

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner

v.

SCRAMOGE TECHNOLOGY LTD.,
Patent Owner

IPR2022-00350
Patent 9,806,565

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 '565 Patent..... 2

III. OVERVIEW OF ASSERTED REFERENCES 5

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

IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 8

 A. Claims 1 and 12 require separate components for the “substrate comprising a receiving space” and the “connecting unit” 8

 1. It is well-settled law that separate claim elements are presumed to be distinct components of the claimed invention 10

 2. The challenged claims support the presumption that the “substrate comprising a receiving space,” the “coil unit” and the “connecting unit” are separate and distinct components 11

 3. The specification supports the presumption that the “substrate comprising a receiving space,” the “coil unit” and the “connecting unit” are separate and distinct components 13

 4. The prosecution history supports the presumption that the “substrate comprising a receiving space,” the “coil unit” and the “connecting unit” are separate and distinct components 17

V. THE PETITION FAILS BECAUSE HONG DOES NOT TEACH A “SUBSTRATE COMPRISING A RECEIVING SPACE” AND A “CONNECTING UNIT” AS SEPARATE AND DISTINCT COMPONENTS..... 19

A.	The Petition asserts that Hong alone discloses these claim limitations—the Petition does not assert any combination of references or articulate any modifications to Hong	21
B.	Hong does not disclose a “substrate comprising a receiving space” that is separate and distinct from the “connecting unit”	22
1.	“substrate comprising a receiving space”	22
2.	“connecting unit”	24
VI.	WITH RESPECT TO CLAIM 13, GROUND FAILS BECAUSE HONG DOES NOT TEACH THE “CONNECTING UNIT” AS SEPARABLE FROM THE “RECEIVING SPACE”	31
VII.	CONCLUSION	32

Table of Authorities

Cases

Am. Piledriving Equip., Inc. v. Geoquip, Inc.,
637 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2011)..... 12

Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Grp., LP,
616 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2010)..... 10, 12

Bicon, Inc. v. Straumann Co.,
441 F.3d 945 (Fed. Cir. 2006)..... 30

Comcast Cable Comm'ns, LLC v Promptu Sys. Corp.,
838 F. App'x 551 (Fed. Cir. Jan. 4, 2021) 12

Elekta Instrument S.A. v. O.U.R. Sci. Int'l, Inc.,
214 F.3d 1302 (Fed. Cir. 2000)..... 31

Gaus v. Conair Corp.,
363 F.3d 1284 (Fed. Cir. 2004)..... 10

Gen. Am. Transp. Corp. v. Cryo-Trans, Inc.,
93 F.3d 766 (Fed. Cir. 1996)..... 30

Graham v. John Deere Co.,
383 US 1 (1966)..... 21

Honeywell Int'l, Inc. v. ITT Indus., Inc.,
452 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2006)..... 18

In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.,
829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 21

IRIS Corp. v. Japan Airlines Corp.,
769 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 12

Kyocera Senco Indus. Tools Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n,
22 F.4th 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2022)..... 10

<i>Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casualty Ins. Co.</i> , Case CBM2012-00003 (Paper 8) (PTAB Oct. 25, 2012)	22
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	11
<i>Nidec Motor Corp. v. Zhongshan Broad Ocean Motor Co.</i> , 868 F.3d 1013 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	8
<i>NTP, Inc. v. Research in Motion, Ltd.</i> , 419 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	11
<i>Regents of Univ. of Minn. v. AGA Med. Corp.</i> , 717 F.3d 929 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	12, 18
<i>SandBox Logistics LLC v. Proppant Express Invs. LLC</i> , 813 F. App'x 548 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	10
<i>SciMed Life Sys. Inc. v. Adv. Cardiovascular Sys., Inc.</i> , 242 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	18
<i>U.S. Surgical Corp. v. Ethicon, Inc.</i> , 103 F.3d 1554 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	8
<i>Verizon Servs. Corp. v. Vonage Holdings Corp.</i> , 503 F.3d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	19
<i>Vivid Techs., Inc. v. Am. Sci. & Eng'g, Inc.</i> , 200 F.3d 795 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	8
<u>Statutes and Rules</u>	
37 C.F.R. §1.11.....	18, 19

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.