

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ASSA ABLOY AB, ASSA ABLOY Inc.,
ASSA ABLOY Residential Group, Inc., August Home, Inc., HID Global
Corporation, and ASSA ABLOY Global Solutions, Inc.,
Petitioners,

v.

CPC Patent Technologies PTY LTD.,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2022-01089
Patent No. 9,269,208

Before SCOTT A. DANIELS, BARRY L. GROSSMAN, and AMBER L. HAGY,
Administrative Patent Judges.

**PETITIONERS' REPLY TO
PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	4
II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	7
A. The plain and ordinary meaning of “Biometric Signal” is the input and output of a biometric sensor.....	7
B. PO Improperly Imports Limitations into the Claims.....	10
C. PO’s Construction Relies on Irrelevant Extrinsic Evidence.....	11
D. “Configured to” and “Capable of”.....	11
III. THE BIANCO-MATHIASSEN COMBINATIONS RENDER ALL CLAIMS OBVIOUS (GROUNDS 1-3).	12
A. Bianco-Mathiassen Teach the Biometric Signal Limitation.....	12
1. Mathiassen’s teachings are the same as the Patent’s sole embodiment.....	12
2. Mathiassen explicitly teaches analyzing fingerprint data for inputting commands.....	14
3. Bianco teaches analyzing multiple signatures for inputting commands.	16
B. Bianco-Mathiassen Teach Mapping Said Series of the Biometric Signals Into an Instruction and Populating the Database According to the Instruction	17
C. The Petitions Establish There Was A Strong Motivation to Combine Bianco and Mathiassen	18
IV. THE PETITION IS NOT TIME BARRED AS THE BOARD HAS ALREADY CORRECTLY DETERMINED.....	20
A. Apple is not a Real Party in Interest.	21
1. This Petition was not filed at Apple’s behest.....	21
2. The business relationship does not support an RPI theory.	22
B. The Developer Agreement does not support Apple being an RPI.....	23
C. Sending products to Apple for routine compliance/certification does not make Apple an RPI.	25
D. CPC’s “clear beneficiary” argument is meritless.....	25
V. APPLE IS NOT IN PRIVACY WITH PETITIONERS.....	26
Factor 1: No agreement binds the Petitioners to the Apple action.	27

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
Factor 2: No privity in business relationship between Apple and Petitioners.	27
Factors 3-4: Petitioners have no control or representation in the Apple action.....	27
Factor 5: Petitioners are not acting as Apple’s proxy.....	27
Factor 6: No special statutory scheme foreclosing successive litigation.....	28

..

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Aspex Eyewear, Inc. v Marchon Eyewear, Inc.</i> , 672 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	12
<i>Authentication by Keystroke Timing: Some Preliminary Results</i> , R-2526-NSF	2
<i>CPC Patent Technologies Pty Ltd v. Apple Inc.</i> , WDTX-6-21-cv-00165-ADA, Dkt. No. 76.....	1
<i>CPC Patent Technologies Pty Ltd v. HMD Global Oy</i> , WDTX-6-21-cv-00166-ADA, Dkt. No. 45.....	1
<i>In re Dembiczak</i> , 175 F.3d 994 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	18, 19
<i>INVT SPE LLC v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 46 F.4th 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2022)	12
<i>Merck & Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	10
<i>ParkerVision, Inc. v. Qualcomm Inc.</i> , 903 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	12

PETITIONERS' EXHIBIT LIST (New Exhibits in *Italics*)

<u>Exhibit</u>	<u>Description</u>
EX-1001	U.S. Patent No. 9,665,705 (“Burke II”)
EX-1002	Patent Prosecution History of U.S. Patent No. 9,665,705
EX-1003	U.S. Patent No. 6,256,737 to Bianco <i>et al.</i> (“Bianco”)
EX-1004	World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) Int. Pub. No. WO 2002028067A1 (02/28067) to Mathiassen (“Mathiassen”)
EX-1005	Declaration of S. Lipoff Regarding Invalidity of U.S. Patent No. 9,665,705
EX-1006	Curriculum Vitae of Stuart Lipoff
EX-1007	U.S. Patent No. 9,269,208 to Burke (“Burke I”)
EX-1008	Dawn Xiodong Song, David Wagner, and Xuqing Tian (University of California, Berkeley), “Timing Analysis of Keystrokes and Timing Attacks on SSH,” <i>USENIX Security Symposium</i> , vol. 2001 (2001), available at https://people.eecs.berkeley.edu/~daw/papers/ssh-use01.pdf .
EX-1009	Claim Construction Order in <i>CPC Patent Technologies Pty Ltd v. Apple Inc.</i> , WDTX-6-21-cv-00165-ADA, Dkt. No. 76 (“Apple CC Order”)
EX-1010	Claim Construction Order in <i>CPC Patent Technologies Pty Ltd v. HMD Global Oy</i> , WDTX-6-21-cv-00166-ADA, Dkt. No. 45 (“HMD CC Order”)

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.