UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

UNIFIED PATENTS, LLC
Petitioner

v.

MEMORYWEB, LLC
Patent Owner

IPR2021-01413 U.S. PATENT 10,621,228

PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE



TABLE OF CONTENTS

| I. | CLA | CLAIM CONSTRUCTION | | | | |
|------|----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|--|--|
| | A. | Limitations [1b], [1d], [1e]/Claim 3 | | | | |
| | B. | Limitations [1n], [1p]/Claim 5 | | | | |
| II. | THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE | | | | | |
| | A. | Limitation [1c] | | | | |
| | B. | Limitation [1d] | | | | |
| | | 1. | Okamura Does Not Teach Away | 4 | | |
| | | 2. | Okamura's Related Art is Different from Flora | 10 | | |
| | | 3. | A POSITA Would Have Been Motivated to Combine Okamura and Flora | 15 | | |
| | C. | Limitations [1d], [1e], [1f], [1i] (thumbnail image) | | 17 | | |
| | D. | Limitations [1b], [1d], and [1e] | | | | |
| | E. | Lim | Limitations [1g] and [1j] | | | |
| | | 1. | Okamura and Flora (Ground 1) | 18 | | |
| | | 2. | Okamura, Flora, and Wagner (Ground 2)/Okamura, Flora, Wagner, and Gilley (Ground 4) | 19 | | |
| | F. | Limitations [1n] and [1p] | | 20 | | |
| | | 1. | Okamura and Flora (Ground 1) | 20 | | |
| | | 2. | Okamura, Flora, and Gilley (Ground 3)/Okamura, Flora, Wagner, and Gilley (Ground 4) | 20 | | |
| | G. | Dependent Claims 2, 4, and 6-7 | | 21 | | |
| | Н. | Claim 3 | | | | |
| | I. | Claim 5 | | | | |
| | J. | Okamura, Flora, Wagner, and Gilley (Ground 4) | | | | |
| III. | REAL PARTY IN INTEREST AND ESTOPPEL | | | | | |
| | A. | Unified is the Sole RPI | | | | |



REDACTED VERSION

IPR2021-01413 U.S. Patent 10,621,228

| | 1. | Business Model | 23 |
|----|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| | 2. | No Benefit to Any Individual Members | 25 |
| | 3. | No Considering or Representing of Any Member Interest or Desire | 27 |
| | 4. | Remaining Factors | 33 |
| B. | Anv | Inquiry into 8315(e) is Both Premature and Irrelevant | 33 |



I. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION

Even under PO's incorrect interpretations, claims 1-7 (the "Challenged Claims") are unpatentable.

A. Limitations [1b], [1d], [1e]/Claim 3

PO alleges the plain and ordinary meaning requires the "map view" displayed in response to the "first input" must "includ[e]" first and second "thumbnail image[s]...on the interactive map" and an "indication feature" connected to the first thumbnail image. POR, 27-28, 30-31. PO asserts there cannot be any intervening inputs between the first input and displaying the map view. *Id.*, 27-28, 30-31, 52-54, 64-66. As an initial matter, the Okamura-Flora combination does not have any intervening inputs as discussed below in Sections II.D and II.H.

Regardless, the intrinsic record does not restrict these limitations as PO asserts—that displaying a map view is solely responsive to a first input. EX1038, ¶¶9-15, 21-26 (plain meaning encompasses intervening inputs). No restrictions exist in the claim language. *Id.*; EX1001, claims 1, 3. Dr. Reinman's declaration parroting the POR is unhelpful. POR, 27-28, 30-31; EX2038, 73-77, 82-87. The specification is unsupportive; 23:34-35,¹ 29:41-56, and Figure 41 do not exclude intervening inputs. POR, 28; EX1001, 23:34-35; EX1038, ¶¶9-15, 21-26. Dr. Reinman admitted



1

¹ Column 43 does not exist. PO likely intended column 23.

Figure 41 is not limiting. EX1034, 51:14-19. Mere embodiments should not limit claims. *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2005). And the file history is silent. EX1003.

B. Limitations [1n], [1p]/Claim 5

PO alleges the plain and ordinary meaning requires the "people view" must include displaying a first name and a second name simultaneously in the same view (limitations[1n], [1p]) and the "map view" must display a first indication feature and second indication feature simultaneously in the same view (claim 5). POR, 28-29, 32, 63, 66-68.

The claim language is unsupportive as it does not recite the alleged restriction. EX1001, claims 1, 5. EX1038, ¶16-20, 27-30. The specification is not limiting; nowhere (including 22:59-23:4, Figures 32 & 41) is there a **requirement** according to PO's assertion. *Id.* These passages teach an example. The file history is silent. *See generally*, EX1003. Dr. Reinman's declaration is unhelpful as it again parrots the POR. POR, 28-29, 32; EX2038, 78-81, 88-90. The claims should not be limited beyond their plain meaning. *Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1323. A POSITA would not have understood the plain meaning as having the requirement argued by PO and would have instead understood it encompasses first and second names displayed at different times in a people view and first and second indication features displayed at different times in a map view. EX1038, ¶16-20, 27-30. Louie corroborates this



DOCKET

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.

