

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

NINTENDO CO., LTD., and NINTENDO OF AMERICA INC.,
Petitioners,

v.

ANCORA TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2021-01338
U.S. Patent No. 6,411,941 B1

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. SUMMARY OF THE '941 PATENT	2
A. The Inventions Disclosed in the '941 Patent.....	2
B. The Challenged Claims	6
C. Prosecution History	7
1. Non-Final Office Action, December 20, 2000	7
2. Amendment, May 23, 2001	10
3. Final Office Action, June 22, 2001	10
4. Amendment and Request for Continued Examination, November 16, 2001	11
5. Non-Final Office Action, January 15, 2002	11
6. Amendment, February 5, 2002	17
7. Notice of Allowability, March 28, 2002	18
D. Prior Invalidity Challenges.....	20
1. Microsoft's Reexamination No. 90/010,560.....	20
2. Apple Litigation	26
3. HTC's Failed Petition for CBM Review	27
4. HTC's Failed Patentable Subject Matter Challenge	27
5. TCL's IPR Petition Asserting Hellman and Chou and the "Me-Too" Challengers.....	28
6. Samsung's Failed Inter Partes Review Petition.....	28
E. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	29

F.	Claim Interpretation	30
1.	“Agent”	32
III.	SUMMARY OF THE ASSERTED REFERENCES.....	36
A.	Hellman	37
B.	Chou	43
C.	Shneck	46
IV.	PETITIONER FAILS TO ESTABLISH OBVIOUSNESS BASED ON EITHER ASSERTED GROUND.....	48
A.	Governing Legal Principles.....	49
B.	Claim 1: The Petition Fails to Establish a Valid Motivation for Combining Hellman With Chou	52
1.	The Petition’s Asserted Motivations to Combine Hellman with Chou Are Logically Flawed.....	52
2.	Petitioners Do Not Offer Any Motivation for Storing Hellman’s Value “M” in the Memory Area “Used By the BIOS”	55
C.	Claim 1: Petitioners’ Combinations Fail to Identify the Claimed Step of Using an Agent to Set Up a Verification Structure in the Erasable, Non-Volatile Memory of the BIOS.....	56
1.	The Petition Wholly Fails to Identify Any Teaching in the Combined References of the claimed “Agent,” Which Requires an “OS-Level Software Program or Routine”	57
2.	The Petition Fails to Identify a Legally Sufficient Motivation For Modifying Hellman’s Update Unit 36 or Authorization and Billing Unit 13 to Be Software-Based.....	59
3.	The Petition Improperly Conflates the Memory of the BIOS and the Verification Structure, Which the Claim Requires to be Separate.....	62

D.	Dependent Claims 3, 8, 9, 14: The Allegedly Combined System Proposed in the Petition Would Not Function for its Intended Purpose	64
E.	Dependent Claims 2, 6–7, 10–13 Are Not Obvious For All of the Same Reasons as Claim 1.....	66
F.	Objective Evidence Establishes Non-Obviousness of the Claimed Invention	66
1.	A Leading BIOS Company Praised the Claimed Invention and Agreed to Commercialize	66
2.	Additional Licenses Establish the Significance of the Claimed Invention.....	69
V.	CONCLUSION	71

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page</u>
Cases	
<i>Activevideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc’ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	51
<i>Akzo N.V. v. United States ITC</i> , 808 F.2d 1471 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	50
<i>Ancora Techs., Inc. v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 744 F.3d 732 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	27, 35, 36, 70
<i>Ancora Techs., Inc. v. HTC Am., Inc.</i> , 908 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	27, 28
<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.</i> , 839 F.3d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	66, 67
<i>Bosch Automotive Service Solutions, LLC v. Matal</i> , 878 F.3d 1027 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	68
<i>Comcast Cable Commc’ns, LLC v. Rovi Guides, Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00299, Paper 45 (PTAB June 29, 2020)	52
<i>Custom Accessories, Inc. v. Jeffrey-Allan Indus., Inc.</i> , 807 F.2d 955 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	66
<i>Fox Factory Inc. v. SRAM LLC</i> , 944 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	67
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966)	50
<i>Henny Penny Corp. v. Frymaster LLC</i> , 938 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	67
<i>Impax Laboratories Inc. v. Lannett Holdings Inc.</i> , 893 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	69
<i>In re Dow Chem. Co.</i> , 837 F.2d 469 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	51, 62
<i>In re Evanega</i> , 829 F.2d 1110 (Fed. Cir. 1987)	50
<i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	51
<i>In re Huang</i> , 100 F.3d 135 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	67
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	50, 61, 62

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.