

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
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 1

II. The Board Should Deny Institution Because the Parties Are Scheduled to Try the Validity of the Challenged Patent in a District Court Jury Trial Before The Requested IPR Would Conclude4

A. The Parallel District Court Proceeding Between The Parties Is Scheduled For Trial Three Months Before The Final Written Decision Deadline6

B. All Six *Fintiv* Factors Weigh In Favor Of The Board Denying Institution.....8

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”12

4. “overlap between issues raised in the petition and in the parallel proceeding”13

5. “whether the petitioner and the defendant in the parallel proceeding are the same party”15

6. “other circumstances that impact the Board’s exercise of discretion, including the merits”15

III. The ’431 Patent.....16

A. Prior Art Interactive Voice Systems Suffered From Numerous Drawbacks17

1. Typical Prior Art Systems For Accessing Web Sites Were Not Sufficiently Portable, Comprehensive, And Affordable17

- 2. Voice Enabled Options Introduced Additional Problems and Drawbacks18
- 3. Prior Art “Interactive Voice Response” Systems Suffered From A Lack Of Fault Tolerance, Limited Webpage Resources, And Generic Search Options And Results19
- B. The ’431 Patent’s Solution.....21
 - 1. Overview Of The ’431 Patent’s Voice Browser System22
 - 2. Sequentially Accessing A Plurality of Pre-selected Web Sites25
- C. The Challenged ’431 Patent Claims.....28
- IV. The Petition Should Be Denied Because It Does Not Establish the Required Reasonable Likelihood Success.....31
 - A. Grounds 1-4.....31
 - 1. The Asserted References.....33
 - a. Kovatch.....33
 - b. Neal.....37
 - 2. The Missing Limitations39
 - a. “at least one instruction set for identifying said information to be retrieved”39
 - b. “said instruction set comprising: a plurality of pre-selected web site addresses”42
 - c. “sequentially access” the pre-selected web sites45
 - i. *Neal* does not teach sequentially accessing pre-selected web sites until the requested information is found or all pre-selected web sites have been accessed.....46

- ii. The Petition Does Not Establish It Was Obvious To Combine *Kovatch* and *Neal* As Required In Grounds 1-4.....47
- B. Grounds 5 & 650
 - 1. The Asserted Art50
 - 2. Grounds 5 & 6 Are Assertions Of § 112 Written Description Invalidity51
 - 3. The Petition’s Written Description Assertions Are Baseless.....52
 - a. Ground 5: Both the ’431 Patent and Its Identical Parent Application Provide The Necessary Written Description For Claim 952
 - b. Ground 6: Both the ’431 Patent and Its Identical Parent Application Provide The Necessary Written Description For Claim 1454
- V. Conclusion56

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.,
IPR2020-00019, Paper 15 (PTAB May 13, 2020)7, 11

Multimedia Content Management v. Dish Network,
Civil No. 6:18-CV-00207 (W.D. Tex. May 30, 2019) (J. Albright)9

NHK Spring Co., Ltd. v. Intri-Plex Techs., Inc.,
IPR2018-00752, Paper 8, 20 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2018).....*passim*

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 10331

35 U.S.C. § 11251, 52

35 U.S.C. § 314(a)*passim*

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. §42.24(d)58

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.