

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,
and SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

SMART MOBILE TECHNOLOGIES LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2022-00807
Patent 9,756,168

**PATENT OWNER'S SUR-REPLY
TO PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. THE REPLY CONFIRMS PETITIONER’S FAILURE TO PROVE ITS COMBINATION TEACHES A “REMOTE SERVER” (CLAIM 2, GROUND 1).	1
A. Petitioner’s Construction Remains Unsupported.	2
B. The Intrinsic And Extrinsic Evidence Confirms Patent Owner’s Construction And Is Inconsistent With Petitioner’s.	6
C. Petitioner’s Attempt To Change Its Combination Is Improper And Would Still Fail Even If Permitted.....	11
II. PETITIONER FAILS TO SHOW A POSITA WOULD BE MOTIVATED TO COMBINE SAINTON AND BAKER (ALL CLAIMS, ALL GROUNDS).	14
III. THE REPLY FAILS TO REBUT THE POR’S SHOWING THAT PETITIONER FAILS TO PROVE ITS COMBINATIONS TEACH “USER” “PROFILE[S]” (ALL CLAIMS, ALL GROUNDS).	16
A. The Reply Confirms That It Would Not Be Obvious To Store User Profiles At Sainton’s Alleged Server.....	16
B. Petitioner Fails To Prove That Sainton And Baker In Combination Teach Storing “User” Profiles On The Server (Claims 2, 4).....	18
IV. PETITIONER FAILS TO PROVE ITS COMBINATION TEACHES “AN INDICATOR OF A SOFTWARE APPLICATION TO BE DOWNLOADED FROM THE REMOTE SERVER.” (CLAIM 19, GROUND 4).	21
V. PETITIONER FAILS TO PROVE BAKER IS ANALOGOUS ART (ALL CLAIMS, ALL GROUNDS).	23
VI. CONCLUSION	26

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

COURT DECISIONS

AllVoice Computing PLC v. Nuance Communs., Inc.,
504 F.3d 1236 (Fed. Cir. 2007)7

Aspex Eyewear, Inc. v. Marchon Eyewear, Inc.,
672 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2012)7

August Tech. Corp. v. Camtek, Ltd.,
655 F.3d 1278 (Fed. Cir. 2011)8

C.R. Bard, Inc. v. U.S. Surgical Corp.,
388 F.3d 858 (Fed. Cir. 2004)3

Comark Commc'ns, Inc. v. Harris Corp.,
156 F.3d 1182 (Fed. Cir. 1998)7

Dell Inc. v. Acceleron, LLC,
884 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2018)12

Donner Tech. LLC v. Pro Stage Gear, LLC,
979 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2020)25

In re Clay,
966 F.2d 656 (Fed. Cir. 1992)24

In re Magnum Oil,
829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)22

Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge, Ltd.,
821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016)11

Littlefuse, Inc. v. Mersen USA EP Corp.,
29 F.4th 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2022)20

Medrad, Inc. v. MRI Devices Corp.,
401 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2005)4

Medtronic, Inc. v. Teleflex Innovations S.A.R.L.,
2023 U.S. App. LEXIS 13790,
__ F.4th __ (Fed. Cir. June 5, 2023).....14

PAR Pharm. v. TWi Pharms., Inc.,
773 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2014)12

Phillips v. AWH Corp.,
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)3

Polaris Indus. v. Arctic Cat, Inc.,
882 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2018)15

PSN Ill., LLC v. Ivoclar Vivadent, Inc.,
525 F.3d 1159 (Fed. Cir. 2008)8

Sci. Plastic Prods. v. Biotage AB,
766 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2014)23

Tandon Corp. v. U.S. Int’l Trade Comm’n,
831 F.2d 1017 (Fed. Cir. 1987)7

Ultimax Cement Mfg. Corp. v. CTS Cement Mfg. Corp.,
587 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2009)4

Wang Labs., Inc. v. Toshiba Corp.,
993 F.2d 858 (Fed. Cir. 1993)24

Wasica Fin. GmbH v. Cont’l Auto. Sys., Inc.,
853 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2017)12

AGENCY DECISIONS

3Shape A/S v. Align Tech.,
IPR2019-00163, Paper 37 (June 9, 2020).....2

Coherus Biosciences, Inc. v. Hoffman-Larcoche Inc.,
IPR2017-02066, Paper 11 (PTAB Mar. 9, 2018)13

Facebook, Inc. v. Uniloc USA, Inc.,
IPR2017-01524, Paper 7 (PTAB Dec. 4, 2017)13

Limelight Networks v. Akamai Techs.,
IPR2016-01894, Paper 30 (Mar. 1, 2018)3

Marvell Semiconductor, Inc. v. Uniloc 2017 LLC,
IPR2019-01350, Paper 24 (Feb. 1, 2021)6

Netflix Inc. v. DivX, LLC,
IPR2020-00646, Paper 47 (Sept. 9, 2021)23

RPX Corp. v. Vertical Connection Techs.,
IPR2018-01388, Paper 31 (Jan. 17, 2020)3

Samsung Elecs. Co. Ltd. v. KAIST IP US LLC,
IPR2017-01046, Paper 14 (Jan. 22, 2018) 15, 22

Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Elm 3DS Innovations, LLC,
IPR2016-00393, Paper 62 (June 23, 2017)1

Volkswagen Grp. of Am., Inc. v. Michigan Motor Techs.,
IPR2019-01274, Paper 47 (Dec. 21, 2020)3

Xerox Corp. v. Bytemark, Inc.,
IPR2022-00624, Paper 9 (Aug. 24, 2022)
(precedential)12

REGULATIONS

37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b)12

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.