

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

APPLE INC.  
Petitioner,

v.

OPTIS WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2020-00466  
Patent No. 8,411,557

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

*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**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. <i>FINTIV</i> FACTORS FAVOR DISCRETIONARY DENIAL OF INSTITUTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 314(a) .....	2
A. <i>Fintiv</i> Factor #1: no evidence that the district court would grant a stay if a proceeding is instituted given that the institution date would be one month after the trial start date.....	2
B. <i>Fintiv</i> Factor #2: the court's trial date is one month before the Board's projected institution date and 13 months before Board's projected statutory deadline for a final written decision.....	4
C. <i>Fintiv</i> Factor #3: There has been immense "investment in the parallel proceeding by the court and parties." .....	5
D. <i>Fintiv</i> Factor #4: There is complete "overlap between issues raised in the petition and in the parallel proceeding." .....	6
E. <i>Fintiv</i> Factor #5: "The petitioner and the defendant in the parallel proceeding are the same party." .....	9
F. <i>Fintiv</i> Factor #6: "Other circumstances that impact the Board's exercise of discretion, including the merits" favor non-institution. ....	9
III. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY THE INSTITUTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) BECAUSE THE OFFICE HAS CONSIDERED TAN IN DEPTH UNDER PETITIONER'S THEORY .....	11
IV. SUMMARY OF THE '557 PATENT.....	13
V. THE PRIOR ART REFERENCES DIFFER FROM THE '577 INVENTIONS .....	16
A. Harris .....	16
B. Sutivong.....	18

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
C. Tan.....	20
VI. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL .....	22
VII. NEITEHR GROUND RENDERS '557 PATENT OBVIOUS.....	22
A. Ground 1: Claims 1-10 Are Not Rendered Obvious by Harris in View of Tan.....	24
1. Petitioner fails to explain why Harris in view of Tan discloses a recited "selecting unit." .....	24
2. Petitioner has not shown why Harris in view of Tan discloses element 1.3 .....	31
3. Petitioner has not shown why Harris in view of Tan discloses element 1.4 .....	32
4. The Petition Fails to Establish That Harris in View of Tan Renders Obvious Claims 2 through 9.....	33
5. The Petition Fails to Establish That Harris in View of Tan Renders Obvious Claim 10.....	34
6. Petitioner Fails to Provide Sufficient Motivation to Combine Harris and Tan.....	34
B. Ground 2: Claims 1-10 Are Not Rendered Obvious By Sutivong in View of Tan .....	42
1. Sutivong and Tan does not disclose element 1.2 .....	42
2. Petitioner has not shown why Sutivong discloses element 1.4 .....	42
3. The Petition Fails to Establish That Sutivong in View of Tan Renders Obvious Claims 2 through 9 .....	44
4. The Petition Fails to Establish That Sutivong in View of Tan Renders Obvious Claim 10 .....	45

**Page**

5.	Petitioner Fails to Provide Sufficient Motivation to Combine Sutivong and Tan .....	45
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	49

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	48
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB, March 20, 2020) .....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 832 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	26, 35, 36
<i>DSS Technology Management, Inc. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 885 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....	26, 45, 46
<i>E-One, Inc. v. Oshkosh Corp.</i> , IPR2019-00161, Paper 16, 6-9 (PTAB May15, 2019) .....	5
<i>Google LLC v. Uniloc 2017 LLC</i> , IPR2020-00115, Paper 8.....	8
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	48
<i>Intel Corporation v. VLSI Technology LLC</i> , IPR2020-00106, Paper 17, 5-13 (PTAB May 17, 2020).....	5, 8
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	22
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	26, 33, 41, 47
<i>Metalcraft of Mayville, Inc. v. The Toro Co.</i> , 848 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	22
<i>Next Caller Inc. v. TRUSTID Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00961, Paper 10, 9-15 (PTAB Oct. 16, 2019).....	5
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	22, 23

# 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.