

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., and
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

ANCORA TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2020-01184
U.S. Patent No. 6,411,941

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

Table of Contents

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	U.S. PATENT NO. 6,411,941	5
	A. Background	5
	B. Challenged Independent Claim	8
III.	REFERENCES RELIED UPON IN THE PETITION AND PROPOSED GROUNDS FOR INSTITUTION	9
	A. References	9
	B. Proposed Grounds	10
IV.	THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE IT FAILS TO IDENTIFY THE CLAIM TERMS AND CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS THAT PETITIONER KNOWS TO BE ESSENTIAL TO THE BOARD’S DETERMINATIONS	10
	A. Before the district court in parallel litigation, Petitioner argued that the phrase “memory of the BIOS” requires more than a “mere association” between the “memory” and the “BIOS”	11
	B. Petitioner advances invalidity arguments that reflect an inconsistent construction of the phrase “memory of the BIOS”—namely, that the phrase requires no more than a “mere association” between the “memory” and the “BIOS”	11
	C. Petitioner’s failure to brief this Board on proper claim construction justifies denial of the Petition.	15
V.	THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION BASED ON GROUND 1	17
	A. The Board should exercise its discretion to deny institution under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	18
	1. The same art previously was presented to the Office	18
	2. The Petitioner has not demonstrated that the Office erred in its analysis of previously considered art	20

B. Petitioner has not demonstrated a reasonable likelihood that Schwartz in view of Yee renders Claims 1, 2, and 6–17 unpatentable.	22
VI. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION BASED ON GROUND 2	26
A. The Board should exercise its discretion to deny institution under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	26
1. The Board should deny institution on Petitioner’s Hasebe and Hasebe-based Grounds because the art and arguments are the same or substantially the same as art and arguments previously presented to and considered by the Office.	26
2. Petitioner has not shown error in the Examiner’s reasons for allowance over the art to which Hasebe and Shipman are merely cumulative	31
B. Petitioner has not demonstrated a reasonable likelihood that Hasebe in view of Shipman renders Claims 1–3, 6–15, and 17 unpatentable.	33
VII. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER THE FINTIV FACTORS AND 35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	35
1. Factor 1: A stay is unlikely even if IPR were instituted	36
2. Factor 2: The scheduled trial date precedes the Board’s projected statutory deadline for a final written decision	37
3. Factor 3: The district court and the parties have invested substantially in the district court litigation	40
4. Factor 4: There is substantial overlap between issues raised in Samsung’s Petition and in the district court litigation	43
5. Factor 5: The parties are the same in both proceedings	44
6. Factor 6: The merits of the Petition weigh against institution	44
VIII. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE PETITIONER’S ARGUMENTS ARE CONCLUSORY AND ATTEMPT TO IMPERMISSIBLY INCORPORATE EXPERT TESTIMONY BY REFERENCE	45
IX. CONCLUSION	48

Table of Authorities

Cases

<i>Amazon.com, Inc. v. Barnesandnoble.com, Inc.</i> , 239 F.3d 1343, 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	17
<i>Ancora Technologies, Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. and Samsung Electronics America, Inc.</i> , Case No. 1:20-cv-00034-ADA (W.D. TX.)	2
<i>Ancora Techs., Inc. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 2012 WL 6738761 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 31, 2012)	6
<i>Ancora Techs., Inc. v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 744 F.3d 732 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	5, 14, 16
<i>Ancora Techs., Inc. v. HTC Am., Inc.</i> , 908 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	6, 7, 8
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019,	passim
<i>Avid Tech.</i> , 815 F.3d at 1363	49
<i>Conopco, Inc. v. Proctor & Gamble Co.</i> , IPR2013-00510	51
<i>Fintiv</i> , IPR2020-00019	47
<i>Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1356, 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	48
<i>In re DiStefano</i> , 808 F.3d 845 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	22
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	48
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364, 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	48
<i>MV3 Partners</i>	39
<i>Next Caller, Inc. v. TRUSTID, Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00961, Paper 10 at 16 (PTAB Oct. 16, 2019)	45
<i>NHK Spring Co., Ltd. v. Intri-Plex Techs., Inc.</i>	38
<i>Optis Wireless Technology, LLC et al v. Apple Inc.</i> , Case No. 2:19-CV-00066	41
<i>Orthopediatrics Corp. v. K2M, Inc.</i> , Case IPR2018-01548	17
<i>Samsung Electronics America, Inc.</i> , Case No. 1:20-cv-00034-ADA (W.D. TX.)	23
<i>Sand Revolution II, LLC v. Continental Intermodal Group - Trucking LLC</i> , IPR2019-01393 (June 16, 2020)	42

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 101	6
35 U.S.C. § 103	28
35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3)	45
35 U.S.C. § 313	1
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	35, 47, 52

Rules

35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	17, 22, 26, 33
35 U.S.C. §325(d)	18, 20
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3)	16, 17
37 C.F.R. § 42.107	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.24	51
37 C.F.R. § 42.24(a)(i)	46, 48
37 C.F.R. § 42.24(b)(1)	51
37 C.F.R. §§ 42.104(b)(3)	2, 15
42.104(b)(4)	2

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.