

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

APPLE, INC.

Petitioner

v.

MEMORYWEB, LLC

Patent Owner

Patent No. 10,621,228

---

*Inter Partes* Review No. IPR2022-00031

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE  
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	Page(s)
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Overview of the ‘228 Patent.....	2
A. The ‘228 patent.....	2
B. Relevant Prosecution History.....	5
1. The Related ‘426 Application.....	5
2. The ‘228 Patent.....	7
III. Summary of References Identified by Petitioner.....	8
A. A3UM (Ex. 1005).....	8
B. Belitz (Ex. 1006).....	10
IV. The Board Should Deny Institution Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....	11
A. Substantially The Same Art Was Already Considered.....	12
1. The Office Already Considered Art That Is Substantially the Same as A3UM.....	12
2. The Office Already Considered Art That Is Substantially the Same as Belitz.....	20
3. The Office Already Substantially the Same Combination.....	22
B. Petitioner Did Not Show How the Office Allegedly Erred.....	24
V. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	25
VI. Claim Construction.....	25
VII. Petitioner Has Not Established a Reasonable Likelihood of Success.....	26
A. Petitioner Has Not Established That the Applied References Qualify as Printed Publication Prior Art.....	26
1. A3UM (Ex. 1005).....	27
2. Other Non-Prior Art.....	44
B. Independent Claim 1.....	47
1. Petitioner fails to show that A3UM discloses or renders obvious a “third/[fourth] set of digital files including digital photographs	

and videos”.....	47
2. Petitioner fails to meet its burden to show a POSITA would combine A3UM and Belitz .....	54
3. Petitioner does not identify the alleged “first[/second] location view in A3UM-Belitz with specificity.....	62
C. Dependent Claims .....	65
VIII. Conclusion.....	65

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Acceleration Bay, LLC v. Activision Blizzard Inc.</i> , 908 F.3d 765, 772 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....	27, 31
<i>Advanced Bionics, LLC v. Med-EL Elektromedizinische Gerate GmbH</i> , IPR2019-01469, Paper 6 (PTAB Feb. 13, 2020).....	11, 24, 25
<i>Arctic Cat Inc. v. Bombardier Recreational Prod. Inc.</i> , 876 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	54
<i>Becton, Dickinson &amp; Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG</i> , IPR2017-01586, Paper 8 (PTAB Dec. 15, 2017) .....	12, 24
<i>Blue Calypso, LLC v. Groupon, Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1331, 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	26
<i>Callaway Golf Co. v. Acushnet Co.</i> , 576 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	65
<i>Capsugel Belgium NV v. Innercap Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00331, Paper 9 at 15 (PTAB Dec. 9, 2013) .....	33
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Centripetal Networks, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-01436, Paper 40 (PTAB Jan. 23, 2020) .....	35, 36, 38
<i>Dominion Dealer Sols., LLC v. AutoAlert, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00684, Paper 9 at 8 (PTAB Oct. 6, 2014).....	45
<i>Eli Lilly &amp; Co. v. Teva Pharms. Int’l GmbH</i> , 8 F.4th 1331, 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2021) .....	45
<i>Ex Parte Stuart A. Nelson</i> , No. 2020-004978, 2020 WL 8186425, at *15 (PTAB Dec. 31, 2020)).....	35

<i>Hulu, LLC v. Sound View Innovations, LLC</i> , IPR2018-01039, Paper 29 at 9 (PTAB Dec. 20, 2019) .....	27, 37
<i>In re Hall</i> , 781 F.2d 897, 898-99 (Fed. Cir. 1986) .....	27
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith &amp; Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342, 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	57, 61
<i>Molins PLC v. Textron, Inc.</i> , 48 F.3d 1172 (Fed. Cir. 1995) .....	12
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Icon Health Fitness Inc.</i> , IPR2017-01363, Paper 33 at 15-21 (PTAB Nov. 28, 2018) .....	42, 43
<i>Nidec Motor Corp. v. Zhongshan Broad Ocean Motor Co.</i> , 868 F.3d 1013 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	25
<i>Polaris Indus., Inc. v. Arctic Cat, Inc.</i> , 882 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....	60
<i>Power Integrations, Inc. v. Fairchild Semiconductor Int’l, Inc.</i> , 711 F.3d 1348, 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	62
<i>Quad Envtl. Techs. Corp. v. Union Sanitary Dist.</i> , 946 F.2d 870, 875 (Fed. Cir. 1991) .....	34, 35
<i>Qualcomm Inc. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 24 F.4th 1367, 2022 WL 288013 (Fed. Cir. 2022).....	34, 35, 44, 46
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Infobridge Pte. Ltd.</i> , 929 F.3d 1363, 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2019) .....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Sandoz Inc. v. Abbvie Biotechnology Ltd.</i> , IPR2018-000002, Paper 13 at 12-13 (May 3, 2018) .....	39
<i>Supercell Oy v. GREE, Inc.</i> , IPR2021-00501, Paper at 6 (PTAB Aug. 17, 2021).....	33

# 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.