

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.
Petitioner,

v.

MAXELL, LTD.,
Patent Owner

Case: IPR2020-00408

U.S. Patent No. 6,430,498

**PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR
INTER PARTES REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,430,498**

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

PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBIT LIST

Description	Exhibit #
5/31/19 Scheduling Order from District Court Action	2001
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
<i>Hayashida</i> Chart from Apple's Invalidity Contentions	2007
<i>Hayashida</i> Chart from Apple's Expert Report from District Court Action	2008
<i>Abowd</i> Chart from Apple's Expert Report from District Court Action	2009
Apple's Final Election of Prior Art	2010
1/8/20 Minute Order	2011
8/28/19 Minute Order	2012
9/18/19 Minute Order	2013
<i>Markman</i> Decision from District Court Action	2014
4/20/20 Scheduling Order from District Court Action	2015
Declaration of Tiffany A. Miller	2016
5/8/20 Notices of Compliance	2017
Decision denying Apple's Motion to Stay	2018
'498 IPR Preliminary Response	2019
'498 IPR Petition (ASUS)	2020
Getting Heading and Course Information	2021
Getting the Heading and Course of a Device	2022
Wayback Machine excerpts	2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE BOARD SHOULD EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION AND DENY INSTITUTION FOR ALL GROUNDS PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C.....	2
A. Application of the General Plastic Factors Weighs in Favor of Denying Institution.....	5
1. General Plastic Factors 6 and 7 Weigh in Favor of Denial	7
a. The District Court Action Will Resolve the Same or Substantially the Same Arguments as Those Presented Here	7
b. The District Court Action Will Be Complete Well Before a Final Written Decision in This Proceeding	11
c. Apple’s Inexcusable Delay in Filing the Petition.....	15
2. General Plastic Factors 4 and 5 Weigh in Favor of Denial	17
3. General Plastic Factor 3 Weighs in Favor of Denial	20
4. General Plastic Factor 2 Weighs in Favor of Denial	20
5. Factor 1 Has Little Probative Value in this Case.....	21
B. Application of the Fintiv Factors Weighs in Favor of Denying Institution.....	21
III. THE PETITION DOES NOT SHOW A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF PREVAILING WITH RESPECT TO ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM	22
A. Background	22
1. Background Of The Relevant Technology	22
2. Level of Skill of a POSITA	23
B. Claim Construction.....	24
1. The Petition Fails To Apply A Proper 35 U.S.C	24
2. Maxell Did Not Disavow Claim Scope in Prior IPR Proceedings	26

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

	Page
C. Ground 1: Petitioner Failed To Establish That Claims 1, 3, 5, and 7-8 Are Obvious Over Hayashida In View Of The Knowledge of POSITA	28
1. Petitioner fails to establish that Hayashida Discloses Element 1(b).....	28
2. Petitioner fails to establish that Hayashida Discloses Element 1(c)(ii).....	34
3. Petitioner fails to establish that Hayashida Discloses Claim 5	39
4. Petitioner fails to establish that Hayashida Discloses Claims 3 and 7-8	39
D. Ground 2: Petitioner Failed To Establish That Claims 3 And 7 Are Obvious Over Hayashida In View Of Ikeda	39
E. Ground 3: Petitioner Failed To Establish That Claims 1, 3-5, 7-11, and 13 Are Obvious Over Hayashida In View Of Abowd	39
1. Petitioner fails to show that Abowd is prior art.....	40
a. The University of Pittsburgh Exhibits Are Insufficient.....	41
(1) Appendix AB01 Does Not Show Public Accessibility	41
(2) Appendix AB02 Does Not Prove Public Accessibility	43
b. The Carnegie Mellon University Exhibits Are Insufficient.....	45
(1) Appendix AB03 Fails to Prove Public Accessibility	45
(2) Appendix AB04 Fails to Prove Public Accessibility	45
2. Petitioner fails to show that it would be obvious to combine Hayashida and Abowd	51
IV. CONCLUSION.....	53

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Apple Inc. v. Maxell Ltd.</i> , IPR2020-00204, Paper 1	18, 19
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	5
<i>E-One, Inc. v. Oshkosh Corp.</i> , IPR2019-00161, Paper 16 (PTAB May 16, 2019)	14, 17
<i>Gen. Plastic</i> , IPR2016-01357, Paper 19	5, 21
<i>Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech.</i> , 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	5
<i>Hormel Foods Corp. v. HIP, Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00469, Paper 9 (PTAB July 15, 2019)	14, 17
<i>KAIST IP LLC v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.</i> , No. No. 2:16-cv-01314-JRG (E.D. Tex. Feb. 13, 2020)	17
<i>Maxell, Ltd. v. Apple Inc.</i> , No. 5:19-cv-00036-RWS (E.D. Tex.).....	1, 2
<i>Mylan Pharms., Inc. v. Bayer Intell. Prop. GmbH</i> , IPR2018-01143, Paper 13 (PTAB Dec. 3, 2018)	14, 17
<i>NHK Spring Co., Ltd. v. Intri-Plex Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00752, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2018).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Sand Revolution II, LLC v. Continental Intermodal Group – Trucking LLC</i> , IPR2019-01393, Paper 12 (PTAB Feb. 5, 2020).....	6, 14, 17

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.