

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOPRO, INC., GARMIN INTERNATIONAL, INC., AND GARMIN USA,
INC.
Petitioners,

vs.

CELLSPIN SOFT, INC.,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2019-01107
Patent No. 9,258,698

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

The undersigned, acting on behalf of the patent owner, Cellspin Soft, Inc. (“Cellspin”), and, pursuant to 37 U.S.C. § 42.107(a) and 35 U.S.C. § 313, respectfully requests the petition of GoPro, Inc., Garmin International, Inc. and Garmin USA, Inc. (collectively “Petitioner”) for *Inter Partes* Review (“IPR”) be denied, including because Petitioner fails to establish a reasonable likelihood of prevailing on any claim.

Dated: August 22, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ John J. Edmonds

John J. Edmonds, Reg. No. 56,184
EDMONDS & SCHLATHER, PLLC
355 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2450
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Telephone: 213-973-7846
Facsimile: 213-835-6996
Email: pto-edmonds@ip-lit.com

Stephen F. Schlather, Reg. No. 45,081
EDMONDS & SCHLATHER, PLLC
2501 Saltus Street
Houston, TX 77003
P: 713-234-0044
F: 713-224-6651
E: sschlather@ip-lit.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXHIBIT LIST5

I. INTRODUCTION7

II. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS10

III. SUPPORTING EVIDENCE10

IV. LEGAL PRINCIPLES11

IV. THE '698 PATENT11

V. THE LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART15

VI. ANALYSIS16

 A. Claim Construction16

 B. Claim Construction Summary30

 C. Prior Art Relied Upon by Petitioner31

 1. Hiroishi31

 2. Takahashi34

 3. Nozaki35

 4. Hollstrom37

 5. Ando39

 D. Non-Obviousness of Claims 1–20 over Hiroishi and Takahashi (Ground 1)39

 1. Limitations 1(c)-(e) and (h)-(j) of Independent Claims 1,5,8 and 1340

 2. Lack of Motivation to Combine58

 E. Claim 5 and Claim 8 – No Single Application Performing Steps59

 F. Non-Obviousness of Claims 21 and 22 over Hiroishi, Takahashi, and Ando (Ground 2)60

 G. Non-Obviousness of Claims 1–22 over Hiroishi, Takahashi, and Nozaki (Ground 3)63

 H. Non-Obviousness of Claims 21 and 22 over Hiroishi, Takahashi, Nozaki, and Ando (Ground 4)64

 I. Non-Obviousness of Claims 1,3–5,7,8,10–13, and 15–20 over Hollstrom and Takahashi (Ground 5)64

 J. Non-Obviousness of Claims 2,6,9,14,21 and 22 over Hollstrom, Takahashi, and Ando (Ground 6)66

VII. PETITIONER’S PURPORTED EXPERT DECLARATION IS CLEARLY INSUFFICIENT AND IT SHOULD BE EXCLUDED OR GIVEN NO WEIGHT.67

IX. THIS PROCEEDING AND ANY INVALIDITY RULINGS BASED
THEREON ARE UNCONSTITUTIONAL, INCLUDING UNDER THE
FIFTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS69

IX. CONCLUSION.....70

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

| | |
|---|----|
| <i>Allscripts Healthcare Solutions, Inc. et al. v. Uniloc Luxembourg S.A.</i> , IPR2015-01615, Paper 13 at p. 9 (Feb. 17, 2016) | 36 |
| <i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398, 418 (2007)..... | 36 |
| <i>Perreira v. Dep't of Health and Human Serv.</i> , 33 F.3d 1375, 1377 n.6 (Fed.Cir. 1994)..... | 37 |
| <i>Tre Milano, LLC v. TF3, Ltd.</i> , IPR2015-00649, Paper 37 (P.T.A.B. May 2, 2016) | 37 |
| <i>American Key v. Cole National</i> , 762 F.2d 1569,1580 (11thCir.1985)..... | 57 |
| <i>Member Services v. Sec. Mut. Life Ins.</i> , 2010 WL 3907489,*27 (N.D.N.Y.,Sep. 30,2010) | 57 |
| <i>Deutz v. City Light & Power</i> , 2009 WL 2986415, at *6 (N.D.Ga.2009)..... | 57 |
| <i>Bouygues Telecom v. Tekelec</i> , 472 F.Supp.2d 722, 729 (E.D.N.C.2007)..... | 57 |
| <i>Yorkey v. Diab</i> , 601 F.3d 1279,1284 (Fed.Cir.2010) | 58 |
| <i>McClurg v. Kingsland</i> , 42 U.S. 202, 206 (1843)..... | 58 |
| <i>Eldred v. Ashcroft</i> , 537 U.S. 186, 203,206 (2003) | 59 |
| <i>Concrete Pipe & Prods. of Cal. v. Construction Laborers Pens. Trust</i> , 508 U.S. 602, 617-18 (1993) | 59 |
| <i>In re Murchison</i> , 349 U.S. 133, 136 (1955)..... | 59 |
| <i>Brown v. Duchesne</i> , 60 U.S. 183, 197 (1857) | 59 |
| <i>Horne v. Dept' of Ag.</i> , 135 S. Ct. 2419, 2427 (2015) | 59 |
| <i>Celgene Corp. v. Peter</i> , No. 18-1167 (Fed. Cir. July 30,2019)..... | 59 |

Statutes

| | |
|---------------------------|----|
| 35 U.S.C. § 313 | 2 |
| 35 U.S.C. § 42.107..... | 2 |
| Fed. R. Evid. 702 | 57 |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a)..... | 58 |

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.