

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APPLE INC.  
Petitioner,

v.

MAXELL, LTD.,  
Patent Owner

---

**Case: IPR2020-00409**

**U.S. Patent No. 6,580,999**

---

**PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR  
*INTER PARTES REVIEW* OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,580,999**

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 #
Decision denying Apple's Motion to Stay	2001
4/20/20 Scheduling Order from District Court Action	2002
5/31/19 Scheduling Order from District Court Action	2003
Docket from District Court Action	2004
<i>Markman</i> Decision from District Court Action	2005
1/8/20 Minute Order	2006
8/28/19 Minute Order	2007
9/18/19 Minute Order	2008
Declaration of Tiffany A. Miller	2009
5/8/20 Notices of Compliance	2010
<i>Hayashida</i> Chart from Apple's Expert Report from District Court Action	2011
<i>Abowd</i> Chart from Apple's Expert Report from District Court Action	2012
Maxell's Infringement Contentions from District Court Action	2013
Maxell's Final Election of Claims	2014
Apple's Final Election of Prior Art	2015
Apple's Invalidity Contentions from District Court Action	2016
<i>Hayashida</i> Chart from Apple's Invalidity Contentions	2017
3/10/15 Letter from Apple to Maxell	2018
5/15/15 Letter from Apple to Maxell	2019
'498 IPR Petition (ASUS)	2020
'498 IPR Preliminary Response	2021
Wayback Machine excerpts	2022
Getting Heading and Course Information	2023
Getting the Heading and Course of a Device	2024
5/17/18 Letter from Maxell to Apple	2025

## 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. Factor 1: The District Court Denied Apple’s Motion to Stay.....	6
B. Factor 2: Trial In The District Court Action Will Occur Ten Months Before The Board’s Final Written Decision .....	7
C. Factor 3: Significant Investment of Time And Resources By The Court And the Parties Has Already Occurred.....	9
1. The District Court Has Spent Significant Time And Resources On The District Court Action .....	10
2. The Parties Have Spent Significant Time And Resources On The District Court Action .....	10
D. Factor 4: There Is Significant Overlap Between Issues Raised In The Petition And In The District Court Action .....	11
E. Factor 5: Apple Is Both Petitioner And Defendant.....	15
F. Factor 6: Other Circumstances, Such As Apple’s Purposeful Delay In Filing The Petition, Weigh In Favor of Denial .....	15
III. THE PETITION DOES NOT SHOW A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF PREVAILING WITH RESPECT TO ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM .....	19
A. Background .....	19
1. Background Of The Relevant Technology .....	19
2. Level of Skill of a POSITA .....	20
B. Claim Construction.....	20
1. The Petition Fails To Apply A Proper 35 U.S.C .....	21
2. Maxell Did Not Disavow Claim Scope in Prior IPR Proceedings .....	23
C. Ground 1: Petitioner Failed To Establish That Claims 1-6 Are Obvious Over Hayashida In View Of Abowd .....	24

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
(continued)

	<b>Page</b>
1. Petitioner fails to show that Abowd is prior art.....	25
a. The University of Pittsburgh Exhibits Are Insufficient.....	26
(1) Appendix AB01 Does Not Show Public Accessibility .....	26
(2) Appendix AB02 Does Not Prove Public Accessibility .....	28
b. The Carnegie Mellon University Exhibits Are Insufficient.....	30
(1) Appendix AB03 Fails to Prove Public Accessibility .....	30
(2) Appendix AB04 Fails to Prove Public Accessibility .....	30
2. Petitioner fails to show that it would be obvious to combine Hayashida and Abowd .....	36
3. Petitioner fails to establish that Hayashida in view of Abowd Discloses Element 1(b) .....	38
4. Petitioner fails to establish that Hayashida in view of Abowd Discloses Element 1(d)(ii) .....	44
5. Petitioner fails to establish that Hayashida in view of Abowd Discloses Claims 2-4.....	49
6. Petitioner fails to establish that Hayashida in view of Abowd Discloses Claims 5 and 6 .....	49
IV. CONCLUSION.....	49

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Acceleration Bay, LLC v. Activision Blizzard Inc.</i> , 908 F.3d 765 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....	29
<i>In re Antor Media Corp.</i> , 689 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	46
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 .....	5
<i>Apple Inc., v. Immersion Corporation</i> , IPR2016-01372, Paper 7 (January 11, 2017) .....	21
<i>Apple v. Maxell</i> , IPR2020-00204, Paper 1 .....	11, 17
<i>Beckman Instruments, Inc. v. LKB Produkter AB</i> , 892 F.2d 1547 (Fed. Cir. 1989) .....	46
<i>Bruckelmyer v. Ground Heaters, Inc.</i> , 445 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	27
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	4
<i>E-One, Inc. v. Oshkosh Corp.</i> , IPR2019-00161, Paper 16 (PTAB May 16, 2019) .....	8, 9
<i>Edwards Lifesciences Corp. v. Evalve</i> , IPR2019-01546, Paper 7, 12-13 (PTAB Feb. 26, 2020) .....	15
<i>Facebook, Inc. v. Sound View Innovations, LLC</i> , IPR2017-01004, Paper No. 13 (Aug. 29, 2017) .....	21
<i>Facebook, Inc. v. Sound View Innovations, LLC</i> , IPR2017-01006, Paper No. 14 (Aug. 29, 2017) .....	21

# 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.