Paper No. __

Filed on behalf of Patent Owner by:
Gerald B. Hrycyszyn, Reg. No. 50,474
Richard F. Giunta, Reg. No. 36,149
Jason Balich, Reg No. 67,110
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, MA 02210
(617) 646-8000 Phone
(617) 646-8646 Fax

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

_____

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

_____

LENOVO (UNITED STATES) INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

LITL LLC,
Patent Owner

_____

Case No. IPR2021-00681
Patent No. 8,289,688

_____

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

A. The Petition Is Procedurally Improper 1

B. The Petition's Grounds Fail on the Merits 3

II. LITL'S '688 PATENT 3

A. Disputed Claims 4

B. The Disputed Claims Cover LiTL's Webbook 5

C. Claimed Aspects of LiTL's Webbook Received Contemporaneous Praise 7

III. THE PETITION FAILED TO IDENTIFY WITH PARTICULARITY HOW THE PRIOR ART IS ALLEGED TO MEET THE DISPUTED CLAIMS 8

A. The Petition's Conclusory Analysis Improperly Relied On a Web of Nested Cross-References 8

B. The Web of Nested Cross-References Improperly Shifts the Burden of Deciphering Petitioner's Arguments onto Patent Owner and the Board 13

IV. LENOVO'S EXPERT TESTIMONY CANNOT SAVE THE PETITION 15

A. The Testimony Merely Parroted the Petition 15

B. The Declaration and Exhibits Cited Therein Cannot Be Incorporated by Reference into the Petition 16

V. LENOVO CIRCUMVENTED THE WORD COUNT LIMIT 17

A. 700+ Words in Images 17

B. The Petition Improperly Moved Arguments to an "Exhibit" 18

C. The Petition Impermissibly Used Atypical Spacing Techniques 18

VI. THE PETITION FAILED TO DEMONSTRATE UNPATENTABILITY OF ANY DISPUTED CLAIM 18

A. Claim Construction 18

1. Display Orientation Module (claims 3-5, 11, 13-14, 16, 19 and 25) 18

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

2. Other Constructions....24
B. The Board Should Not Conduct a Trial on this Facially Deficient Petition....24
C. Ground 1 Fails for Claims 1-7....25
1. Independent Reason 1: Lenovo Failed to Establish that a Computer with a Single-Axis Hinge that Supports Easel Mode Would Have Been Obvious over Shimura and Hisano....25
a. Lenovo Failed to Establish that Hisano's Single-Axis Hinge Was a "Design Choice" for Shimura's Computer Having an Easel Mode....27
b. Lenovo Failed to Establish that the Shimura-Hisano Combination Meets All Claim 1's Elements....29
2. Independent Reason 2: Lenovo Failed to Establish that the Shimura-Hisano Combination Meets Limitation [1c]'s Requirement that the Hinge Assembly Be at Least Partially Housed Within the Base and Display Components....32
3. Independent Reason 3: Lenovo Failed to Even Allege that the Hinge Assembly in the Shimura-Hisano Combination Defines a "Longitudinal Axis Running Along an Interface"....34
D. Ground 1 Fails for Claim 19....37
1. Independent Reason 1: Lenovo Failed to Establish the Cited Prior Art Discloses the Claimed "Display Orientation Module"....37
2. Independent Reason 2: Lenovo Failed to Establish that the Cited Prior Art Discloses a "Frame Mode"....38
a. Frame Mode....38
b. Tablet Mode....39
c. Lenovo Mischaracterized Shimura's Tablet Mode as Frame Mode....42
d. The Petition's Obviousness Arguments Fail Because They Are Based on Shimura's Teaching of Tablet Mode....44
e. Lenovo Failed to Establish that the Shimura-Hisano Combination's Hinge Assembly Supports Frame Mode....46

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

3. Independent Reason 3: Lenovo Failed to Demonstrate [19c]'s "Orientation Sensor" Is Met by the Shimura-Hisano Combination 48
a. The Petition Failed to Identify How or Why Limitation [19c]'s Orientation Sensor Is Met 48
b. The Petition Cannot Meet the Claimed "Orientation Sensor" by Implication 48
E. Ground 1 for Claims 29-32 49
1. Claim 29 49
2. Claims 30-32 49
F. Ground 2 Fails 50
1. Independent Reason 1: Lenovo Failed to Establish that Shimura And Tsuji Render Obvious a Computer with "Integrated Navigation Hardware Control that Would Be Accessible in Each of the Plurality of Modes" 51
a. Lenovo Failed to Establish Shimura's Display Reverse Switch is "Navigation Hardware" as Claimed 52
b. Lenovo's Reliance on Tsuji's Buttons Fails 52
i. Shimura's Laptop 53
ii. Tsuji's PDA 53
iii. Lenovo Failed to Establish a POSA Would Have Put Tsuji's Buttons on Shimura's Laptop 55
iv. Lenovo Failed to Establish that Buttons on the Back of Shimura's Laptop Would Be Accessible in Laptop Mode 60
c. Lenovo's Reliance on Tsuji's Touch Screen Fails 62
i. Lenovo Failed to Establish a Reason for Its Modification to Shimura's Laptop 62
ii. Lenovo Failed to Establish that Tsuji's Touch Screen Meets [12f] 62

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

2. Independent Reason 2: Lenovo Failed to Map Limitation [12c2] to the Shimura-Tsuji Combination 64
G. Ground 3 Fails 64
H. Ground 4 Fails 66
1. Independent Reason 1: Lenovo Failed to Establish Limitations [17b]-[17d] Are Met 66
a. Lenovo Failed to Map [17b]-[17c] to the Prior Art 66
b. Lenovo Failed to Map [17d] to the Prior Art 67
c. Failure to Map [17b]-[17d] to the Prior Art Is Fatal 68
d. Lenovo Failed to Address What "Detecting a Degree of Rotation" Requires 68
2. Independent Reason 2: Lenovo Failed to Map All the Requirements of Limitation [17a] to the Shimura-Hisano-Shigeo Combination 71
I. Ground 5 Fails 72
1. Independent Reason 1: Lenovo Failed to Establish the Combination Meets [11d]'s "Display Orientation Module" 72
a. Lenovo's Construction Failed 72
b. The Petition Failed to Apply Its Own Construction of the Function of the Alleged Means-Plus-Function Limitation 73
2. Independent Reason 2: Lenovo Failed to Establish that a POSA Following the Teachings of Shimura, Hisano, Shigeo and Choi Would Have Been Led to a Computer that Meets [11c]'s Means for Rotation 74
a. Lenovo Failed to Establish that a POSA Would Have Used the Single-Axis Hinge Assembly of Hisano or Choi in Shimura's Computer that Is Configurable in Easel Mode 75
b. Lenovo Failed to Establish the Shimura-Hisano-Shigeo-Choi Combination Meets [11c]'s Function 77
c. Lenovo Failed to Establish that the Shimura-Hisano-Shigeo-Choi Combination Has the Specification's Corresponding Structure for [11c] or an Equivalent 78
VII. CONCLUSION 81

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

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.