

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner

v.

SCRAMOGE TECHNOLOGY LTD.,
Patent Owner

IPR2022-00118
Patent 10,804,740

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

II. THE PATENTED TECHNOLOGY 2

 A. Overview of the '740 Patent..... 2

III. OVERVIEW OF ASSERTED REFERENCES 5

 A. Hasegawa (Ex. 1005)—the only reference applied in Ground 1—
 does not disclose the claimed invention.....5

IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 7

 A. Claims 6 and 16 require separate components for the “coil” and the
 “connecting unit”8

 1. It is well-settled law that separate claim elements are
 presumed to be distinct components of the claimed invention9

 2. The challenged claims support the presumption that the “coil
 unit” is a separate and distinct component from the
 “connecting unit”10

 3. The specification supports the presumption that the “coil
 unit” is a separate and distinct component from the
 “connecting unit”12

 4. The prosecution history supports the presumption that the
 “coil unit” is a separate and distinct component from the
 “connecting unit”16

 B. The “first connection terminal” and the “second connection
 terminal” are not part of the “connecting unit”19

V. Ground 1 of the Petition Fails Because Hasegawa Does Not Teach a
 “Coil Unit” and a “Connecting Unit” as Separate and Distinct
 Components.....23

 A. The Petition asserts that Hasegawa alone discloses these claim
 limitations—the Petition does not assert any combination of
 references or articulate any modifications to Hasegawa24

 B. Hasegawa does not disclose a “first connection terminal” and
 “second connection terminal” that are separate and distinct from the
 “connecting unit”25

VI. Ground 1 of the Petition Additionally Fails Because Hasegawa’s
 Connection Pads and Wiring Pattern are Part of the Substrate.....31

VII. CONCLUSION 34

Table of Authorities

Cases

Am. Piledriving Equip., Inc. v. Geoquip, Inc.,
637 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2011)..... 11

Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Grp., LP,
616 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2010)..... 9, 11

Comcast Cable Comm'ns, LLC v Promptu Sys. Corp.,
838 F. App'x 551 (Fed. Cir. Jan. 4, 2021) 11

Gaus v. Conair Corp.,
363 F.3d 1284 (Fed. Cir. 2004)..... 9

Graham v. John Deere Co.,
383 US 1 (1966)..... 24

Honeywell Int'l, Inc. v. ITT Indus., Inc.,
452 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2006)..... 17

In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.,
829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 24

IRIS Corp. v. Japan Airlines Corp.,
769 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 10

Kyocera Senco Indus. Tools Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n,
22 F.4th 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2022)..... 9

Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casualty Ins. Co.,
Case CBM2012-00003 (Paper 8) (PTAB Oct. 25, 2012) 25

Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.,
789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... 10

Nidec Motor Corp. v. Zhongshan Broad Ocean Motor Co.,
868 F.3d 1013 (Fed. Cir. 2017)..... 7

NTP, Inc. v. Research in Motion, Ltd.,
419 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 10

Regents of Univ. of Minn. v. AGA Med. Corp.,
717 F.3d 929 (Fed. Cir. 2013)..... 11, 17

Rodime PLC v. Seagate Tech., Inc.,
174 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 1999)..... 20

SandBox Logistics LLC v. Proppant Express Invs. LLC,
813 F. App'x 548 (Fed. Cir. 2020) 9

SciMed Life Sys. Inc. v. Advanced Cardiovascular Sys., Inc.,
242 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2001)..... 17

Toro Co. v. White Consol. Indus., Inc.,
199 F.3d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 1999)..... 19

U.S. Surgical Corp. v. Ethicon, Inc.,
103 F.3d 1554 (Fed. Cir. 1997)..... 7

Verizon Servs. Corp. v. Vonage Holdings Corp.,
503 F.3d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 2007)..... 18

Vivid Techs., Inc. v. Am. Sci. & Eng'g, Inc.,
200 F.3d 795 (Fed. Cir. 1999)..... 7

PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit No.	Description
2001	Notice of IPR Petitions, <i>Scramoge Technology Ltd. v. Apple Inc.</i> , Case No. 6:21-cv-00579-ADA, Dkt. No. 35 (W.D. Tex. Nov. 11, 2021)
2002	Scheduling Order, <i>Scramoge Technology Ltd. v. Apple Inc.</i> , Case No. 6:21-cv-00579-ADA, Dkt. No. 33 (W.D. Tex. Sept. 28, 2021)
2003	Law360 Article: <i>West Texas Judge Says He Can Move Faster Than PTAB</i>
2004	Text Order Denying Motion to Stay Pending IPR, <i>Solas OLED Ltd. v. Google, Inc.</i> , Case No. 6:19-cv-00515-ADA (W.D. Tex. June 23, 2020)
2005	Order Denying Motion to Stay Pending IPR, <i>Multimedia Content Management LLC v. DISH Network L.L.C.</i> , Case No. 6:18-cv-00207-ADA, Dkt. No. 73 (W.D. Tex. May 30, 2019)
2006	Scheduling Order, <i>Correct Transmission LLC v. Adtran, Inc.</i> , Case No. 6:20-cv-00669-ADA, Dkt. No. 34 (W.D. Tex. Dec. 10, 2020)
2007	Scheduling Order, <i>Maxell Ltd. v. Ampere Technology Ltd.</i> , Case No. 6:21-cv-00347-ADA, Dkt. No. 37 (W.D. Tex. Nov. 8, 2021)
2008	Standing Order Governing Proceedings in Patent Cases, Judge Alan D. Albright
2009	Claim Construction Order, <i>Solas OLED Ltd. v. Apple Inc.</i> , Case No. 6:19-cv-00537-ADA, Dkt. No. 61 (W.D. Tex. Aug. 30, 2020)
2010	Plaintiff Scramoge Technology Ltd.'s Amended Preliminary Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions to Apple Inc. in <i>Scramoge Technology Ltd. v. Apple Inc.</i> , Case No. 6:21-cv-00579-ADA (W.D. Tex.)

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.