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.

_____

IPR Case No. IPR2021-00786
U.S. Patent No. 9,880,715

_____

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. LITL'S '715 PATENT 3

A. The Challenged Claims 4

B. The Challenged Claims Cover LiTL's Webbook 4

C. The '715 Patent Improved the User Experience by Providing Different "Views" for Different Modes 7

III. LENOVO'S EXPERT TESTIMONY IS ENTITLED TO NO WEIGHT 13

IV. THE DECLARATION AND NUMEROUS EXHIBITS CITED ONLY THEREIN CANNOT BE INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE INTO THE PETITION 14

V. THE PETITION FAILED TO DEMONSTRATE UNPATENTABILITY OF ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM 15

A. Claim Construction 15

B. Grounds 1-2 Both Fail for Three Reasons Common to Both Grounds 15

1. Independent Reason 1: The Petition Failed to Establish the Shimura-Tsuji Combination Meets the Claimed "Execution Component" Under the Petition's Means-Plus-Function Analysis 16

a. Alleged Means-Plus-Function Limitations 16

b. Lenovo Bears the Burden to Prove Its Case 18

c. The Petition's Failure to Identify All Corresponding Structure for Each Alleged Means-Term Is Contrary to Law 19

d. The Petition's Failure to Identify an Algorithm Performed By the Software "Program(s)" the Petition Identifies as Corresponding Structure for Its Alleged Means-Plus-Function Limitations is Contrary to Law 21

e. Conclusion On Lenovo's Failure to Properly Construe Alleged Means-Plus-Function Limitations 23

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

2. Independent Reason 2: All Grounds Fail Because the Petition Fails to Establish the Shimura-Tsuji Computer Has a "Plurality of Views" as Claimed....24
a. Lenovo Implicitly Interpreted "Plurality of Views" (Claims 1, 17, and 20) as Two Orientations of the Same Organization of Displayed Content....26
b. The Specification Confirms a "View" Is an Organization of Displayed Content – Not the Displayed Content's Orientation....28
i. All Examples of Different Views Have Different Organization of Displayed Content and/or Different Content....29
ii. Different Orientations Are Described as Distinct from Different Views....31
iii. Treating Different Orientations as Different Views Is Inconsistent with the Specification's Explanation of the Benefits Different Views Provide....33
iv. Lenovo's Construction Is Wrong Because It Is Inconsistent with the Specification....38
c. The Claims Use "Plurality of Views" Consistent with the Specification's Usage....42
d. Conclusion – The Petition's Reliance on Different Orientations of the Same Displayed Content as Being Different Views Fails....44
3. Independent Reason 3: The Petition Failed to Establish a POSA Would Have Arrived at the Shimura-Tsuji Computer (Ground 1) or the Shimura-Tsuji-Pogue Computer (Ground 2)....45
a. Grounds 1 and 2 Both Rely on a "Computer" Having the Features of the "Shimura-Tsuji Computer"....47
b. The Petition Alleges a POSA Would Have Incorporated Tsuji's Gravity Sensor into Shimura's Laptop Only to Distinguish Between Easel and Frame Modes....48
c. Lenovo Failed to Establish Shimura Has a Frame Mode....50

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

i. Frame Mode 50

ii. Tablet Mode 51

iii. The Petition Mischaracterizes Shimura's Tablet Mode as Frame Mode 54

iv. The Petition's Rationale Relies Repeatedly on Shimura Having an Alleged Frame Mode 55

d. Conclusion – Petition Failed to Prove a Reason to Make the Combinations Relied on in Grounds 1-2 59

C. Ground 2 Fails for Additional Reasons 59

1. The Petition Fails to Map All Limitations in Dependent Claims 2-16 to the Shimura-Tsuji-Pogue Computer 60

2. Independent Claim 17 and its Dependent Claims 18-19 62

3. Lenovo Failed to Show a POSA Would Have Formed the Shimura-Tsuji-Pogue Computer with a Reasonable Expectation of Success 65

a. The Petition Provides No Supportable Reason to Use Windows XP in the Shimura-Tsuji Computer 65

b. Citation to Its Expert Cannot Save Lenovo 68

c. Pogue's 2004 Windows XP OS Does Not Accept Pen Input that Shimura's Tablet Mode Requires Which Is Fatal to Lenovo's Combination 69

d. Lenovo Never Explains Why a POSA Would Have Selected *Pogue's* Windows XP as a Suitable Operating System for the Shimura-Tsuji Computer 71

e. Lenovo Never Explains how the Shimura-Tsuji-Pogue Combination Meets the Hardware Requirements to Run XP 72

f. Conclusion – The Petition Failed to Establish a POSA Would Have Arrived at the Shimura-Tsuji-Pogue Computer 73

VI. CONCLUSION 74

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Arctic Cat Inc. v. Polaris Industries, Inc.,
795 Fed. Appx. 827 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....58

Arista Networks Inc. v. Cisco Systems, Inc.,
908 F.3d 792 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....41

Arista Networks, Inc. v. Cisco Systems, Inc.,
IPR2015-00976, Paper 9 (PTAB Oct. 19, 2015).....20

Aristocrat Technologies v. International Game Technology,
521 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....22

Askeladden LLC v. Digital Verification Systems LLC,
IPR2018-00745, Paper 9 (PTAB Aug. 24, 2018).....22

Bell Atlantic Network Services, Inc. v. Covad Communications Group, Inc.,
262 F.3d 1258 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....41

Cardiac Pacemakers, Inc. v. St. Jude Med., Inc.,
296 F.3d 1106 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....20

Cisco Systems Inc. v. C-Cation Technologies,
IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (PTAB Aug. 29, 2014).....14

DePuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.,
567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009)..... 67, 68, 70

Duo Security Inc. v. StrikeForce Technologies, Inc.,
IPR2017-01064, Paper 7 (PTAB October 16, 2017).....18

Eli Lilly and Company v. Zenith Goldline Pharmaceuticals, Inc.,
471 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....71

Finisar Corporation v. DirecTV Group, Inc.,
523 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....22

Fitbit Inc. v. Koninklijke Philips N.V.,
IPR2020-00774, Paper 13 (PTAB Oct. 16, 2020).....13

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.