

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,
ASSA ABLOY GLOBAL SOLUTIONS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

CPC PATENT TECHNOLOGIES PTY LTD.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2022-01089
Patent 9,269,208

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| TABLE OF CONTENTS..... | i |
| TABLE OF AUTHORITIES | iii |
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| II. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND | 3 |
| A. The Apple Action Was Served More Than 1 Year Before The Petition Was Filed | 3 |
| B. The '208 Patent And The Yale/August Products At Issue In The Parallel Litigation | 4 |
| C. Patent Owner Contacted Petitioner Yale Regarding The '705 And The '208 Patents (But Not The '039 Patent)..... | 9 |
| D. The Petitioners' Declaratory Judgment Complaint And IPR Petitions Against <i>All Three</i> Of The Patents Asserted In The Apple Action | 10 |
| E. The Petitioners' Admissions Regarding Apple..... | 11 |
| F. The Apple Developer Program License Agreement | 12 |
| III. LEGAL STANDARDS | 14 |
| A. Petitioners Bear The Burden Of Persuasion..... | 15 |
| B. Real Parties-In-Interest And Privity Standards | 15 |
| 1. Scope Of Real Parties In Interest | 16 |
| 2. Scope Of Privity | 17 |
| IV. INSTITUTION IS BARRED UNDER SECTION 315(b) BECAUSE APPLE IS AN RPI AND PRIVY OF PETITIONERS | 18 |
| A. Apple Is An Unnamed RPI To This Proceeding..... | 19 |
| 1. Apple Has A Preexisting, Established Relationship With Petitioners..... | 19 |
| a. Petitioners Admitted To A Preexisting, Established Relationship With Apple In The Declaratory Judgment Complaint..... | 19 |
| b. The Apple Agreement Also Establishes That Apple Is An RPI To This Proceeding | 22 |

| | | |
|------|--|----|
| i. | Representations And Warranties Of Noninfringement | 25 |
| ii. | Indemnification Clauses | 27 |
| iii. | Product Inspection And Insurance Coverage Clauses..... | 30 |
| iv. | Apple Appointed As Petitioners' Agent | 32 |
| v. | Summary Of Apple Agreement Significance | 33 |
| c. | Apple's Homekit Platform And Related Documents Are Further Evidence That Apple Is A RPI To This Proceeding | 35 |
| 2. | Apple Is A Clear Beneficiary Of The Petition..... | 37 |
| 3. | The Petitioners Filed An IPR Petition Against The '039 Patent For Apple's Benefit..... | 39 |
| B. | Apple Is A Privy To This Proceeding | 40 |
| V. | CONCLUSION..... | 42 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

| | |
|--|------------|
| <i>Apple Inc., v. Achates Reference Publ, Inc.,</i> IPR2013-00080 (PTAB June 2, 2014) | 34, 35 |
| <i>Applications in Internet Time, LLC v. RPX Corp.,</i> 897 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2018) | passim |
| <i>Bungie v. Worlds Inc.,</i> IPR2015-01264 (PTAB Jan. 14, 2020) | passim |
| <i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Hewlett Packard Enter. Co.,</i> IPR2017-01933 (PTAB Mar. 16, 2018) | 16, 17 |
| <i>CPC Patent Technologies Pty Ltd. v. Apple, Inc.,</i> No. 5:22-cv-02553-NC (N.D. Cal., San Jose Division) | 4 |
| <i>CPC Patent Technologies Pty Ltd. v. Apple, Inc.,</i> No. 6:21-cv-00165 (W.D. Tex., Waco Division) | 1 |
| <i>Power Integrations, Inc. v. Semiconductor Components Indus., LLC,</i> 926 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2019) | 16, 17 |
| <i>RPX Corp. v. Applications in Internet Time, LLC,</i> IPR2015-01750 (PTAB Oct. 2, 2020) | 40 |
| <i>Taylor v. Sturgell,</i> 553 U.S. 880 (2008) | 18, 40, 41 |
| <i>U.S. v. N.Y., New Haven & Hartford R.R. Co.,</i> 355 U.S. 253 (1957) | 20 |
| <i>Ventex Co., Ltd., v. Columbia Sportswear North America, Inc.,</i> IPR2017-00651 (PTAB Jan. 24, 2019) | passim |
| <i>WesternGeco LLC v. ION Geophysical Corp.,</i> 889 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2018) | 17 |
| <i>Wi-Fi One, LLC v. Broadcom Corp.,</i> 887 F.3d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2018) | 16, 17 |
| <i>Worlds, Inc. v. Bungie, Inc.,</i> 903 F.3d 1237 (Fed. Cir. 2018) | passim |

Statutes

| | |
|-----------------------|----|
| 35 U.S.C. § 314 | 38 |
|-----------------------|----|

35 U.S.C. § 315(b) passim

Other Authorities

BLACK’S LAW DICTIONARY (10th ed. 2014).....18

Congressional Record Volume 157, Number 132
(Thursday, September 8, 2011)40

Office Patent Trial Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756, 48759 (Aug. 14, 2012) 16, 17

Rules

37 C.F.R. § 42.51(b)(2).....2

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.