UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

GUI GLOBAL PRODUCTS, LTD.,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2021-00470

U.S. Patent No. 10,259,020

Patent Owner's Preliminary Response Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 10,259,020



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT 1			
II.	PRI	ORITY DATE , A POSITA AND CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	12	
III.	REI	LATED PROCEEDINGS	14	
IV.	OV.	ERVIEW OF THE '020 PATENT	14	
	A. O	verview of the Presently Relevant Disclosure of the '020 Patent	14	
		1. Overview of '020 Claim 1.	20	
V.	LIK	E PETITION FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE ELIHOOD THAT CHALLENGED CLAIM 1, AND THUS ANY ITS DEPENDENT CLAIMS, IS UNPATENTABLE	21	
VI.	BO DEI	E CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE NOT OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF HBOT AND GUNDLACH; THUS, PETITIONER FAILS TO MONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF EVAILING ON GROUNDS 1A-1F.	24	
	A.	Overview of Allegedly Relevant Disclosures of Bohbot	24	
	B.	Overview of Gundlach	29	
	C.	Bohbot and Gundlach are not analogous art; thus, a POSITA would have no reason or motivation to combine them as alleged		
	D.	Bohbot does not disclose a "switching device"	33	
	E.	Bohbot does not disclose that the alleged switching device is "configured to activate, deactivate or send into hibernation the portable electronic device"	38	
	F.	Bohbot does not disclose or render obvious "a first magnet disposed within" the headset, i.e., the alleged switching device		
	G.	A POSITA would not have reason or motivation to make the suggested combination of Bohbot and Gundlach, which does not disclose or render obvious that the primary module, i.e., the electron	ic	



		device, has a recessed area configured to correspond to complementary surface elements on the alleged switching device, i the headset.	
	Н.	The combination of Bohbot and Gundlach does not render obvious that "when coupled, the second case functions to protect the first case"	. 43
VII.	BOF PET	CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE NOT OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF HBOT IN VIEW OF GUNDLACH AND DIEBEL; THUS, ITIONER FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE ELIHOOD OF PREVAILING ON GROUNDS 1A-1F	. 45
	A. Ov	verview of allegedly relevant portions of Diebel	. 46
	В.	Neither Gundlach nor Diebel are analogous art to Bohbot, nor is the alleged Bohbot-Gundlach combination analogous art to Diebel; thu POSITA would have no reason or Motivation to combine as alleged	s, a
	C.	A POSITA would not have reason or motivation to make the suggested combination of Diebel with the alleged Bohbot-Gundlack Combination to add an extended sleep mode to Bohbot	
VIII.	I. THE FINTIV DISCRETIONARY FACTORS, NAMELY THOSE DISFAVORING PARALLEL PROCEEDINGS, FURTHER WEIG AGAINST THE BOARD EXERCISING ITS DISCRETION TO GRANT THE PETITION		. 51
IX.	FAII	BOARD SHOULD TERMINATE THIS IPR BECAUSE IT LS UNDER THE APPOINTMENTS AND DUE PROCESS USES	. 53
X.	CON	NCLUSION	. 55
XI.	CER	TIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE	. 57
XII	CER	TIFICATE OF SERVICE	58



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	٦		
•	ંત્ર	2	PC

Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc., IPR 2020-00019, paper 11 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2020) 52
Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc., 941 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2019) 53
Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC, 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015)
Celgene Corp. v. Peter, 931 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2019), cert denied, 141 S.Ct. 132 (2020)
Doolin Sec. Sav. Bank, F.S.B. v. FDIC, 53 F.3d 1395 (4th Cir. 1995)
Edmond v. United States, 520 U.S. 651 (1997)
Fanduel, Inc. v. Interactive Games LLC, 966 F.3d 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2020) 52
In re Gordon, 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984)
In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887 (Fed. Cir. 1985)
In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd., 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)
<i>In re Ratti</i> , 270 F.2d 810 (CCPA 1959)
In re Warner, 379 F.2d 1011 (CCPA 1967)
Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd., 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir.
2016)
KSR Int'l v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007)
K-TEC, Inc. v. Vita-Mix Corp., 696 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2012)
SAS Inst. Inc. v. Iancu, 138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018)
Sawai USA, Inc. v. Astellas Pharma Inc., IPR2018-00079 (PTAB May 4, 2018). 13
Smithkline Beecham Corp. v. Apotex Corp., 439 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2006) 13
<i>Tumey v. Ohio</i> , 273 U.S. 510 (1927)
Worlds Inc. v. Bungie, Inc., 903 F.3d 1237 (Fed. Cir. 2018)



Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3)	21
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	51
5 U.S.C. § 556	54
5 U.S.C. § 7521(a)	54
Regulations 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3)	13
37 C.F.R. § 42.20(c)	
Other Authorities	
112 Cong Rec \$1375 (daily ed Mar & 2011)	21



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.

