

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 RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page(s)
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. OVERVIEW OF THE ‘228 PATENT	1
A. The ‘228 Patent “Views”	2
A. The Claimed Methods Provide Easy Navigation of These Views	6
III. SUMMARY OF PETITIONER’S REFERENCES	7
A. A3UM (Ex. 1005)	7
1. The Browser/Viewer	8
2. The Toolbar	9
3. The Inspector Panes	10
4. Places and Faces Views	10
5. The Apple Human Interface Guidelines	13
B. Belitz (Ex. 1006)	14
IV. LEVEL OF SKILL IN THE ART	15
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	15
VI. PETITIONER HAS NOT ESTABLISHED THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE	15
A. Petitioner Has Not Established That A3UM Qualifies as Prior Art	15
1. Petitioner Has Not Established that the Website Version of A3UM was Publicly Accessible to a POSITA	16
2. Petitioner Has Not Established That Ex. 1005 Accurately Represents What Was Shown on the Aperture 3 User Manual Page Before June 2010	23
3. Petitioner’s “Evidence” of Sales Fails to Establish Public Accessibility	26
4. Petitioner’s Reliance on the Aperture 3 Installation DVD Falls Short	27
5. Aperture 3 Installed on a Mac Computer is Not a Printed	

Publication	38
6. Mr. Birdsell’s Testimony Lacks Credibility	41
B. Other Non-Prior Art	43
C. Petitioner Failed to Meet its Burden for Claim 1	45
1. Petitioner failed to show that A3UM discloses or renders obvious a “third/[fourth] set of digital files including digital photographs and videos”	45
2. Petitioner failed to meet its burden to show a POSITA would combine A3UM and Belitz	52
D. Petitioner Failed to Meet its Burden for Dependent Claims 8-9	60
E. Petitioner Failed to Meet its Burden for Dependent Claim 15	64
VII. CONCLUSION	70

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Acceleration Bay, LLC v. Activision Blizzard Inc.</i> , 908 F.3d 765, 772 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	<i>Passim</i>
<i>Arctic Cat Inc. v. Bombardier Recreational Prod. Inc.</i> , 876 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	51
<i>Arctic Cat Inc. v. Polaris Indus., Inc.</i> , 795 F. App'x 827 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	55
<i>B/E Aerospace, Inc. v. C & D Zodiac, Inc.</i> , 709 F.App'x 687 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	26
<i>Blue Calypso, LLC v. Groupon, Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	17
<i>Capsugel Belgium NV v. Innercap Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00331, Paper 9 (PTAB Dec. 9, 2013)	41
<i>Centripetal Networks, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , 847 F. App'x 869 (Fed. Cir. 2021).....	21
<i>Checkpoint Sys., Inc. v. All-Tag Sec.; S.A.</i> , 412 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	42
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Centripetal Networks, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-01436, Paper 40 (PTAB Jan. 23, 2020)	36, 37
<i>Electronic Frontier Foundation v. Personal Audio, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00070, Paper 21 (PTAB Apr. 18, 2014)	23, 24, 25
<i>Eli Lilly & Co. v. Teva Pharms. Int'l GmbH</i> , 8 F.4th 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	43

<i>Ex Parte Stuart A. Nelson,</i> No. 2020-004978, 2020 WL 8186425 (PTAB Dec. 31, 2020)).....	41
<i>GoPro, Inc. v. Contour IP Holding LLC,</i> 908 F.3d 690 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	21
<i>In re Cronyn,</i> 890 F.2d 1158 (Fed. Cir. 1989)	29
<i>Instradent USA, Inc. v. Nobel Biocare Services AG,</i> IPR2015-01786, Paper 106 (PTAB Feb. 15, 2017).....	16, 38
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.,</i> 688 F.3d. 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	57
<i>Linear Tech. Corp. v. Impala Linear Corp.,</i> 379 F.3d 1311 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	42
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Icon Health Fitness Inc.,</i> IPR2017-01363, Paper 33 (PTAB Nov. 28, 2018).....	19
<i>Nidec Motor Corp. v. Zhongshan Broad Ocean Motor Co.,</i> 868 F.3d 1013 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	15
<i>Ohio Willow Wood v. Alps South,</i> 735 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	42
<i>Polaris Indus., Inc. v. Arctic Cat, Inc.,</i> 882 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	56
<i>Qualcomm Inc. v. Apple Inc.,</i> 24 F.4th 1367, 2022 WL 288013 (Fed. Cir. 2022).....	43
<i>Salesforce.com, Inc. v. WSOU Investments, LLC,</i> IPR2022-00428, Paper 10 (PTAB July 13, 2022).....	20
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Infobridge Pte. Ltd.,</i> 929 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	<i>Passim</i>

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.