

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.
Petitioner,

v.

MAXELL, LTD.,
Patent Owner

Case: IPR2020-00200

U.S. Patent No. 10,084,991

**PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR
INTER PARTES REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 10,084,991**

Mail Stop **Patent Board**
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE BOARD SHOULD EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION AND DENY INSTITUTION FOR ALL GROUNDS PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C.....	2
A.	Factor 1: The District Court Action is Unlikely To Be Stayed.....	6
B.	Factor 2: Trial In The District Court Action Will Occur Nine Months Before The Board’s Final Written Decision	8
C.	Factor 3: Significant Investment of Time and Resources By The Court and the Parties Has Already Occurred	11
1.	The District Court Has Spent Significant Time and Resources on the District Court Action	11
2.	The Parties Have Spent Significant Time and Resources on the District Court Action.....	12
D.	Factor 4: There is Significant Overlap Between Issues Raised In The Petition And In The District Court Action.....	13
E.	Factor 5: Apple is Both Petitioner And Defendant	17
F.	Factor 6: Other Circumstances, Such As Apple’s Purposeful Delay In Filing The Petition, Weigh In Favor of Denial	17
III.	THE PETITION DOES NOT SHOW A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF PREVAILING WITH RESPECT TO ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM	20
A.	Background	21
1.	Overview of the ’991 Patent Invention.....	21
2.	Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	21
B.	Claim Construction.....	22
C.	All Grounds Are Unlikely To Succeed Because Petitioner Fails To Articulate A Rationale For Combining Asmussen and Bear.....	24

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
1. Petitioner Fails to Identify What Is Missing From the Primary Reference.....	26
2. Petitioner Fails to Explain What It Is Combining From Each Reference	27
3. Petitioner Fails to Explain How It Is Combining Each Reference	28
D. Ground 1: Petitioner Fails To Establish That Claims 1 and 8 Are Obvious Over Asmussen In View of Bear.....	31
1. Petitioner Fails to establish that Asmussen in combination with Bear discloses element 1(a)	31
2. Petitioner Fails to establish that Asmussen in combination with Bear discloses element 1(e)	34
3. Petitioner Fails to establish that Asmussen in combination with Bear discloses element 8(b).....	41
E. Ground 2: Petitioner Fails To Establish That Claims 1-5 and 8-12 Are Obvious Over Asmussen In View Of Bear In Further View Of Marley.....	42
1. Marley Was Already Considered During Prosecution	42
2. Petitioner Fails to establish that Asmussen In Combination With Bear In Further View Of Marley Discloses Claims 1(preamble)-(b) And 1(d)-(g) And Claim 8	46
3. Petitioner Fails To Establish That Asmussen In Combination With Bear In Further View Of Marley Discloses Claim 2.....	46
4. Petitioner Fails To Establish That Asmussen In Combination With Bear In Further View Of Marley Discloses Claim 3.....	47

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
5. Petitioner Fails To Establish That Asmussen In Combination With Bear In Further View Of Marley Discloses Claim 4.....	48
6. Petitioner Fails To Establish That Asmussen In Combination With Bear In Further View Of Marley Discloses Claim 5.....	48
7. Petitioner Has Failed To Establish That Asmussen In Combination With Bear In Further View Of Marley Discloses Claim 9.....	51
8. Petitioner Fails To Establish That Asmussen In Combination With Bear In Further View Of Marley Discloses Claim 10.....	51
9. Petitioner Fails To Establish That Asmussen In Combination With Bear In Further View Of Marley Discloses Claim 11.....	52
10. Petitioner Fails To Establish That Asmussen In Combination With Bear In Further View Of Marley Discloses Claim 12.....	52
11. Petitioner Fails To Articulate Any Rational Underpinning For Petitioner’s Obviousness Combination Of Asmussen, Bear, And Marley.....	53
F. Ground 3: Petitioner Fails To Establish That Claims 5 and 12 Are Obvious Over Asmussen In View Of Bear And In Further View Of Marley and DeFazio	59
1. Petitioner Fails To Articulate Any Rational Underpinning for Petitioner’s Obviousness Combination of Asmussen, Bear, Marley, and DeFazio	60
G. Ground 4: Petitioner Fails To Establish That Claims 1 And 8 Are Obvious Over Asmussen In View Of Bear And In Further View of Lindstrom	65

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
H. Ground 5: Petitioner Fails To Establish That Claims 1-5 And 8-12 Are Obvious Over Asmussen In View Of Bear And Lindstrom In Further View Of Marley.....	69
I. Ground 6: Petitioner Fails To Establish That Claims 5 and 12 Are Obvious Over Asmussen In View Of Bear, Lindstrom, and Marley And In Further View Of DeFazio.....	70
IV. CONCLUSION.....	71

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.