EXHIBIT B

1 MICHAEL A. JACOBS (CA SBN 111664)
   mjacobs@mofo.com
2 RICHARD S.J. HUNG (CA SBN 197425)
   rhung@mofo.com
3 FRANCIS C. HO (CA SBN 247426)
4 fho@mofo.com
   ERIC W. OW (CA SBN 252921)
5 eow@mofo.com
   MORRISON & FOERSTER, LLP
6 425 Market Street
7 San Francisco, CA 94105-2482
   Telephone: (415) 268-7000
8 Facsimile: (415) 268-7522

9 BITA RAHEBI (CA SBN 209351)
   brahebi@mofo.com
10 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
11 555 West Fifth Street, Suite 3500
   Los Angeles, CA 90013-1024
12 Telephone: (213) 892-5200
   Facsimile: (213) 892-5454
13

14 *Attorneys for Defendant Apple Inc.*

15   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

16   CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

17   SOUTHERN DIVISION

18 ANCORA TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,   Case No. 2:10-cv-10045-AG-MLG

19   Plaintiff,   **APPLE INC.'S N.D. CAL. PATENT
                                        L.R. 3-3 DISCLOSURES**
20   v.

21 APPLE INC.,

22   Defendant.
   APPLE INC.,
23

24   Counterclaimant,

25 v.

26 ANCORA TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

27   Counterdefendant.

28

sf-3054790

1   Pursuant to the Court's August 29, 2011 Order Re: Stipulated Trial Schedule

2 (D.I. 40), Apple Inc. hereby provides its N.D. Cal. Patent L.R. 3-3 Disclosures

3 ("Invalidity Contentions") for U.S. Patent No. 6,411,941.

4   By providing these Invalidity Contentions, Apple does not waive any

5 applicable privilege or immunity, including the attorney-client privilege or work

6 product doctrine. Apple predicates the Invalidity Contentions, in part, on the claim

7 constructions suggested by Ancora's September 14, 2011 Discovery Order

8 Disclosures and Disclosures Pursuant to Patent Rules 3-1 and 3-2 ("Infringement

9 Contentions"). Accordingly, these Invalidity Contentions should not be read as

10 representing or otherwise reflecting Apple's final positions regarding the proper

11 interpretation of the claims. Ancora has asserted in its Infringement Contentions

12 that Apple's iPhone, iPod Touch, iPad and Apple TV infringe Claims 1-3 and 5-17

13 of the '941 patent ("Asserted Claims"). These Invalidity Contentions address only

14 the Asserted Claims.

15   Apple bases these Invalidity Contentions on information reasonably available

16 to it at this time. The significant deficiencies in Ancora's Infringement Contentions

17 and other discovery responses have made it difficult for Apple to understand

18 Ancora's infringement and claim construction positions, and those positions

19 necessarily inform Apple's invalidity positions.[1] Apple's investigation of Ancora's

20 claims and the prior art is ongoing. Apple incorporates by reference the

21 Preliminary Invalidity Contentions of Microsoft and PC Company Defendants in

22 *Ancora Technologies, Inc. v. Toshiba Am. Info. Sys., Inc.*, No. 2:09-cv-00270-MJP

23 (W.D. Wash.), attached as Exhibit A. Apple reserves the right to supplement or

24 amend these Invalidity Contentions in the future, particularly in response to any

25 supplementation by Ancora of its infringement contentions to clarify its theories.

26 _____

27   [1] *See* October 26, 2011 letter to Ancora's counsel outlining deficiencies.

28

sf-3054790

A.   Patent L.R. 3-3(a)

Apple identifies prior art publications and patents that anticipate or render obvious one or more of the limitations of the Asserted Claims in Table A below.

