

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

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner

v.

BILLJCO LLC,
Patent Owner

CASE: IPR2022-00310
U.S. PATENT NO. 9,088,868

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE
PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. §§ 316(a)(8)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	PETITIONER'S UNPATENTABILITY GROUNDS.....	1
III.	THE '868 PATENT	2
IV.	THE CITED PRIOR ART.....	9
	A. Haberman	9
	B. Boger	12
	C. Evans	13
V.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART.....	13
VI.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	14
	A. "Accepting User Input, From A User Of A Mobile Application User Interface Of A User Carried Mobile Data Processing System, For Configuring A User Specified Location Based Event Configuration To Be Monitored And Triggered By The Mobile Data Processing System Wherein The Mobile Data Processing System Uses The User Specified Location Based Event Configuration To Perform Mobile Data Processing System Operations..."	16
	B. "Identifier Data ... For A Wireless Data Record"	22
VII.	PETITIONER'S CITED PRIOR ART IS MERELY CUMULATIVE OR LESS RELEVANT THAN THAT CONSIDERED DURING PROSECUTION OF THE '868 PATENT	23
VIII.	NONE OF PETITIONER'S GROUNDS 1 – 4 RENDER THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS UNPATENTABLE AS OBVIOUS	25
	A. Haberman, By Itself, Fails To Render Any Challenged Claim Obvious	26
	1. Haberman Fails To Disclose The "Accepting User Input ... For Configuring A User	

	Specified Location Based Event Configuration ... " Limitation.....	26
2.	Haberman Fails To Disclose Or Make Obvious Limitations Related To The Claimed "Identifier Data ... For A Wireless Data Record"	30
3.	Haberman Fails To Disclose Or Make Obvious The Claimed "First Identifier"	32
4.	Haberman Fails To Disclose Or Make Obvious The Claimed "Second Identifier" And "Third Identifier"	34
C.	Combining Haberman With Boger Does Not Render The Challenged Claims Obvious.....	35
D.	Petitioner's Basis For Its Grounds 3 and 4 Is Inapplicable	38
IX.	OBJECTIVE INDICIA OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS DEMONSTRATES THE PATENTABILITY OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS	39
A.	Copying	40
1.	Petitioner's Access to the '868 Patented Technology.....	40
2.	Petitioner's Devices Embody The Challenged Claims	42
B.	Commercial Success.....	45
C.	Licensing	46
D.	The Nexus Between The Challenged Claims And The Objective Evidence of Non-Obviousness	47
X.	CONCLUSION.....	49

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases:

AbbVie Deutschland GmbH v. Janssen Biotech, Inc., 759 F.3d 1285 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	24
Advanced Bionics, LLC v. Med-El Electromedizinische Gerate GmbH, IPR2019-01469, Paper 6 at 7 (Feb. 13, 2020)	24
Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG, IPR2017-01586, Paper 8 at 17 (Dec. 15, 2017)	24
DePuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc., 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	36, 38
Fox Factory, Inc. v. SRAM, LLC, 944 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	47
Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kan. City, 383 U.S. 1, 86 S.Ct. 684 (1966)	25
In re Gartside, 203 F.3d 1305 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	25
In re Warsaw Orthopedic, Inc., 832 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	25
Institut Pasteur & Universite Pierre Et Marie Curie v. Focarino, 738 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	46
J.T. Eaton & Co. v. Atl. Paste & Glue Co., 106 F.3d 1563 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	48
Lectrosonics, Inc. v. Zaxcom, Inc., IPR2018-01129, Paper 33 at 33 (PTAB Jan. 24, 2020)	47
Liqwd, Inc. v. L'Oreal USA, Inc., 941 F.3d 1133 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	40

Microsoft Corp. v. i4i Ltd. Partnership, 564 U.S. 91 (2011).....	23
Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co., 774 F.2d 1082 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	40
Phillips v. AWH Corp., 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc)	14, 15
Thorner v. Sony Computer Entm't Am. LLC, 669 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	14
Transocean Offshore Deepwater Drilling Inc. v. Maersk Drilling USA, Inc., 699 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	39
Underwater Devices Inc. v. Morrison-Knudsen Co., 717 F.2d 1380 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	24
United States v. Adams, 383 U.S. 39, 86 S.Ct. 708 (1966)	25
WBIP, LLC v. Kohler Co., 829 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	39, 40, 45, 48

Other Authority:

35 U.S.C. § 103	25
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	24
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)	14

All **emphasis** supplied unless otherwise noted.

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.