### UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC., Petitioner,

V.

PARUS HOLDINGS, INC., Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2020-00686 U.S. Patent No. 7,076,431

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a)



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Summary of Argument						
II.	The Board Should Deny Institution Under Section 314(a) and PTAB's Precedent-Designated <i>NHK</i> and <i>Fintiv</i> Decisions Because The Parties Are Scheduled To Try The Validity Of The Challenged Patent In A District Court Jury Trial Two Months Before This IPR Would Conclude						
	A.	The Parallel District Court Proceeding Between The Parties Is Scheduled For Trial Two Months Before The Final Written Decision Deadline					
	B.	All Six <i>Fintiv</i> Factors Weigh In Favor Of The Board Denying Institution					
		1.	"whether the court granted a stay or evidence exists that one may be granted if a proceeding is instituted"	8			
		2.	"proximity of the court's trial date to the Board's projected statutory deadline for a final written decision"	10			
		3.	"investment in the parallel proceeding by the court and the parties"	10			
		4.	"overlap between issues raised in the petition and in the parallel proceeding"	12			
		5.	"whether the petitioner and the defendant in the parallel proceeding are the same party"	12			
		6.	"other circumstances that impact the Board's exercise of discretion, including the merits"				
	C.	Petitioner Apple's Arguments Against Denial Are Irrelevant And Unsupported		15			
III.	The '431 Patent						
	A.	Prior Art Interactive Voice Systems Suffered From Numerous Drawbacks					



		1.	Were Not Sufficiently Portable, Comprehensive, And Affordable	22		
		2.	Voice Enabled Options Introduced Additional Problems and Drawbacks	23		
		3.	Prior Art "Interactive Voice Response" Systems Suffered From A Lack Of Fault Tolerance, Limited Webpage Resources, And Generic Search Options And Results	24		
	B.	The '431 Patent's Solution				
		1.	Overview Of The '431 Patent's Voice Browser System	27		
		2.	Sequentially Accessing A Plurality of Pre-selected Web Sites	30		
	C.	The	Challenged '431 Patent Claims	33		
IV.	Appl	Apple's Petition & Grounds				
	A.	Ladd				
	B.	Kurosawa				
	C.	Goedken				
V.	The Petition Should Be Denied Because It Does Not Establish The Required Reasonable Likelihood Success					
	A.	The Petition Does Not Identify The "at least one instruction set for identifying said information to be retrieved" Limitation Required In Every Challenged Claim				
	В.	The Petition Does Not Identify The "sequentially access" the pre-selected web sites Limitation Required In Every Challenged Claim		51		
		1.	Goedken does not teach sequentially accessing preselected web sites until the requested information is found or all pre-selected web sites have been accessed	51		



		2.	2. <i>Kurosawa</i> does not teach sequentially accessing preselected web sites until the requested information is found or all pre-selected web sites have been accessed52		
		The Petition Does Not Establish It Was Obvious To Combine Ladd, Kurosawa, and Goedken As Required In All Asserted Grounds			
		1.	A POSITA Would Not Combine Ladd With Kurosawa	54	
		2.	A POSITA Would Not Combine <i>Ladd</i> With <i>Kurosawa</i> And <i>Goedken</i>	.59	
VI	Concl	usion		61	



## **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

Page(s) **Cases** Apple Inc., v. Fintiv, Inc., IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB May 13, 2020) ......passim Apple Inc., v. Fintiv, Inc., Koninklijke Phillips N.V. v. Google LLC, No. 2019-1177, 2020 U.S. App. LEXIS 2911 (Fed. Cir. Jan. 30, Multimedia Content Management v. Dish Network, NHK Spring Co., Ltd. V. Intri-Plex Techs., Inc., IPR2018-00752, Paper 8, 20 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2018)......passim Samsung Elecs. Am., Inc. v. Prisua Eng'g Corp., No. 2019-1169, 2020 U.S. App. 3292 (Fed Cir. Feb. 2, 2020) .....................50 SAS Inst., Inc. v. Iancu, WesternGeco LLC v. ION Geophysical Corp., 889 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2018) ......21 Statutes Other Authorities S. Rep. No. 110-259 (2008)......21



# DOCKET

# 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.

