

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.
Petitioner,

v.

MAXELL, LTD.,
Patent Owner

Case: IPR2020-00597

U.S. Patent No. 8,339,493

**PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR
INTER PARTES REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,339,493**

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

Case IPR2020-00597
Patent No. 8,339,493
Patent Owner Preliminary Response

PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBIT LIST

Description	Exhibit #
5/31/19 Scheduling Order from District Court Action	2001
Apple's Invalidation Contentions from District Court Action	2002
Apple's Supplemental Invalidation Contentions from District Court Action	2003
Apple's Motion for Leave to Supplement	2004
Maxell's Opposition to Motion for Leave to Supplement	2005
Court Order on Motion for Leave to Supplement	2006
Apple's Final Election of Prior Art	2007
Excerpts from Bovik Report	2008
Sony Chart from Apple's Invalidation Contentions	2009
Casio Chart from Apple's Invalidation Contentions	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
Notices of Compliance	2017
COVID Standing Order	2018
Docket from District Court Action	2019
Decision denying Apple's Motion to Stay	2020
'236 IPR Preliminary Response	2021
'236 IPR Institution Decision	2022
'904 IPR Preliminary Response	2023
10/9/18 Letter from Maxell to Apple	2024
U.S. Patent No. 5,828,406 to Parulski	2025
Mansoorian Declaration from '236 IPR	2026
5/17/18 Letter from Maxell to Apple	2027

Casio Subpoena	2028
Casio Objections and Response to Subpoena	2029
Casio Fiscal Year Schedule	2030

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.....	4
1. General Plastic Factors 6 and 7 Weigh in Favor of Denial	6
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	13
c. Apple’s Inexcusable Delay in Filing the Petition.....	18
2. General Plastic Factors 4 and 5 Weigh in Favor of Denial	20
3. General Plastic Factor 3 Weighs in Favor of Denial	22
4. General Plastic Factors 1 and 2 Have Little Probative Value in this Case	26
B. Application of the Fintiv Factors Weighs in Favor of Denying Institution.....	27
III. THE PETITION DOES NOT SHOW A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF PREVAILING WITH RESPECT TO ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM	28
A. Background	28
1. Background Of The Relevant Technology	28
2. Level of Skill of a POSITA	36
B. Claim Construction.....	36

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
C. Petitioner Failed to Establish that Casio Is Prior Art.....	38
1. The Etchells Declaration is Insufficient to Show Public Accessibility of the Casio User Guide.....	39
2. The Etchells Declaration Lacks Corroboration and Credibility	44
3. The Casio Press Release Does Not Demonstrate Public Accessibility of the User Guide Prior to the Critical Date	45
4. Apple Fails to Show Relevant Sales Prior to the Critical Date	48
D. Ground 1: Petitioner Failed To Establish That Claims 1, 3, 5, and 10 Are Obvious Over Casio In View Of Juen.....	49
1. A POSITA Would Not Have Combined Casio and Juen Without the Benefit of Hindsight.....	49
2. Petitioner fails to establish that Casio in view of Juen Discloses Elements 1(a)/5(a)/10(a).....	53
3. Petitioner fails to establish that Casio in view of Juen Discloses Elements 1(b)/5(b)/10(b)	56
4. Petitioner fails to establish that Casio in view of Juen Discloses Elements 1(d)/5(e)/10(f).....	59
5. Petitioner fails to establish that Casio in view of Juen Discloses the “pixel intervals of K1 pixels” / “intervals of a first distance” of Elements 1(d)/5(e)/10(f) and the “pixel intervals of K2 pixels” / “intervals of a second distance” of Elements 1(e)/5(f)/10(g)	61
6. Petitioner fails to establish that Casio in view of Juen Discloses Claim 3.....	63
E. Ground 2: Petitioner Failed To Establish That Claim 4 Is Obvious Over Casio In View Of Juen And Takase	63

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.