

U.S. Patent No. 10,621,228
Patent Owner's Request for Rehearing
IPR2021-01413

Paper No. ____

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

UNIFIED PATENTS, LLC
Petitioner

v.

MEMORYWEB, LLC
Patent Owner

Patent No. 10,621,228

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2021-01413

PATENT OWNER'S REQUEST FOR REHEARING

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....1

II. Applicable Rules.....1

III. Requested Relief.....1

IV. Argument2

 A. The Board Overlooked Patent Owner’s Argument that Unified
 Improperly Introduced New Evidence and Argument in Its Reply2

 B. The Board Should Rehear Its Determinations as to Limitations [1b], [1d],
 and [1e] and Claim 3.....3

 1. The Board Failed to Resolve the Parties’ Dispute Concerning the
 Appropriate Construction of “Responsive To”3

 2. The Board Overlooked Evidence and Argument in Finding Okamura-
 Flora Meet Limitations [1b], [1d], and [1e]4

 3. The Board Overlooked Evidence and Argument in Finding Claim 3
 Unpatentable.....5

 C. The Board Should Rehear Its Determinations as to Limitations [1n] and
 [1p] and Claim 57

 1. The Board Misapprehended Patent Owner’s Arguments When It
 Construed Limitations [1n] and [1p].....7

 2. The Board Similarly Misapprehended Patent Owner’s Arguments When
 It Construed Claim 511

 3. The Board Overlooked Evidence and Argument by Finding Okamura
 Meets Limitations [1n] and [1p].....11

 4. The Board Overlooked Evidence and Argument in Finding Claim 5
 Unpatentable.....12

 D. The Board Overlooked Evidence and Argument in Adopting Petitioner’s
 Proposed Okamura – Flora Combination13

 E. The Board Committed Legal Error by Improperly Shifting the Burden to
 Patent Owner to Prove Patentability.....14

V. Conclusion15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Federal Cases	
<i>Bausch & Lomb, Inc. v. Barnes-Hind/Hydrocurve, Inc.</i> , 796 F.2d 443 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	7
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat'l Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	5
<i>Fisher & Paykel Healthcare v. ResMed Pty Ltd.</i> , IPR2017-00061, Paper 37 (July 5, 2018)	10
<i>Homeland Housewares, LLC v. Whirlpool Corp.</i> , 865 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	3
<i>Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	2
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools International, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	15
<i>O2 Micro Int'l Ltd. v. Beyond Innovation Tech. Co.</i> , 521 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	3
<i>Polaris Indus., Inc. v. Arctic Cat, Inc.</i> , 882 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2018). POR, 47-49	14
<i>Power Integrations, Inc. v. Lee</i> , 797 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	10
<i>SuperGuide Corp. v. DirecTV</i> , 358 F.3d 870 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	8
<i>Trivascular, Inc. v. Samuels</i> , 812 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	13
Federal Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 316(e)	15

U.S. Patent No. 10,621,228
Patent Owner's Patent Owner's Request for Rehearing
IPR2021-01413

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b)2
37 C.F.R. § 42.71(c).....1
37 C.F.R § 42.71(d)1

LISTING OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit No.	Description
2001	WITHDRAWN
2002	Japanese Unexamined Patent Application Publication No. 2001-160058 and Certified English Translation (“Fujiwara”)
2003	Japanese Unexamined Patent Application Publication No. 2007-323544 and Certified English Translation (“Takakura”)
2004	U.S. Patent No. 9,552,376 (“the ’376 patent”)
2005	U.S. Patent No. 10,423,658 (“the ’658 patent”)
2006	U.S. Patent No. 11,163,823 (“the ’823 patent”)
2007	’376 patent Prosecution History
2008	Reserved
2009	Transcript of October 15, 2019 Deposition of Kevin Jakel (IPR2019-00482)
2010	Non-confidential Brief of Barkan Wireless IP Holdings on Appeal from IPR2018-01186
2011	3 Questions for Unified Patents CEO Post-Oil States (Part II)
2012	Brief of Amicus Curiae Unified Patents Inc. in <i>Cuozzo Speed Technologies, LLC v. Michelle K. Lee et al.</i>
2013	Unified Patents September 3, 2021 Press Release regarding MemoryWeb IPR
2014	Unified Patents September 9, 2021 email regarding MemoryWeb IPR

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.