

Filed on behalf of: Patent Owner Nant Holdings IP, LLC

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

NIANTIC, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

NANT HOLDINGS IP, LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2021-01133  
U.S. Patent No. 10,403,051

---

**PATENT OWNER NANT HOLDINGS IP, LLC'S PRELIMINARY  
RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iii
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. THE '051 PATENT .....	3
A. Teachings of the Patent Specification .....	3
B. Patent Claims .....	6
III. LEVEL OF SKILL IN THE ART .....	8
IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	8
V. THE PETITION'S REFERENCES .....	10
A. Yu (Ex. 1003) .....	10
B. Sanz-Pastor (Ex. 1004) .....	11
C. Mullen (Ex. 1005) .....	12
VI. THE BOARD SHOULD EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION TO DENY THE PETITION FOR VIOLATING BOARD RULES .....	13
A. The Petition Fails to Provide Required Claim Constructions or Support Therefor in Violation of 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3) .....	13
B. The Petition Improperly Incorporates the Zyda Declaration to Evade the Board's 14,000-Word Limit on IPR Petitions in Violation of 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4) .....	16
VII. THE PETITION SHOULD BE REJECTED UNDER SECTION 314(a) BECAUSE THE PETITIONER IS UNLIKELY TO PREVAIL WITH RESPECT TO ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM .....	18
A. Grounds 1–3: The Elements of the '051 Patent's Claims 1 and 43 are Not Taught by Yu, Sanz-Pastor, or Mullen, and Are Not Inherent Based on Yu .....	20
1. The Petition Does Not Identify a “Virtual Element Attribute” in Yu, Sanz-Pastor, or Mullen .....	20
2. The Petition Does Not Show that Yu, Sanz-Pastor, or Mullen Teach to “Determine Whether to Alter Presence of a Relevant AR Object” .....	25

**TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
B. Grounds 1–3: The Petition Has Not Shown the Unpatentability of the '051 Patent's Dependent Claims 5–11, 15, 18, 22–29, 34, 36, and 38 .....	29
1. Claim 15: The Petition Does Not Show that Sanz-Pastor Discloses or Renders Obvious “the Relevant AR Objects is Caused to be Rendered According to a Haptic Format” .....	31
2. Claim 18: The Petition Does Not Show that Yu Teaches “the Presence of the Relevant AR Object is Altered to Include a Non-Visible Presence” .....	33
C. Grounds 1–3: The Petition Fails to Provide Proper Motivation to Combine Yu and Sanz-Pastor .....	36
D. Grounds 1–3: The Petition Fails to Consider the Required <i>Graham</i> Factors .....	42
VIII. CONCLUSION.....	44

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES*****Cases****3Shape A/S v. Align Tech., Inc.,*

IPR2020-00173, Paper 14 (June 12, 2020) .....30

*ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc.,*

694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....40

*Albany Int'l Corp. v. Kimberly-Clark Worldwide, Inc.,*

PGR2021-00019, Paper 22 (PTAB Jun. 22, 2021) .....37

*Apple, Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.,*

IPR2015-00355, Paper 9 (PTAB Jun. 26, 2015).....43

*Ariosa Diagnostics v. Verinata Health, Inc.,*

805 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....36

*Blackberry Corp. v. Mobilemedia Ideas LLC,*

IPR2013-00016, Paper 32 (Feb. 25, 2014).....18

*Cisco Sys., Inc., v. C-Cation Techs., LLC,*

IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (Aug. 29, 2014)..... 18, 42

*Dominion Dealer Solutions, LLC. v. Autoalert, Inc.,*

IPR2013-00225, Paper 15 (Oct. 10, 2013) .....30

*Fid. Nat'l Info. Servs., Inc. v. DataTreasury Corp.,*

IPR2014-00489, 2014 WL 4059220 (PTAB Aug. 13, 2014) .....17

*Graham v. John Deere Co.,*

383 U.S. 1 (1966)..... 42, 43, 44

*Hon Hai Precision Indus. Co. v. Asia Vital Components Co.,*

No. 03-cv-0093-SVW(MCX), 2004 WL 5806997 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 12,

2004).....38

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (Continued)**

	<b><u>Page(s)</u></b>
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.,</i>	
676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	42
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.,</i>	
829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	37
<i>In re NuVasive, Inc.,</i>	
842 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	36, 37
<i>In re Stepan Co.,</i>	
868 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	36
<i>In re Warsaw Orthopedic, Inc.,</i>	
832 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	36
<i>Infinera Corp. v. Core Optical Techs. LLC,</i>	
IPR2018-01259, 2019 WL 3059846 (PTAB July 11, 2019) .....	15
<i>Intri-Plex Techs. v. St. Gobain,</i>	
IPR2014-00309, Paper 83 (PTAB March 23, 2014) .....	42
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,</i>	
550 U.S. 398 (2007) .....	37
<i>LG Elecs. Inc. v. Core Wireless Licensing S.A.R.L.,</i>	
IPR2016-00986, Paper 12 (PTAB Aug. 22, 2016) .....	13
<i>Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.,</i>	
CBM2012-00003, Paper 7 (PTAB Oct. 25, 2012) .....	44
<i>Moses Lake Indus., Inc. v. Enthone, Inc.,</i>	
IPR2014- 00243, Paper 6 (PTAB Jun. 18, 2014) .....	44
<i>PersonalWeb Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc.,</i>	
848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	36

# 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.