# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

\_\_\_\_

### BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

\_\_\_\_\_

APPLE INC.,

Petitioner

V.

LBT IP I LLC,

Patent Owner

\_\_\_\_

Case No. IPR2020-01189 U.S. Patent No. 8,497,774

\_\_\_\_\_

# PETITIONER APPLE INC.'S OPPOSITION TO PATENT OWNER'S MOTION TO AMEND



### TABLE OF CONTENTS

<ul> <li>3. Sakamoto teaches that the cycle timing/updated set of network communication protocols represent a timing schedule for at least one of the request rate and the listen rate.</li> <li>4. LBT's Arguments Distinguishing over Sakamoto Misapprehend</li> </ul>	•••••	INTRODUCTION	I.
A. THE PROPOSED SUBSTITUTE CLAIMS IMPERMISSIBLY ATTEMPT TO BROADEN THE SCOPE OF THE CORRESPONDING CHALLENGED CLAIMS  B. THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS ARE UNPATENTABLE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112	•••••	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	II.
BROADEN THE SCOPE OF THE CORRESPONDING CHALLENGED CLAIMS  B. THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS ARE UNPATENTABLE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112			III.
B. THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS ARE UNPATENTABLE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112			A.
1. Written Description Support Is Required for the Amended Claims 2. Claims 20 and 27 Lack Written Description Support	U.S.C.	. The Proposed Amendments Are Unpatentable Under 35 U	В.
<ul> <li>IV. THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS ARE OBVIOUS OVER THE ART CITED IN THE PETITION</li></ul>	laims	<ol> <li>Written Description Support Is Required for the Amended Cla</li> <li>Claims 20 and 27 Lack Written Description Support</li> </ol>	
<ol> <li>Sakamoto teaches a request rate representing a repeating time interval for transmission of location coordinate packets to a target host</li></ol>	THE	THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS ARE OBVIOUS OVER	
<ol> <li>Sakamoto teaches a listen rate representing a repeating time interval for receipt of the location coordinate packets from a satellite navigation system.</li> <li>Sakamoto teaches that the cycle timing/updated set of network communication protocols represent a timing schedule for at least one of the request rate and the listen rate.</li> <li>LBT's Arguments Distinguishing over Sakamoto Misapprehend Sakamoto's Teachings</li> <li>THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS ARE OBVIOUS OVER</li> </ol>	e	1. Sakamoto teaches a request rate representing a repeating time interval for transmission of location coordinate packets to a ta	A.
<ol> <li>Sakamoto teaches that the cycle timing/updated set of network communication protocols represent a timing schedule for at least one of the request rate and the listen rate.</li> <li>LBT's Arguments Distinguishing over Sakamoto Misapprehend Sakamoto's Teachings</li> <li>THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS ARE OBVIOUS OVER</li> </ol>		2. Sakamoto teaches a listen rate representing a repeating time interval for receipt of the location coordinate packets from a	
<ul> <li>4. LBT's Arguments Distinguishing over Sakamoto Misapprehend         Sakamoto's Teachings</li></ul>	rk least	3. Sakamoto teaches that the cycle timing/updated set of network communication protocols represent a timing schedule for at least	
		4. LBT's Arguments Distinguishing over Sakamoto Misapprehe	
BOARD		ADDITIONAL PRIOR ART NOT PREVIOUSLY BEFORE	V.
A. GROUND 4: CLAIMS 20–34 ARE OBVIOUS OVER <i>SAKAMOTO</i> IN VIEW OF			Δ
HUANG			11.
B. HUANG IS ANALOGOUS, PRIOR ART			B.
C. HUANG IS NON-CUMULATIVE ART			
D. THE PROPOSED COMBINATION OF SAKAMOTO IN VIEW OF HUANG E. HUANG TEACHES THE AMENDED CLAIM LIMITATIONS			



VI.	CONCLUSION		
		Considered During Prosecution of the '774 Patent	23
	3.	The Added Limitations of the Amended Claims Were Not	
	2.	Motivation to Combine	21
	1.	Huang's Teachings	18



## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases:

Ariad Pharm., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co., 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010)4
Corning Optical Communications RF, LLC v. PPC Broadband, Inc., IPR2014-00441, Paper 19 (Oct. 30, 2014)
<i>GE Lighting Sols., LLC v. AgiLight, Inc., 750 F.3d 1304</i> (Fed. Cir. 2014)
Veeam Software Corp. v. Veritas Technologies, LLC, IPR2014-00090, Paper 48 (July 17, 2017)
Statutes:
35 U.S.C. § 103
35 U.S.C. § 102(a)
35 U.S.C. § 102(e)
35 U.S.C. § 112
35 U.S.C. § 316(d)(3)
Regulations:
37 C.F.R. § 42.6
37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e)
37 CFR § 42.121(a)(2)(ii)



### I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner, Apple Inc. submits this opposition to Patent Owner's, LBT's Motion to Amend. LBT's Motion (Paper 16, "MTA") should be denied because the amended claims improperly use claim construction to import limitations into the claims, lack written description support, and are unpatentable under § 103.

### II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION

LBT's amendments should be rejected as excluding the only disclosed embodiment. *GE Lighting Sols.*, *LLC v. AgiLight, Inc.*, 750 F.3d 1304, 1311 (Fed. Cir. 2014) ("We normally do not construe claims in a manner that would exclude the preferred embodiment, *especially where it is the only disclosed embodiment*. In particular, 'where claims can reasonably [be] interpreted to include a specific embodiment, it is incorrect to construe the claims to exclude that embodiment, absent probative evidence on the contrary."") (internal citations omitted) (emphasis added). In particular, the amended claims recite a "timing schedule," and the '774 Patent Specification's only description of a "schedule" is a refresh rate expressed as either a time interval between updates or an update frequency. LBT, however, improperly uses claim construction to limit the claims to *when* an event will occur, rather than a frequency of the event or a time interval between events.

Rather than providing an explicit construction for the amendments, LBT characterizes the amended claims as a whole:



# 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.

