

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

QUALCOMM INCORPORATED,

Petitioner,

v.

UNM RAINFOREST INNOVATIONS,

Patent Owner.

PTAB Case No. IPR2021-00375

Patent No. 8,265,096 B2

PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR
INTER PARTES REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,265,096 B2
CLAIMS 1-4 AND 6-8

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	RELATED PROCEEDINGS	1
III.	UNM BACKGROUND.....	2
IV.	THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION UNDER § 314(a).	3
A.	All of the <i>Fintiv</i> Factors Favor Denial of Institution.	5
B.	Efficiency and Integrity of the System Are Best Served by Denying Institution.....	11
V.	THE '096 PATENT.....	13
A.	Technical Background.....	13
B.	The Challenged Claims	14
1.	Claim 1	14
2.	Claim 2.....	15
3.	Claim 3.....	15
4.	Claim 4.....	15
5.	Claim 6.....	15
6.	Claim 7.....	16
7.	Claim 8.....	16
8.	Prosecution History.....	16
C.	Priority Date – Based on Provisional Application dated 2007/07/11	17
VI.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART.....	17
VII.	PATENT OWNER’S CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS	18

A.	Claim Construction Order in UNM Rainforest Innovations v. Apple Inc., No. 1-20-cv-00351 (W.D. Tex.).....	18
VIII.	THE ASSERTED PRIOR ART	19
A.	<i>Talukdar</i> (EX1012)	19
B.	<i>Li</i> (EX1016).....	22
C.	<i>Nystrom</i> (EX1017).....	23
IX.	PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF PREVAILING AS TO ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM.	24
A.	<i>Talukdar</i> Is Not Prior Art	24
B.	Ground 1: Claims 1-4, 6, and 7 are not obvious over <i>Talukdar</i> and <i>Li</i> . ..	37
1.	Claim 1	37
2.	Claim 2	49
3.	Claim 3	49
4.	Claim 4	49
5.	Claim 6	49
6.	Claim 7	50
C.	Ground 2 – Claim 8 is not obvious over <i>Talukdar</i> and <i>Nystrom</i>	50
1.	Claim 8	50
X.	SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS	57
XI.	CONCLUSION.....	57

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 941 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	12
<i>Continental Intermodal Group - Trucking LLC v. Sand Revolution LLC</i> , No. 7-18-cv-00147-ADA, Text Order (W.D. Tex. July 22, 2020).....	5, 6
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs. v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	4
<i>Ecofactor Inc. v. Vivint, Inc.</i> , 6:20-cv-00080-ADA, Dkt. No. 55 (W.D. Tex. Apr. 16, 2021).....	6, 7
<i>Industrial Technology Research Institute v. LG Electronics, Inc.</i> , No. 2:15-cv-00552, Dkt. No. 1 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 24, 2015)	11
<i>Kerr Machine Co. d/b/a Kerr Pumps v. Vulcan Industrial Holdings, LLC</i> , 6:20-cv-00200-ADA, Text Order (W.D. Tex. Aug. 2, 2020)	5, 6
<i>MultiMedia Content Mgmt LLC v. Dish Network L.L.C.</i> , 6:18-cv-00207-ADA, Dkt. No. 73 (W.D. Tex. May 30, 2019)	5, 6
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303, 1312–15 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (<i>en banc</i>).....	18
<i>Solas OLED v. Dell Techs. Inc.</i> , 6:19-cv-00514-ADA, Text Order (W.D. Tex. Jun. 23, 2020)	5, 6
<i>Solas OLED v. Dell Techs. Inc.</i> , 6:19-cv-00515-ADA, Text Order (W.D. Tex. Jun. 23, 2020)	5, 6
<i>STC.UNM v. Quest Diagnostics Inc.</i> , No. 17-1123 MV/KBM, 2019 WL 1091390, at *7, *13 (D. N.M. 2019).....	12
<i>Taylor v. Sturgell</i> , 533 U.S. 880 (2008).....	10

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 312(a)11
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)4

Rules

2011 U.S.C.C.A.N. 6912

Administrative Regulations

Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.,
No. IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2020) (precedential).....5

General Plastic Industrial Co., Ltd. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha,
No. IPR2016-01357, Paper 19 (PTAB Sept. 6, 2017) (precedential)13

Intel Corp. v. VLSI Tech., LLC
No. IPR2020-00106, Paper 17 (PTAB May 5, 2020)7

Mylan Pharms., Inc. v. Bayer Intellectual Property GMBH
No. IPR2018-01143, Paper 13 (PTAB Dec. 3, 2018)13

NetApp, Inc. v. Realtime Data LLC,
No. IPR2017-01195, Paper 8 (PTAB Oct. 12, 2017).....13

NetApp, Inc. v. Realtime Data LLC,
No. IPR2017-01195, Paper 9 (PTAB Oct. 12, 2017).....12

NHK Spring Co., Ltd v. Intri-Plex Techs., Inc.,
No. IPR2018-00752, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2018)..... 12, 13

Philip Morris Prod., S.A. v. RAI Strategic Holdings, Inc.
No. IPR2020-0921, Paper 9 (PTAB Nov. 16, 2020)..... passium

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.