

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APPLE INC.,  
Petitioner

v.

COREPHOTONICS LTD.,  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2018-01140  
Patent 9,402,032 B2

---

**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO  
PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW  
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 9,402,032**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. BACKGROUND 3

A. Overview of the '032 Patent (Ex. 1001)..... 3

B. Complexity of the Design of Multiple Lens Assemblies, Like the Patented Invention ..... 7

III. LEGAL STANDARD FOR PETITION REVIEW 11

IV. LEVEL OF A PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART (POSITA) 12

V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 13

A. Legal Standard ..... 13

B. Total Track Length (TTL)..... 14

C. “Effective Focal Length (EFL)” ..... 20

VI. THE PETITION FAILS TO ESTABLISH THAT OGINO ANTICIPATES CLAIMS 1 AND 13 20

A. Apple Fails to Show that Ogino Discloses a Lens Assembly with TTL / EFL < 1 ..... 21

B. Apple also Fails to Show that Ogino’s Disclosure of “Telephoto” Lens Assemblies Implicitly Discloses TTL / EFL < 1 ..... 27

VII. THE PETITION FAILS TO ESTABLISH THAT CLAIMS 14 AND 15 ARE OBVIOUS OVER OGINO IN VIEW OF CHEN II 29

A. Apple Fails to Show that it Would be Obvious for a POSITA to Modify Ogino Example 6 with the CG Element Removed..... 29

B. Apple Fails to Show that there is Any Reason Other than Hindsight for a POSITA to Modify Ogino Based on Chen II ..... 31

1. The Petition fails to show sufficient factual support for purported motivation to combine nor its applicability to the '032 patent. .... 32

2. The Petition fails to show that a POSITA would have understood that replacing the second lens of Ogino with a meniscus lens from Chen II would yield a predictable result. .... 34

3. The Petition further errs by relying on *further* modifications to the Ogino-Chen II combination to obtain an operable design, but not providing a rationale for those further modifications besides hindsight. .... 41

VIII. CONCLUSION 47

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	30
<i>Allergan, Inc. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 754 F.3d 952 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	24, 26
<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 839 F.3d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	29
<i>Apple Inc. v. Uniloc Luxembourg S.A.</i> , IPR2018-00420, Paper 7 (PTAB, Aug. 6, 2018) .....	19
<i>Ariosa Diagnostics v. Verinata Health, Inc.</i> , 805 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	11
<i>Cisco Systems, Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (PTAB, Aug. 29, 2014) .....	12
<i>Cont'l Can Co. USA, Inc. v. Monsanto Co.</i> , 948 F.2d 1264 (Fed.Cir.1991).....	27
<i>Edmund Optics, Inc. v. Semrock, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00583, Paper 50 (PTAB, Sep. 9, 2015) .....	11
<i>Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed.Cir.2016).....	10
<i>Honeywell Int'l, Inc. v. Universal Avionics Sys. Corp.</i> , 493 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	14
<i>In re Kubin</i> , 561 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	35
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	11
<i>In re Nuvasive, Inc.</i> , 842 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	30
<i>In re Smith Int'l, Inc.</i> , 871 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	13, 26
<i>Martek Biosciences Corp. v. Nutrinova, Inc.</i> , 579 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	14
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Biscotti, Inc.</i> , 878 F.3d 1052 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	20, 23
<i>Monarch Knitting Mach. Corp. v. Sulzer Morat GmbH</i> , 139 F.3d 877 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	46
<i>Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	20
<i>Otsuka Pharm. Co., v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 678 F.3d 1280 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	45
<i>Pers. Web Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	31
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	13, 14
<i>SAS Institute, Inc. v. Iancu</i> , 138 S.Ct. 1348 (2018).....	13

<i>Standard Oil Co. v. Am. Cyanamid Co.</i> , 774 F.2d 448 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	29
<i>Therasense, Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson &amp; Co.</i> , 593 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	27
<i>Transclean Corp. v. Bridgewood Servs., Inc.</i> , 290 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	27
<i>V-Formation, Inc. v. Benetton Grp. SpA</i> , 401 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	17
<i>Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.</i> , 90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	14
<i>Wasica Finance GMBH v. Continental Auto. Systems</i> , 853 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	11
<i>Zoltek Corp. v. United States</i> , 815 F.3d 1302 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	39
<b>Statutes</b>	
35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3).....	10
<b>Rules</b>	
37 C.F.R. §42.6(a)(3).....	12
37 C.F.R. §42.65(a).....	11

## **Patent Owner's Exhibit List for IPR2018-01140**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.63(e), Patent Owner Corephotonics Ltd., hereby submits its exhibit list associated with the above-captioned *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 9,402,032 B2.

<b>Exhibit No.</b>	<b>Description</b>
2013	Declaration of Duncan Moore, Ph.D.
2014	Curriculum Vitae of Duncan Moore, Ph.D.
2003	Excerpts from "Optical System Design"
2004	U.S. Patent No. 8,395,851, "Optical Lens System"
2005	U.S. Patent App. Pub. 2011/0249346, "Imaging Lens Display"
2006	U.S. Patent App. Pub. 2011/0279910, "Photographing Optical Lens Assembly"
2007	U.S. Patent App. Pub. 2011/0261470, "Photographing Optical Lens Assembly"
2008	190215 Deposition Transcript of Jose Sasian, Ph.D.
2009	Exhibit 11 to 190215 Deposition Transcript of Jose Sasian, Ph.D.
2010	Exhibit 12 to 190215 Deposition Transcript of Jose Sasian, Ph.D.
2011	Exhibit 13 to 190215 Deposition Transcript of Jose Sasian, Ph.D.
2012	Exhibit 1015 to Apple's Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review

# 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.