UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,

Petitioner

v.

LBT IP I LLC,

Patent Owner

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

PATENT OWNER'S SUR-REPLY

TO PETITIONER'S REPLY



TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAT	ENT C	OWNER'S EXHIBIT LIST	IJ	
TAB	LE OF	AUTHORITIESI	[]	
I.	INTRODUCTION			
II.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION			
	A.	Patent Owner's Prosecution History Disclaimer Is "Clear and Unequivocal"	.3	
	B.	Patent Owner's Proposal Is Fully Supported By The Written Description	.5	
III.	AND	TIONER HAS NOT MET ITS BURDEN OF SHOWING BY CLEAR CONVINCING EVIDENCE THAT ANY OF THE CHALLENGED IMS ARE INVALID AS OBVIOUS.		
	A.	Adjusting Cycle Rates, as Purportedly Taught by <i>Sakamoto</i> , Does No Disclose "an Updated Set of Network Communication Signaling Protocols Associated with at least one of a Request Rate … and a Listen Rate" and "the Updated Set of Network Communication Signaling Protocols Having a Value That is Responsive to a User Input Request" of Limitation 1(e).		
	В.	Adjusting Cycle Rates, as Purportedly Taught by <i>Sakamoto</i> , Does No Disclose "Adjust Cycle Timing of at Least one of a Request Rate and a Listen Rate" as recited in Limitation 8(c)		
	C.	Multiple Different Thresholds, as Purportedly Taught by <i>Sakamoto</i> , Does Not Disclose "the Power Level Comprising a Multitude of Threshold Values Determined by a User or System Administrator" Limitation 8(d).	12	
IV.	RESERVATION OF RIGHTS14			
V	CONCLUSION 1		1 /	



PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit Numer	Description
2001	Declaration of Brian S. Seal in support of Patent Owner's
	Unopposed Motion For Pro Hac Vice Admission
2002	Revised Declaration of Brian S. Seal in support of Patent
	Owner's Unopposed Motion For Pro Hac Vice Admission
2003	Transcript of deposition of Scott Andrews
2004	U.S. Pub. No. 2009/0174603 (Appl. No. 11/969,905)
2005	Sun, U.S. Patent Number 7,612,663
2006	Syrjarinne et al., U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0113124
2007	Suprun et al., U.S. Patent Number 7,292,223
2008	Croyle et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,862,511
2009	Lau et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,592,173
2010	Tsai, U.S. Pub. No. 2007/0057068
2011	Huang et al., U.S. Patent Number 7,826,968
2012	File history of U.S. Patent Number 8,421,619
2013	U.S. Pub. No. 2009/0189807 (Appl. No. 12/419,451)
2014	U.S. Appl. No. 13/356,614
2015	U.S. Appl. No. 11/969,905
2016	U.S. Appl. No. 13/356,599
2017	U.S. Appl. No. 12/419,451
2018	U.S. Appl. No. 13/356,643



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Brookhill-Wilk I, LLC v Intuitive Surgical Inc.,	
334 F.3d 1294, 1300 (Fed.Cir.2003)	2
Helmsderfer v. Bobrick Washroom Equip., Inc.,	
527 F.3d 1379, 1382 (Fed.Cir.2008)	2
Phillips v. AWH Corp.,	
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed.Cir.2005) (en banc)	2,3,5
Renishaw PLC v. Marposs Societa' per Azioni,	
158 F.3d 1243, 1250 (Fed.Cir.1998)	2,3
Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.,	
90 F.3d 1576, 1582 (Fed.Cir.1996)	2



I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner's Reply (Paper 25, "Reply") turns on two primary issues. First, Petitioner appears to contend that a proper interpretation for the claim term "multitude" should be "a number larger than four" by arguing that prosecution history disclaimer must be clear and unequivocal and that the '774 Patent lacks written description support for a number of thresholds less than five. See Reply at 1-9. Second, Petitioner appears to acknowledge that Sakamoto fails to disclose limitations 1(e), 8(c), and 8(d) of the '774 Patent by 1) contending that each of Sakamoto's positioning modes has a regular refresh rate which automatically changes with a change in mode responsive to the battery charge level, as opposed to "having a value that is responsive to a user input request"; and 2) contending that Sakamoto discloses four thresholds associated with signal level, as opposed to "the power level comprising a multitude of threshold values determined by a user or system administrator." Id. at 15-17. As discussed below, Petitioner has not demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence that any of the challenged claims of U.S. Patent No. 8,497,774 ("the '774 Patent") are invalid as obvious because the references on which it relies nonetheless fail to disclose required limitations from the challenged claims. Because the Petitioner has not met its burden, the challenged claims should be upheld.

II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION



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.

