

Filed on behalf of Petitioners by:

Paper No. \_\_

Elisabeth H. Hunt, Reg. No. 67,336  
Richard F. Giunta, Reg. No. 36,149  
Gregory S. Nieberg, Reg. No. 57,063  
Anant K. Saraswat, Reg. No. 76,050  
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.  
600 Atlantic Avenue  
Boston, MA 02210  
(617) 646-8000 Phone  
(617) 646-8646 Fax

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

GOOGLE LLC, SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,  
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,  
LG ELECTRONICS INC., and  
LG ELECTRONICS U.S.A., INC.,  
Petitioners,

v.

PARUS HOLDINGS INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case No. IPR2020-00846  
Patent No. 7,076,431

---

**PETITIONERS' REPLY TO PATENT OWNER RESPONSE<sup>1</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup> Emphases in this paper are added unless otherwise indicated, and internal quotations, citations, and original alterations are omitted.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	GROUND 1-4: KOVATCH IS PRIOR ART .....	1
	A. The POR's Conclusory Allegation of Antedating Kovatch Should Be Rejected.....	2
	B. If Considered, the Declarations' Arguments Fail to Demonstrate Reduction to Practice.....	5
	1. The Inventor's Testimony Lacks Independent Corroboration.....	6
	2. Parus's Evidence Meets Neither Reduction-to-Practice Prong .....	8
	a. Prong 1: No Evidence Demonstrates an Embodiment Meeting All Limitations of Any Challenged Claim .....	9
	i. No Evidence Demonstrates a Constructed Embodiment Having a Computer Meeting All Claimed Limitations .....	9
	ii. No Evidence Demonstrates a Constructed Embodiment Met Limitations [1pre], [1.h]-[1.k] .....	10
	iii. No Evidence Demonstrates an Embodiment Meeting Claim 9's Additional Limitations .....	11
	iv. No Evidence Demonstrates an Embodiment Meeting Claim 14's Additional Limitations .....	12
	b. Prong 2: No Evidence Demonstrates a Working Embodiment .....	13
	3. The Alleged Reduction-to-Practice Dates Are Uncorroborated .....	15
III.	GROUND 1-4: PARUS'S ARGUMENTS REGARDING THE KOVATCH/NEAL COMBINATION ARE MERITLESS .....	16
	A. POR Section IV.B Fails to Address the Petition's Combination .....	16
	1. "First" Argument.....	16
	2. "Second" Argument .....	17
	3. "Third" Argument .....	19
	4. "Final[]" Argument .....	20

B. Parus's Arguments Regarding Motivation to Combine Fail.....	21
1. Parus's "Speeding Up" Arguments Are Nonresponsive and Wrong.....	21
2. Parus's Fault Tolerance Arguments Are Nonresponsive and Wrong.....	23
IV. GROUNDS 3-4: PARUS'S ARGUMENTS REGARDING DESIMONE ARE MERITLESS.....	25
V. GROUND 5: KURGANOV-262 IS PRIOR ART TO CLAIM 9 WHICH LACKS WRITTEN DESCRIPTION .....	25
VI. GROUND 6: IF INTERPRETED NARROWLY, CLAIM 14 LACKS WRITTEN DESCRIPTION AND KURGANOV-262 IS PRIOR ART.....	28

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### CASES

<i>ABB v. Roy-G-Biv,</i> IPR2013-00062, Paper 84 (Apr. 11, 2014) .....	6
<i>Alexsam v. Gap,</i> 621 F. App'x 983 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	13
<i>Apator Miitors v. Kamstrup,</i> 887 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	8
<i>Apple v. Yu,</i> IPR2019-01258, Paper 29 (Jan. 5, 2021) .....	8
<i>Aspex Eyewear v. Marchon Eyewear,</i> 672 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	11
<i>Bradium Techs. v. Iancu,</i> 923 F.3d 1032 (Fed. Cir. 2019) .....	17
<i>Cisco Systems v. C-Cation Techs.,</i> IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (Aug. 29, 2014).....	4
<i>Cooper v. Goldfarb,</i> 154 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....	6
<i>DePuy Spine v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek,</i> 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	19
<i>Enzo Biochem v. Gen-Probe,</i> 323 F.3d 956 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	27
<i>Ex Parte Kwon,</i> Appeal 2015-008271 (Sep. 28, 2016) .....	19
<i>Ex Parte Rans,</i> Appeal 2020-000512 (Jun. 4, 2020).....	11
<i>Foursquare Labs v. Mimzi,</i> IPR2019-01287, Paper 34 (Jan. 13, 2021) .....	6, 8

<i>Gen. Access Sols. v. Sprint Spectrum</i> , 811 F. App'x 654 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	1, 2, 3, 4
<i>In re Beattie</i> , 974 F.2d 1309 (Fed. Cir. 1992).....	25
<i>In re Fulton</i> , 391 F.3d 1195 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	19
<i>In re Keller</i> , 642 F.2d 413 (C.C.P.A. 1981).....	17
<i>In re Steed</i> , 802 F.3d 1311 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	8
<i>Int'l Bus. Machines v. Intellectual Ventures II</i> , IPR2015-01323, Paper 15 (Feb. 2, 2016).....	16
<i>Jiangu SmartSens Tech. Co. v. OmniVision Tech's</i> , IPR2019-01263, Paper 48 (Dec. 18, 2020) .....	4, 5
<i>Kenexa Brassring v. Taleo</i> , 751 F. Supp. 2d 735 (D. Del. 2010) .....	8
<i>Manning v. Paradis</i> , 296 F.3d 1098 (Fed. Cir. 2002) .....	13
<i>Medichem v. Rolabo</i> , 437 F.3d 1157 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	6, 22
<i>Microsoft v. Surfcast</i> , IPR2013-00292, Paper 93 (Oct. 14, 2014).....	7
<i>Newkirk v. Lulejian</i> , 825 F.2d 1581 (Fed. Cir. 1987) .....	13
<i>Phillips v. AWH</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	28
<i>Raytheon v. Sony</i> , 727 F. App'x 662 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	8

# 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.