

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner

v.

CPC Patent Technologies PTY, LTD.,
Patent Owner

Inter Partes Review Case No. IPR2022-00601
U.S. Patent No. 9,269,208

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 9,269,208**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>I. INTRODUCTION</i>	1
<i>II. SUMMARY OF THE '208 PATENT</i>	1
A. Description of the Alleged Invention	1
B. Summary of Unpatentability of the Challenged Claims	2
C. Priority Date of the Challenged Claims	3
D. Level of Skill of a POSITA	3
<i>III. REQUIREMENTS FOR IPR UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104</i>	4
A. Grounds for Standing Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)	4
B. Identification of Challenge Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b) and Relief Requested	4
C. Claim Construction Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3)	5
1. Constructions Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 6	6
2. Additional Constructions	9
<i>IV. THE CITED REFERENCES ARE ANALOGOUS PRIOR ART</i>	10
<i>V. MATHIASSEN'S COMPUTER PROGRAM PRODUCT</i>	11
<i>VI. GROUND 1: CLAIMS 1, 3-7, 9-11, AND 13 ARE OBVIOUS OVER MATHIASSEN, MCKEETH, AND ANDERSON</i>	12
A. Claim 10	12
1. Claim 10(Pre1).....	12
2. Claim 10(Pre2).....	14
3. Claim 10(Pre3).....	16
4. Claim 10(Pre4).....	25
5. Claim 10(Pre5).....	26
6. Claim 10(a)	29
7. Claim 10(a1)	29
8. Claim 10(a2)	31
9. Claim 10(a3)	36
10. Claim 10(a4).....	37
11. Claim 10(b)	40
12. Claim 10(c).....	40
13. Claim 10(d)	47

14. Claim 10(e).....	48
15. Claim 10(f)	49
B. Claim 11	49
C. Claim 13	50
D. Claim 1	50
1. Claim 1(Pre).....	50
2. Claim 1(a)	50
3. Claim 1(b).....	50
4. Claim 1(b1).....	51
5. Claim 1(b2).....	51
6. Claim 1(b3).....	52
7. Claim 1(c)	52
8. Claim 1(c1)	52
9. Claim 1(c2).....	52
10. Claim 1(d)	52
11. Claim 1(d1)	54
12. Claim 1(d2)	55
13. Claim 1(d3)	55
14. Claim 1(e).....	56
E. Claim 3	56
1. Claim 3(a)	56
2. Claim 3(b).....	58
3. Claim 3(c).....	59
4. Claim 3(d).....	60
F. Claim 4	60
G. Claim 5	60
H. Claim 6	60
1. Claim 6(a)	60
2. Claim 6(b).....	61
3. Claim 6(c)	61
I. Claim 7	62
J. Claim 9	62
1. Claim 9(Pre).....	62
2. Claim 9(a)	62
3. Claim 9(b).....	62
4. Claim 9(c).....	62

5. Claim 9(d).....	63
6. Claim 9(d1).....	63
7. Claim 9(d2).....	63
8. Claim 9(d3).....	63
9. Claim 9(e).....	63
VII. DISCRETIONARY CONSIDERATIONS	63
A. The <i>Fintiv</i> Factors Favor Institution	63
1. Stay	63
2. Proximity of the Court’s Trial Date.....	64
3. Investment in Parallel Proceeding	67
4. Overlap	67
5. Same Party	68
6. Other Circumstances.....	68
B. The <i>Fintiv</i> Framework Should Be Overturned	69
1. The <i>Fintiv</i> Framework Exceeds the Director’s Authority	69
2. The <i>Fintiv</i> Framework Is Arbitrary and Capricious	69
3. The <i>Fintiv</i> Framework Was Impermissibly Adopted Without Notice-and- Comment Rulemaking.....	70
VIII. CONCLUSION.....	70
IX. MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(1).....	72
A. Real Party-In-Interest.....	72
B. Related Matters	72
C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel.....	72

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2020). passim	
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Ramot at Tel Aviv Univ. Ltd.</i> , IPR2020-00122, Paper 15 (PTAB May 15, 2020).....	68
<i>DISH Network L.L.C. v. Broadband iTV, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-01280, Paper 17 (PTAB Feb. 4, 2021)	65
<i>Horsehead Resource Dev. Co. v. Browner</i> , 16 F.3d 1246, 1269 (D.C. Cir. 1994).	70
<i>In re Apple Inc.</i> , No 20-135, slip op. (Fed. Cir. Nov. 9, 2020)	65
<i>Kisor v. Wilkie</i> , 139 S. Ct. 2400 (2019).....	71
<i>NHK Spring Co., Ltd., v. Intri-Plex Technologies, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00752, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2018).....	64, 70
<i>Petrella v. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Inc.</i> , 572 U.S. 663 (2014)	70
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (<i>en banc</i>).....	5
<i>Port of Seattle v. FERC</i> , 499 F.3d 1016 (9th Cir. 2007)	70
<i>Sand Revolution II, LLC v. Continental Intermodal Group-Trucking LLC</i> , IPR2019-01393, Paper 24 (PTAB Jun. 16, 2020).....	64
<i>Shenzhen Carku Tech. Co., Ltd. v. The Noco Co.</i> , IPR2020-00944, Paper 20 (PTAB Nov. 12, 2020).....	64

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 112	6
35 U.S.C. § 314	63
35 U.S.C. § 316	65, 70

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.100.....	5
37 C.F.R. § 42.104.....	4, 5
37 C.F.R. § 42.105.....	83
37 C.F.R. § 42.24.....	82
37 C.F.R. § 42.6.....	83
37 C.F.R. § 42.8.....	72, 82

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.