

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,

Petitioner

v.

BILLJCO LLC,

Patent Owner

CASE: IPR2022-00131

U.S. PATENT NO. 8,639,267

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 313 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| I. INTRODUCTION | - 1 - |
| II. ALLEGED GROUNDS OF UNPATENTABILITY | - 3 - |
| III. THE ‘267 PATENT | - 3 - |
| IV. PETITIONER DISREGARDS THE “DESTINATION IDENTITY” RECITED IN EACH OF THE INDEPENDENT CLAIMS..... | - 4 - |
| A. Neither of the primary references teach or suggest the recited “destination identity”. | - 5 - |
| B. Petitioner’s reliance on Boger doubles down on its mistaken interpretation. | - 7 - |
| V. “PREFERENCES” ARE NOT “PRIVILEGES” | - 8 - |
| VI. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER § 314(A)..... | - 9 - |
| A. <i>Fintiv</i> Factor 1–Likelihood of Stay | - 10 - |
| B. <i>Fintiv</i> Factor 2–Trial Date Versus FWD Due Date | - 11 - |
| C. <i>Fintiv</i> Factor 3–Investment in the Proceeding | - 11 - |
| D. <i>Fintiv</i> Factor 4–Overlap of Issues | - 12 - |
| E. <i>Fintiv</i> Factor 5–Identity of Parties | - 13 - |
| D. <i>Fintiv</i> Factor 6–Other Circumstances | - 14 - |

VII. CONCLUSION..... - 15 -

I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner Apple, Inc. (“Petitioner”) has not met its burden in demonstrating that U.S. Patent No. 8,639,267 (“the ‘267 patent”) is more likely than not invalid, and, as such, institution should be denied.

Petitioner’s contention that the challenged claims of the ‘267 patent are invalid as obvious lacks merit. Petitioner relies on two primary prior art references—U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2005/0096044 A1 to Haberman (Ex. 1004) and U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2002/0132614 A1 to Vanluijt (Ex. 1006). The Petition is facially defective in that it fails to demonstrate “a reasonable likelihood that the Petitioner would prevail with respect to at least one of the claims challenged in the petition” under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).

Petitioner’s obviousness arguments fail because none of the cited references teach or suggest the recited “matching privilege [...] relating the originating identity of the whereabouts data with a destination identity of the whereabouts data”. This “privilege data [is] stored local to the mobile data processing system”. The primary references (Haberman and Vanluijt) are silent regarding any destination address. The secondary reference (Boger) includes the address of the receiving phone in the message, leaving no destination identity to match upon receipt.

Neither the Petition, nor the declaration submitted by Petitioner’s expert, provide an articulated reasoning with a rational underpinning to support a legal conclusion of obviousness. *KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 418 (2007),

quoting *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006). The Petition only provides “mere conclusory statement[s]” (*id.*) that the claims are obvious, and lacks cogent reasoning as to why a person of ordinary skill in the art would modify or combine the cited references in the specific manner that is recited in each of the challenged claims.

Petitioner’s expert declaration (Ex. 1002) merely repeats the attorney arguments in the Petition (often verbatim).

In summary, the IPR Petition fails to show a reasonable likelihood that at least one of the challenged claims of the ‘267 patent is unpatentable. The Board should not institute *inter partes* review of the ‘267 patent and should deny the Petition in its entirety.

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.