

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

SCRAMOGE TECHNOLOGY LTD.,
Patent Owner

IPR2022-00120
Patent No. 9,997,962

PATENT OWNER'S SUR-REPLY

Table of Contents

I. Introduction..... 1

II. Grounds 1-3 fail because the Petition does not properly motivate its proposed combination of Suzuki with Lee. 1

 A. Suzuki does not teach using pressure sensitive adhesive between the magnetic layer 171 and the secondary coil 170. 2

 B. Suzuki does not teach placing an insulating layer between the magnetic layer 171H and the secondary coil 170. 6

 1. *Petitioner relies on new arguments, not in the Petition, to explain how Suzuki purportedly discloses a motivation to combine Suzuki with Lee..* 6

 2. *Petitioner’s new arguments still do not disclose a motivation to combine Suzuki with Lee.* 10

 C. Because a POSITA could have combined double-sided tape with Suzuki does not mean they would have been motivated to do so..... 14

III. Ground 2 additionally fails because a POSITA would not have been motivated to combine Sawa with Suzuki and Lee. 17

IV. Conclusion 18

Table of Authorities

Cases

Acceleration Bay, LLC v. Activision Blizzard Inc.,
908 F.3d 765 (Fed. Cir. 2018)..... 9, 10

Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC,
805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... 15

Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.,
800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... 16

Google LLC v. Koninklijke Philips N.V.,
789 F. App’x 874 (Fed. Cir. 2019) 10

Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.,
815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 16

In re Kahn,
441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)..... 15

In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd.,
829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 16

Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.,
821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 10

Nautilus Hyosung Inc. v. Diebold Self-service Systems division of Diebold,
IPR2016-00633, Paper 9 (PTAB Aug. 22, 2016) 15

Tech. Licensing Corp. v. Videotek, Inc.,
545 F.3d 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2008)) 16

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3) 9, 16

37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b)..... 9

Exhibits

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.)
2011	Defendant Apple Inc.'s First Amended Preliminary Invalidity Contentions in <i>Scramoge Technology Ltd. v. Apple Inc.</i> , Case No. 6:21-cv-00579-ADA (W.D. Tex.)
2012	Android Authority article: LG Innotek's Latest wireless charger is Three times faster
2013	Scheduling Order, <i>Scramoge Technology Ltd. v. Google LLC</i> , Case No. 6:21-cv-00616-ADA, Dkt. No. 28 (W.D. Tex. Nov. 15, 2021)

2014	Defendants' Joint Reply Claim Construction Brief in <i>Scramoge Technology Ltd. v. Apple Inc.</i> , Case No. 6:21-cv-00579-ADA (W.D. Tex.)
2015	Scheduling Order, <i>Scramoge Technology Ltd. v. Apple Inc.</i> , Case No. 6:21-cv-00579-ADA, Dkt. No. 56 (W.D. Tex. Feb. 11, 2022)
2016	Declaration of David S. Ricketts, Ph.D.
2017	<i>Curriculum Vitae</i> of David S. Ricketts, Ph.D.
2018	July 14, 2022 Deposition Transcript of Joshua Phinney, Ph.D.
2019	Declaration of John Petrsoric in Support of Motion for Admission <i>Pro Hac Vice</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.