, Inc.*, Case Nos. 2:18-cv-01844-GW & 2:18-cv-02693-GW (C.D. Cal. June 14, 2019)

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

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)

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.