

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

PARUS HOLDINGS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2022-00948
U.S. Patent No. 9,769,314

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 312 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.104**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PETITIONER’S EXHIBIT LIST	7
I. INTRODUCTION	9
II. GROUNDS FOR STANDING.....	9
III. NOTE.....	9
IV. SUMMARY OF THE ’314 PATENT	9
V. PROSECUTION HISTORY	13
VI. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	13
VII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	14
VIII. RELIEF REQUESTED AND THE REASONS FOR THE REQUESTED RELIEF	14
IX. DISCRETIONARY DENIAL WOULD BE INAPPROPRIATE.....	15
A. Discretionary denial under <i>Fintiv</i> is not appropriate	15
1. No evidence regarding a stay	15
2. Parallel proceeding trial date	15
3. Investment in the parallel proceeding.....	17
4. Overlapping issues with the parallel proceeding	18
5. Petitioner is a defendant.....	18
6. Other circumstances.....	19
B. The <i>Fintiv</i> framework should be overturned.....	19
C. Discretionary denial under <i>General Plastic</i> is not appropriate.....	19

1.	Whether the same petitioner previously filed a petition directed to the same claims of the same patent.....	20
2.	Whether at the time of filing of the first petition the petitioner knew of the prior art asserted in the second petition or should have known of it	22
3.	Whether at the time of filing of the second petition the petitioner already received the patent owner’s preliminary response to the first petition or received the Board’s decision on whether to institute review in the first petition.....	23
4.	The length of time that elapsed between the time the petitioner learned of the prior art asserted in the second petition and the filing of the second petition.....	23
5.	Whether the petitioner provides adequate explanation for the time elapsed between the filings of multiple petitions directed to the same claims of the same patent.....	24
6.	The finite resources of the Board and the requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11) to issue a final determination not later than 1 year after the date on which the Director notices institution of review	24
D.	Discretionary denial under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) is not appropriate	24
X.	IDENTIFICATION OF HOW THE CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE....	25
A.	Challenged Claims	25
B.	Statutory Grounds for Challenges	25
C.	The ’314 Patent is Not Entitled to its Claimed Priority Date	26
D.	Priority was lost when no timely application was filed	26

E.	Several claim limitations in each of the challenged claims 1-26 are not sufficiently described in the earlier-filed provisional application	27
F.	There is no support for a <i>web-browsing server</i> and a <i>media server</i> in the '343 Application.....	28
G.	There is no support for a <i>content extractor</i> that retrieves <i>only the portion</i> of the information in the '343 Application.....	30
H.	There is no support for <i>database associated with the media server</i> in the '343 Application.....	31
I.	Ground 1: Claims 1-26 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Danner	32
1.	Summary of Danner.....	33
i.	Claim 1	35
ii.	Claim 2	60
iii.	Claim 3	61
iv.	Claim 4.....	61
v.	Claim 5	62
vi.	Claim 6.....	63
vii.	Claim 7.....	69
viii.	Claim 8.....	70
ix.	Claim 9.....	70
x.	Claim 10.....	70
xi.	Claim 11	71
xii.	Claim 12.....	76

xiii.	Claim 13	77
xiv.	Claim 14	77
xv.	Claim 15	79
xvi.	Claim 16	79
xvii.	Claim 17	80
xviii.	Claim 18	81
xix.	Claim 19	81
xx.	Claim 20	86
xxi.	Claims 21 and 22.....	87
xxiii.	Claim 23	87
xxiv.	Claim 24	87
xxv.	Claim 25	88
xxvi.	Claim 26	88
J.	Ground 2: Claims 5, 10, and 18 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Danner and Woods	89
1.	Summary of Woods	89
2.	Reasons to Combine Danner and Woods	90
i.	Claim 5	92
ii.	Claim 10	93
iii.	Claim 18	94
XI.	CONCLUSION.....	94

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.