

---

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APPLE INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

GUI GLOBAL PRODUCTS, LTD.,

Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2021-00472

Patent 10,562,077

---

PATENT OWNER'S SUR-REPLY TO PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES*  
REVIEW

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION .....1

II. ARGUMENT.....3

    A. A POSITA lacks rationale/motivation to pursue the Gundlach-Lee combination.....3

        1. The Gundlach-Lee combination, even if it met the claim limitations (which it does not), would not have been obviousness. ....3

            a. The Reply does not meaningfully dispute important reasons why the combination alleged in the Petition is not obvious. ....3

            b. Petitioner’s improper new Lee suggestion theory should be disregarded. Irrespective, it lacks merit.....8

            c. Petitioner’s improper new “additional rationales” theories should be disregarded. Irrespective, they lack merit.....10

            d. The law does not preempt Gwee’s motivation facts and arguments. Rather, it supports them.....12

            e. The serious problems resulting from the proposed Gundlach-Lee combination are more than mere “tradeoffs” and far outweigh and undermine any alleged motivation.....13

f. None of Dr. Cooperstock’s “ten other prior art examples,” (eight of which are untimely raised), involve wireless charging from a portable battery powered device or devices with the geometry of the Petition’s combination...14

B. Petitioner’s new Reply arguments against “bodily incorporation,” for “ordinary creativity,” and against using Gundlach’s “form factor” relied upon by the Petition are untimely and improper .....15

C. Petitioner’s alleged motivations do not support a motivation to make the combination asserted in the Petition. ....16

1. Inductive charging being a “known alternative” in some circumstances (inapplicable here) does not provide a motivation for Gundlach-Lee combination asserted in the Petition. ....16

2. Petitioner’s argument for alleged enhanced reliability is based upon a mistaken premise and, in any event, does not provide a motivation for Gundlach-Lee combination asserted in the Petition. ....17

4. The Reply argument for a very different and allegedly now “feasible” design for the Lee-Gundlach combination is untimely and improper. Further, it is fatally flawed and there is no evidence it would work for a Gundlach headset. In any event, motivation to combine is still lacking for this untimely new design. ....19

5. The Reply’s footnote argument that the “Petition does not solely rely on Lee’s dual-purpose coil embodiment to satisfy claim 1” is false.....	22
6. Petitioner’s interoperability argument lacks merit.....	24
D. Brown is not analogous art.....	25
E. A POSITA would not have been motivated to combine Mak-Fan with Gundlach-Lee. Irrespective, Mak-Fan does not disclose a magnet in the lid of the phone case.....	26
F. Petitioner’s Ground 1A-2E arguments are meritless.....	26
1. Grounds 1A/2A, Element [1b].....	26
2. Grounds 1A/2A, Element [1d].....	28
3. Grounds 1A/2A, Element [1g].....	28
4. Grounds 1A/2A, Element [1j].....	30
5. Grounds 1A/2A and 1C/2C, Element [11].....	31
III. CONCLUSION.....	32
WORD-COUNT CERTIFICATE.....	33
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.....	34

**Cases**

*Henny Penny v. Frymaster*, 938 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2019) .....2

*Hoffmann La Roche v. Apotex*, 748 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....13

*Hulu v. Sound View Innovations* (IPR2018-00582, Paper 34) .....3, 13

*In re Etter*, 756 F.2d 852 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....16

*Intelligent Bio-Sys. v. Illumina Cambridge*, 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....2

*Johns Manville v. Knauf Insulation* (IPR2018-00827, Paper 9)..... 2, 3, 12

**Statutes**

5 U.S.C. § 706.....2

**Rules**

37 C.F.R. §42.23(b) .....2

# 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.