

U.S. Patent No. 10,621,228  
Patent Owner's Sur-Reply  
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 SUR-REPLY**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. The Reply is Improper.....1

II. Claim Construction.....2

    A. Limitations [1b], [1d], [1e] and claim 3 .....2

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

III. Petitioner Has Failed to Meet Its Burden Under Grounds 1 - 4.....9

    A. Limitation [1c]: “the map view including: (i) an interactive map”.....9

    B. Limitation [1d] the “map view including . . . [first/second] location selectable thumbnail image[s]” .....10

        1. Okamura Disparages Features Relevant to Flora.....10

        2. Okamura’s Stated “Preference” Is Relevant Even if Okamura Does Not Teach Away.....13

        3. Petitioner’s Reliance on Okamura Figs. 27A-B and Fig. 41 is Misplaced.....14

    C. Limitations [1b], [1d] and [1e]: “responsive to a first input, causing a map view to be displayed”.....17

    D. Limitations [1g] and [1j]: “[a first/second location view including] a first/second location name associated with the first/second location” .....18

        1. Okamura and Flora (Ground 1) .....18

        2. Okamura, Flora, and Gilley (Ground 2) / Okamura, Flora, Wagner, and Gilley (Ground 4) .....19

    E. Limitations [1n] and [1p]: “the people view including: . . . a first name . . . [and] . . . a second name” .....20

        1. Okamura and Flora (Ground 1) .....20

        2. Okamura, Flora, and Gilley (Ground 3) / Okamura, Flora, Wagner, and Gilley (Ground 4) .....20

    F. Claim 3: “the first indication feature is connected to the first location selectable thumbnail image” .....20

    G. Claim 5: “the map view further includes a first indication feature” and “second indication feature” .....22

IV. Samsung and Apple are Unnamed RPIs.....23

**REDACTED VERSION**

U.S. Patent No. 10,621,228  
Patent Owner’s Sur-Reply  
IPR2021-01413

A. Apple and Samsung Desire Review of the ‘228 Patent and Benefit from Unified’s Petition.....24

B. Unified Filed This IPR at the Behest of Paid Members Apple and Samsung.....25

C. The Board Cannot Disregard the Statutory Requirement to Name all RPIs.....27

U.S. Patent No. 10,621,228  
 Patent Owner’s Sur-Reply  
 IPR2021-01413

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Federal Cases</b>	
<i>Am. Calcar, Inc. v. Am. Honda Motor Co.</i> , 651 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	3, 5, 8
<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.</i> , 839 F.3d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	13
<i>Applications in Internet Time, LLC v. RPX Corp.</i> , 897 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....	23, 24, 25
<i>Bausch &amp; Lomb, Inc. v. Barnes-Hind/Hydrocurve, Inc.</i> , 796 F.2d 443 (Fed. Cir. 1986) .....	21, 22
<i>Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	2, 19
<i>InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGO Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	15
<i>Lumentum Holdings, Inc. v. Capella Photonics, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00739, Paper 38 (PTAB Mar. 4, 2016).....	27
<i>Micron Tech., Inc. v. N. Star Innovations, Inc.</i> , No. IPR2018-00989, 2019 WL 5423610 (PTAB Oct. 22, 2019).....	4
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. FG SRC, LLC</i> 860 F. App'x 708 (Fed. Cir. 2021).....	3, 4
<i>NetApp, Inc. v. Proven Networks, LLC</i> , IPR2020-01436, Paper 33 (Apr. 07, 2022).....	18
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	8
<i>Polaris Indus., Inc. v. Arctic Cat, Inc.</i> , 882 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....	13, 14

**REDACTED VERSION**

U.S. Patent No. 10,621,228  
Patent Owner’s Sur-Reply  
IPR2021-01413

*Power Integrations, Inc. v. Semiconductor Components Indus., LLC*,  
No. IPR2018-00180, 2019 WL 2237863 (PTAB May 23, 2019) .....4, 5

*RPX Corp. v. Applications in Internet Time, LLC*,  
IPR2015-01750, Paper 128, 24-25 (PTAB Oct. 2, 2020) .....24, 25, 26

*Sandisk Corp. v. Memorex Prods.*,  
415 F.3d 1278 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....6

*Wasica Fin. GmbH v. Cont'l Auto. Sys.*,  
853 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....6

**Federal Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 312.....27

**Regulations**

37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b) .....2

# 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.