

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

v.

UNILOC 2017 LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2020-00023
Patent 6,467,088

**PETITIONER'S REPLY TO
PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page(s)
EXHIBIT LIST	iv
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. PATENT OWNER OFFERS NO EXPERT, RELIES ON ATTORNEY ARGUMENT	1
III. PATENT OWNER OFFERS NO COMPETING POSITA PROPOSAL	2
IV. PATENT OWNER OFFERS NO COMPETING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	2
V. PATENT OWNER’S ASSERTIONS REGARDING APFEL’S TEACHINGS MISCONSTRUE BOTH THE REFERENCE AND THE PETITION, AND THE PETITION’S OBVIOUSNESS SHOWING....	3
A. Apfel Clearly Teaches Evaluating “Determined Component” Needed For Upgrade And “At Least One Additional Component Currently Implemented In The Electronic Device”	3
B. Apfel Clearly Teaches Determining That Certain Upgrades Are Known To Be Compatible With Certain Configurations In Determining Configurations That “ <i>Should</i> Result In Their Download” By A User.....	4
C. Apfel’s Related Disclosures Of “Require[d] Upgrade Packages” That The User “Should Install”	9
D. Apfel Is Not Cumulative To The Apple IPR’s Primary Cited Reference	10

VI.	PATENT OWNER’S ASSERTIONS REGARDING APFEL’S COMBINATION WITH TODD AND LILlich MISCONSTRUE THE REFERENCES, THE PETITION, AND THE ’088 PATENT’S OWN DESCRIPTION, ARE CONFUSING, AND DO NOT REBUT THE CLAIMS’ OBVIOUSNESS OVER APFEL, LILlich, AND TODD.....	15
A.	Patent Owner Misconstrues Lillich’s Teachings And Their Combination With Apfel.....	15
B.	Patent Owner Likewise Misconstrues Todd’s Teachings And Their Combination With Apfel.....	19
C.	Patent Owner’s Assertion That Apfel Is Limited To “One Specific Computer Application” Is Incorrect.....	23
D.	Patent Owner’s Assertion That Lillich And Todd Were Only Presented As Alternatives Is Simply Wrong	26
E.	Patent Owner’s Critique Of The Lillich/Todd Combination Is Incorrect, As The Board Has Already Found.....	27
F.	Patent Owner’s Critique Of The Apfel/Lillich/Todd/Pedrizetti Combination Waived Any Additional Substantive Challenges.....	27
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	28
	CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH TYPE-VOLUME LIMITATION PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.24	29
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

Elbit Sys. of Am., LLC v. Thales Visionix, Inc.,
881 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2018)2

Icon Health & Fitness, Inc. v. Strava, Inc.,
849 F.3d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 2017)2

In re Bond,
910 F.2d 831 (Fed. Cir. 1990)22

Inwood Labs., Inc. v. Ives Labs., Inc.,
456 U.S. 844 (1982)2

Trs. of Columbia Univ. v. Illumina, Inc.,
620 Fed. Appx. 916 (Fed. Cir. 2015)2

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 10328

EXHIBIT LIST

LIST OF NEWLY FILED EXHIBITS

Concurrently filed with Petitioner's Reply to Patent Owner's Response to Petition:

No.	Description
1016	Supplemental Declaration of John Villasenor, signed and dated September 27, 2020 (" Villasenor Supp. ")

LIST OF PREVIOUSLY FILED EXHIBITS

No.	Description
1001	U.S. Patent No. 6,467,088, "Reconfiguration manager for controlling upgrades of electronic devices," issued October 15, 2002 (the " '088 patent or '088 ")
1002	File History for U.S. Patent No. 6,467,088, Application No. 09/343,607 (the " '088 FH ")
1003	Declaration of John Villasenor (" Villasenor "), including Appendix A thereto
1004	U.S. Patent No. 5,974,454, "Method and system for installing and updating program module components," issued October 26, 1999 from an application filed November 14, 1997 (" Apfel ")
1005	U.S. Patent No. 5,613,101, "Method and apparatus for determining at execution compatibility among client and provider components where provider version linked with client may differ from provider version available at execution," issued March 18, 1997 from an application filed June 7, 1995 (" Lillich ")
1006	U.S. Patent No. 5,867,714, "System and method for distributing configuration-dependent software revisions to a computer system,"

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.