

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PEAG LLC (d/b/a JLab Audio), AUDIO PARTNERSHIP LLC and AUDIO
PARTNERSHIP PLC (d/b/a Cambridge Audio)
Petitioner,

v.

VARTA MICROBATTERY GMBH,
Patent Owner

Case IPR 2020-01212
Patent 9,153,835

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INSTITUTION SHOULD NOT BE GRANTED	1
II.	BACKGROUND	4
A.	The '835 Patent	4
B.	The '835 Patent Claims	6
C.	The Parallel District Court Proceedings.....	7
D.	Petitioners' Arguments.....	9
III.	PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL	9
IV.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	10
V.	THE BOARD SHOULD EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION TO DENY INSTITUTION	10
A.	Institution Should Be Denied Under § 314(a)	10
1.	The District Court Is Not Likely to Grant a Stay.....	12
2.	The District Court's Trial Date Favors Denial	13
3.	Investment in the Parallel Proceeding Favors Denial.....	15
4.	The Issues in the Petition Substantially Overlap with Those in the District Court.....	16
5.	Petitioners and Defendants in the District Court Litigation Are the Same	20
6.	Other Circumstances Impacting Discretion.....	20
B.	Institution Should Be Denied Under § 325(d)	21
VI.	THE BOARD SHOULD NOT INSTITUTE REVIEW ON THE PROPOSED OBVIOUS GROUNDS (GROUNDS 1-3).....	22
A.	Applicable Legal Standard	23
B.	The References Relied Upon by Petitioners	24
1.	The Kobayashi Reference	24
2.	The Kaun Reference.....	27
3.	The Ryou Reference.....	30

C.	Ground 1 – Petitioners Have Failed to Show that a POSA Would Have Combined Kaun with Kobayashi to Obtain the Claimed Invention.....	31
D.	Ground 2 – Petitioners Have Failed to Show that a POSA Would Have Combined Kobayashi with Kaun to Obtain the Claimed Invention.....	35
E.	Ground 3 – Petitioners Have Failed to Show that a POSA Would Have Combined Kobayashi with Ryou to Obtain the Claimed Invention.....	36
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	38

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 20, 2020).....	11, 12, 20
<i>Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG</i> , IPR2017-01586, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 15, 2017).....	21
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016)	10
<i>Dr. Reddy's Labs. S.A. v. Indivior UK Ltd.</i> , IPR2019-00328, Paper 19 (P.T.A.B. June 3, 2019).....	21, 22
<i>Endress + Hauser, Inc. v. Hawk Measurement Sys. Pty, Ltd.</i> , 122 F.3d 1040 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	29
<i>Expedia, Inc. v. IBM, Corp.</i> , IPR2019-00404, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. June 5, 2019).....	18, 19
<i>General Plastic Indus. Co., v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , IPR2016-01357, Paper 19 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 6, 2017)	13, 14, 19
<i>In re Fine</i> , 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	23
<i>Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , IPR2013-00324, Paper 19 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 21, 2013)	22
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	23
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Secure Web Conference Corp.</i> , IPR2014-00745, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 29, 2014)	24
<i>Mylan Pharm. Inc. v. Bayer Intellectual Prop. GmbH</i> , IPR2018- 01143, Paper 13 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 3, 2018).....	14
<i>NetApp Inc. v. Realtime Data LLC</i> , IPR2017-01195, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 12, 2017).....	14, 18

<i>Next Caller v. TRUSTID</i> , IPR2019-00961, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 16, 2019).....	18
<i>NHK Spring Co. v. Intri-Plex Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00752, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Sep. 12, 2018)	1, 14, 19
<i>Peloton Interactive, Inc. v. Flywheel Sports, Inc.</i> , 2:18-cv-00390, 2019 WL 3826051 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 14, 2019).....	13
<i>Samsung Electronics America, Inc. v. Uniloc 2017 LLC</i> , IPR2020-00117, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. May 28, 2020).....	14
<i>Synopsys, Inc. v. Mentor Graphics Corp.</i> , IPR2012-00041, Paper 16 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 22, 2013)	23
<i>Wowza Media Sys., LLC v. Adobe Sys. Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00054, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. April 8, 2013).....	24
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 112.....	19
35 U.S.C. § 314.....	10, 11, 14, 19, 21, 22
35 U.S.C. § 316.....	11
35 U.S.C. § 325.....	1, 21
Other Authorities	
Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, August 2018 Update, 83 Fed. Reg. 39,989 (Aug. 13, 2018).....	14
The Board’s Trial Practice Guide, July 2019 Update, 84 Fed. Reg. 33,925 (July 16, 2019)	11
Rules	
37 C.F.R. § 42.108.....	22
37 C.F.R. § 42.24.....	39
37 C.F.R. § 42.6.....	40

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.