### UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

### BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC. Petitioner,

v.

MAXELL, LTD., Patent Owner

Case: IPR2020-00407

U.S. Patent No. 6,748,317

### PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,748,317

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

DOCKET

# PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBIT LIST

Description	Exhibit #	
5/31/19 Scheduling Order from District Court Action		
3/10/15 Letter from Apple to Maxell	2002	
5/15/15 Letter from Apple to Maxell	2003	
5/17/18 Letter from Maxell to Apple	2004	
Maxell's Infringement Contentions from District Court Action	2005	
Apple's Invalidity Contentions from District Court Action	2006	
Hayashida Chart from Apple's Invalidity Contentions	2007	
Hayashida Chart from Apple's Expert Report from District Court Action	2008	
Abowd Chart from Apple's Expert Report from District Court Action	2009	
Apple's Final Election of Prior Art		
1/8/20 Minute Order		
8/28/19 Minute Order		
9/18/19 Minute Order		
Markman Decision from District Court Action		
4/20/20 Scheduling Order from District Court Action		
Declaration of Tiffany A. Miller		
5/8/20 Notices of Compliance		
Decision denying Apple's Motion to Stay	2018	
10/9/18 Letter from Maxell to Apple	2019	
'317 IPR Preliminary Response	2020	
'317 IPR Institution Decision	2021	
'498 IPR Preliminary Response		
'498 IPR Petition (ASUS)	2023	
Getting Heading and Course Information	2024	
Getting the Heading and Course of a Device	2025	
Wayback Machine excerpts	2026	

**DOCKET A L A R M** Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

i

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	INT	TRODUCTION1				
II.	II. THE BOARD SHOULD EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION AND DENY INSTITUTION FOR ALL GROUNDS PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C					
	A.	Application of the General Plastic Factors Weighs in Favor of Denying Institution				
		1.	General Plastic Factors 6 and 7 Weigh in Favor of Denial7			
			a. The District Court Action Will Resolve the Same or Substantially the Same Arguments as Those Presented Here			
			b. The District Court Action Will Be Complete Well Before a Final Written Decision in This Proceeding			
			c. Apple's Inexcusable Delay in Filing the Petition15			
		2.	General Plastic Factors 4 and 5 Weigh in Favor of Denial19			
		3.	General Plastic Factor 3 Weighs in Favor of Denial21			
		4.	General Plastic Factor 2 Weighs in Favor of Denial22			
		5.	General Plastic Factor 1 Has Little Probative Value in this Case			
	В.		lication of the Fintiv Factors Weighs in Favor of Denying tution			
III.	LIK	ELIHO	TION DOES NOT SHOW A REASONABLE DOD OF PREVAILING WITH RESPECT TO ANY			
			NGED CLAIM			
	A.	Bacl	kground24			
		Background Of The Relevant Technology24				
	<ol> <li>Level of Skill of a POSITA</li> <li>B. Claim Construction</li> </ol>					
		1.	The Petition Fails To Apply A Proper 35 U.S.C			

DOCKET

ii

DOCKET

# TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

### Page

	2.	The	Petition	n Fails To Apply A Proper 35 U.S.C	29	
	3.			Not Disavow Claim Scope in Prior IPR	32	
C.	Ground 1: Petitioner Failed To Establish That Claims 1-3, 5, 15, and 17 Are Obvious Over Hayashida In View Of The Knowledge of POSITA					
	1.			ails to establish that Hayashida Discloses	33	
	2.	Petitioner fails to establish that Hayashida Discloses Element 1(e)(i)				
	3.	Petitioner fails to establish that Hayashida Discloses Element 1(e)(ii)				
	4.	Petitioner fails to establish that Hayashida Discloses Element 1(e)(iii)4				
	5.	Petitioner fails to establish that Hayashida Discloses Claims 2-3, 5, 15, and 17				
D.	Ground 2: Petitioner Failed To Establish That Claims 1-3, 5, 10-15, 17, and 18 Are Obvious Over Hayashida In View Of Abowd					
	1.	Petit	ioner fa	ails to show that Abowd is prior art	46	
		a.		University of Pittsburgh Exhibits Are ficient	47	
			(1)	Appendix AB01 Does Not Show Public Accessibility	47	
			(2)	Appendix AB02 Does Not Prove Public Accessibility	49	
		b.		Carnegie Mellon University Exhibits Are ficient	51	

# TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

### Page

	(1)	Appendix AB03 Fails to Prove Public Accessibility	51	
	(2)	Appendix AB04 Fails to Prove Public Accessibility	51	
	2. Petitioner fails to show that it would be obvious to combine Hayashida and Abowd			
IV.	CONCLUSION		59	

# DOCKET A L A R M



# 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.