

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

TCT Mobile (US) Inc., Huizhou TCL Mobile Communication Co., Ltd., and  
Shenzhen TCL Creative Cloud Technology Co., Ltd.,

Petitioners,

v.

ANCORA TECHNOLOGIES INC.,

Patent Owner.

---

U.S. Patent No. 6,411,941 B1

Case No. IPR2020-01609

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION  
FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Table of Authorities ..... ii  
List of Exhibits ..... iii  
I. Introduction ..... 1  
II. Standard for granting *Inter Partes* review ..... 2  
III. Overview of the ‘941 Patent ..... 3  
IV. Claim Construction ..... 6  
V. The Board should deny the Petition for taking inconsistent claim construction positions and treating the claims like a “nose of wax” in violation of Rules 42.104(b)(3) and (4).....12  
VI. The Board should deny the Petition because the cited prior art fails to teach the claimed “license record” .....16  
VII. Conclusion .....19  
Certificate of Service .....20  
Certificate of Compliance Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.24.....21

## Table of Authorities

### Cases

<i>Amazon.com, Inc. v. Barnesandnoble.com, Inc.</i> , 239 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....	14
<i>Ancora Techs., Inc. v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 744 F.3d 732 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	3, 5
<i>Ancora Techs., Inc. v. HTC Am., Inc.</i> , 908 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	3, 4, 5
<i>HTC Corp. v. Ancora Techs., Inc.</i> , No. CBM2017-00054, Institution Decision, Paper 7 (Dec. 1, 2017).....	5
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith &amp; Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	2
<i>OrthoPediatrics Corp. v. K2M, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-01548, Paper 9 (PTAB March 1, 2019).....	14, 15
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	9, 12, 13

### Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 101 .....	5
35 U.S.C. § 103 .....	2
35 U.S.C. § 314 .....	2, 15, 18
37 C.F.R. § 2.108.....	2

### Other Authorities

77 Fed. Reg. 48,756, 48,756 (Aug. 14, 2012).....	2
83 Fed. Reg. 51,340, 51,355 (Oct. 11, 2018).....	12

### Rules

37 C.F.R. § 42.104.....	12, 14, 15, 18
-------------------------	----------------

**List of Exhibits**

<b>Exhibit No.</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Identifier</b>
2001	'941 Reasons for Allowance	3/28/2002	
2002	Central District of California Claim Construction Order in <i>Ancora Techs., Inc. v. TCT Mobile, Inc. et al.</i> , 8:19-cv-02192 (CACD)	11/12/2020	
2003	Email from Canavera to Lorelli RE: CC Chart, including attachment	7/17/2020	

## I. Introduction

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.107, Patent Owner, Ancora Technologies, Inc. (“Patent Owner”), submits the following Preliminary Response to the Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 6,411,941 (“the ‘941 Patent”).

The Patent Trial and Appeal Board (the “Board”) should deny the Petition for two reasons. *First*, Petitioner treats the claims as a “nose of wax” and asserts completely inconsistent constructions in this proceeding and in the parallel district court proceeding. Here, Petitioner asserts the claims should be interpreted according to their “plain and ordinary meaning” and that it “does not believe that any claim constructions are needed.” Paper No. 1, p. 21. But in the parallel district court litigation, Petitioner adopted *some* of the prior district court claim constructions, disputed *others* with constructions of its own, and asserted *new* constructions for previously-unconstrued claim terms Petitioner described as “most significant.” It cannot be that the same claim terms require construction (and have been construed) in the district court at Petitioner’s urging, but not in this proceeding. The claim terms are the same, they are subject to the same claim construction standard, and Petitioner offers no reason for departing from the prior district court constructions. Because Petitioner takes inconsistent positions in the two proceedings and has failed to apply the district court constructions (or its own) to the prior art, the Board should deny the petition.

# 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.