Author	Non-Patent Publication	Publication Date
White et al.	ABYSS: A Trusted Architecture for Software Protection, IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering, Vol. 16, No. 6, pp. 38-51 ("White 1990") (Ex. 1)	June 1990
Tygar et al.	Dyad: A System for Using Physically Secure Coprocessors, CMU-CS-94-140R, Carnegie Mellon University ("Tygar 1991") (Ex. 2)	May 4, 1991
Yee	Using Secure Coprocessors, Carnegie Mellon University, CMU-CS-94-149 ("Yee 1994") (Ex. 3)	May 1994
Clark et al.	BITS: A Smartcard Protected Operating System, Communications of the ACM, Vol. 37, No. 11, pp. 68-70; 94 ("Clark 1994") (Ex. 4)	Nov. 1994
Yee et al.	Secure Coprocessors in Electronic Commerce Applications, Proceedings of the 1st USENIX Workshop on Electronic Commerce, pp. 155-170 ("Yee 1995") (Ex. 5)	July 1995
Arbaugh et al.	A Secure and Reliable Bootstrap Architecture, Dept. of Comp. & Info. Sci. Tech. Reports, U. Penn. ("Arbaugh 1996") (Ex. 6)	1996
AMI et al.	Desktop Management BIOS Specification, Version 2.0 ("DMI BIOS Specification") (Ex. 7)	March 6, 1996
Arbaugh et al.	A Secure and Reliable Bootstrap Architecture, SP '97 Proceedings of the 1997 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, pp. 66-71 ("Arbaugh 1997") (Ex. 8)	1997
Inventor	**Patent Number**	**Issue Date**
Hellman	U.S. 4,658,093 ("Hellman Patent") (Ex. 9)	Apr. 14, 1987
Joshi	U.S. 4,688,169 ("Joshi Patent") (Ex. 10)	Aug. 18, 1987
Allen et al.	U.S. 4,757,533 ("Allen Patent") (Ex. 11)	July 12, 1988
Karp	U.S. 4,866,769 ("Karp Patent") (Ex. 12)	Sep. 12, 1989
Waite	U.S. 5,103,476 ("Waite 476 Patent) (Ex. 13)	Apr. 7, 1992

2

sf-3054790

Waite	U.S. 5,222,134 ("Waite 134 Patent) (Ex. 14)	Jun. 22, 1993
Smyth	U.S. 5,325,430 ("Smyth Patent") (Ex. 15)	June 28, 1994
Ewertz	U.S. 5,371,876 ("Ewertz Patent") (Ex. 16)	Dec. 6, 1994
Davis	U.S. 5,473,692 ("Davis 692 Patent") (Ex. 17)	Dec. 5, 1995
Richardson	U.S. 5,490,216 ("Richardson Patent") (Ex. 18)	Feb. 6, 1996
Schull	U.S. 5,509,070 ("Schull Patent") (Ex. 19)	Apr. 16, 1996
Morisawa et al.	U.S. 5,537,544 ("Morisawa Patent") (Ex. 20)	July 16, 1996
Davis et al.	U.S. 5,568,552 ("Davis 552 Patent") (Ex. 21)	Oct. 22, 1996
Christenson et al.	U.S. 5,579,522 ("Christenson Patent") (Ex. 22)	Nov. 26, 1996
McCarty	U.S. 5,666,411 ("McCarty Patent") (Ex. 23)	Sep. 9, 1997
Lewis	U.S. 5,734,819 ("Lewis Patent") (Ex. 24)	Mar. 31, 1998
O'Connor et al.	U.S. 5,745,568 ("O'Connor Patent") (Ex. 25)	Apr. 28, 1998
Davis	U.S. 5,844,986 ("Davis 986 Patent") (Ex. 26)	Dec. 1, 1998
Clark	U.S. 5,892,902 ("Clark Patent") (Ex. 27)	Apr. 6, 1999
Chou et al.	U.S. 5,892,906 ("Chou Patent") (Ex. 28)	Apr. 6, 1999
Labatte et al.	U.S. 5,901,311 ("Labatte 311 Patent") Ex. 29)	May 4, 1999
Labatte et al.	U.S. 5,913,057 ("Labatte 057 Patent") (Ex. 30)	June 15, 1999
Griswold	U.S. 5,940,504 ("Grisworld Patent") (Ex. 31)	
Beelitz	U.S. 5,944,820 ("Beelitz Patent") (Ex. 32)	Aug. 31, 1999
Okada	U.S. 6,049,670 ("Okada Patent") (Ex. 33)	
Osborn	U.S. 6,026,293 ("Osborn Patent") (Ex. 34)	Feb. 15, 2000
Miller	U.S. 6,038,320 ("Miller Patent") (Ex. 35)	Mar. 14, 2000
Mirov et al.	U.S. 6,138,236 ("Mirov Patent") (Ex. 36)	Oct. 24, 2000
Fieres et al.	U.S. 6,148,083 ("Fieres Patent") (Ex. 37)	Nov. 14, 2000
Schwartz et al.	U.S. 6,153,835 ("Schwartz Patent") (Ex. 38)	Nov. 28, 2000
Arbaugh et al.	U.S. 6,185,678 ("Arbaugh Patent") (Ex. 39)	Feb. 6, 2001
Misra et al.	U.S. 6,189,146 ("Misra Patent") (Ex. 40)	Feb. 13, 2001
Saunders	U.S. 6,209,099 ("Saunders Patent") (Ex. 41)	Mar. 27, 2001
Pearce et al.	U.S. 6,243,468 ("Pearce Patent") (Ex. 42)	Jun. 5, 2001
Cotichini et al.	U.S. 6,269,392 ("Cotichini Patent") (Ex. 43)	July 31, 2001

sf-3054790

DOCKET ALARM

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.

fastcase
Smarter legal research.