UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD APPLE, INC., Petitioner,

v.

FUTURE LINK SYSTEMS, LLC,

Patent Owner.

Case No.: IPR2021-01488

U.S. Patent No. 6,807,505

PATENT OWNER FUTURE LINK SYSTEMS, LLC'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION		
II.	OVERVIEW OF '505 PATENT AND CHALLENGED CLAIMS		
III.	PETITIONER FAILS TO PRESENT A PROPER BASIS FOR INSTITUTION		
	A. Pe	titioner Fails To Apply The Claim Elements Consistently	4
	B. Pe	titioner Fails To Apply Its Own Claim Construction	5
IV.	THE BOARD SHOULD EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION TO DENY INSTITUITION		7
	1.	Whether the court granted a stay or evidence exists that one may be granted if a proceeding is instituted	9
	2.	Proximity of the court's trial date to the Board's projected statutory deadline for a final written decision	10
	3.	Investment in the parallel proceeding by the court and the parties	10
	4.	Overlap between issues raised in the petition and in the parallel proceeding	11
	5.	Whether the petitioner and the defendant in the parallel proceeding are the same party	12
	6.	Other circumstances that impact the Board's exercise of discretion, including the merits	12
	7.	All factors favor denying institution	12
V.		USION	



EXHIBITS

Exhibit No.	Description
2001	Joint Agreed Scheduling Order, dated October 7, 2021 (Dkt. 29)
2002	Defendant's Preliminary Invalidity Contentions, dated September 16, 2021



I. INTRODUCTION

The Petition seeks review of claims 1, 6, and 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,807,505 (the "'505 patent") on a single asserted ground of single reference obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Claim 1 is the only challenged independent claim. The challenged claims relate to testing electronic circuits and the use of a test unit to test interconnects between the electronic circuit and other electronic circuits using a combinatorial circuit. The claims contemplate an electronic circuit comprising various elements, including interconnects – input/output nodes, a main unit, and a test unit. The Petition, however, contains significant inconsistencies in its attempt to identify the claim elements in the prior art. These inconsistencies constitute a failure of the Petition to meet the basic standard for institution.

Additionally, the Board should exercise its discretion and decline to institute the Petition under the *Fintiv* criteria. Petitioner conceded that the trial date proposed for the parallel District Court action is approximately two months before the final decision date for this matter. Since the filing of the Petition, the District Court entered the schedule proposed by the parties. Petitioner offers little more than speculation to suggest that this date will change based on unproduced and unverifiable data. But even if Petitioner's "evidence" in Exhibit 1010 were to be accepted, it shows that even if the average amount of "slippage" of the trial date occurred, trial would still occur well before the final decision date for this



proceeding. Thus, Patent Owner respectfully submits that the Board should apply its discretion to deny institution of the Petition for this additional reason.

II. OVERVIEW OF '505 PATENT AND CHALLENGED CLAIMS

The '505 patent (Ex. 1001) issued October 19, 2004 from a U.S. Application filed July 16, 2003. It claims priority to several foreign applications, the earliest of which was filed February 22, 1998. The '505 patent discloses improved electronic circuits containing test units for testing interconnects of the electronic circuits. In particular, the patent teaches the use of test units comprising a combinatorial circuit implementing at least one of an XNOR and an XOR function.

The '505 patent explains that the invention provides for efficient testing of interconnects without the need for compliance with a particular protocol. Ex. 1001 at col. 2:25-54. It further relates to an electronic circuit that includes a test unit for testing interconnects as part of the circuit itself. *Id.* at col. 1:7-15. The patent goes on to provide various examples of test units implemented using combinatorial circuits. *See generally*, Ex. 1001 at col. 9:57-12:20.

The Petition challenges claims 1, 6, and 8. Only claim 1 is independent. It recites:

1. An electronic circuit comprising:

a plurality of input/output (I/O) nodes for connecting the electronic circuit to a further electronic circuit via interconnects,



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.

