

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 IPR2022-01093
Patent 8,620,039

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

U.S. PATENT NO. 8,620,039 (CLAIMS 1, 2, 13, 14, 19, and 20)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| TABLE OF CONTENTS..... | i |
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| II. '039 PATENT OVERVIEW | 3 |
| III. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL | 6 |
| IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION | 6 |
| A. The Independent Claims Are Directed To Enrollment..... | 6 |
| B. “dependent upon” and “defining, <i>dependent upon the received card information</i> , a memory location in a local memory external to the card” | 9 |
| 1. “dependent upon” | 9 |
| 2. “ <i>defining</i> , dependent upon the received card information, a memory location in a local memory external to the card” | 11 |
| C. “Unoccupied” | 14 |
| D. Means-Plus-Function | 15 |
| E. “Biometric signature” | 15 |
| V. THE PRIOR ART FAILS TO RENDER THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OBVIOUS | 15 |
| A. Ground 1 – The Combination of Hsu and Sanford Does Not Teach Or Suggest “defining, dependent upon the received card information, a memory location in a local memory external to the card”..... | 15 |
| 1. Hsu does not teach or suggest that card information “defines” the memory location of the fingerprint data during enrollment..... | 16 |
| 2. Hsu’s cursory description of its database does not save Petitioner’s argument | 19 |
| B. Ground 2 - The Combination of Hsu, Sanford and Tsukamura Does Not Teach Or Suggest “defining, dependent upon the received card information, a memory location in a local memory external to the card” | 21 |

| | | |
|------|--|----|
| 1. | Tsukamura’s card information plays no part in the enrollment process or storage of the biometric signature | 21 |
| 2. | Tsukamura’s user-driven index system is significantly different from the ’039 Patent’s pointer system | 22 |
| 3. | A POSITA would not have been motivated to combine Tsukamura and Hsu | 26 |
| C. | Dependent Claims | 29 |
| VI. | THE PETITION IS TIME-BARRED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 315(b) | 30 |
| A. | Applicable Legal Standards | 30 |
| 1. | Petitioners Bear The Burden Of Persuasion | 30 |
| 2. | RPI And Privity Standards..... | 31 |
| a. | Scope Of Real Parties In Interest..... | 31 |
| b. | Scope Of Privity | 32 |
| 3. | Institution Is Barred Under Section 315(b) Because Apple Is An RPI And Privy Of Petitioners..... | 33 |
| B. | Apple Is An Unnamed RPI To This Proceeding..... | 34 |
| 1. | Control Is Not A Requirement For A Non-Party To Be A Real-Party-In-Interest | 34 |
| 2. | Apple Has A Preexisting, Established Business Relationship With Petitioners | 34 |
| a. | Petitioners Admit Their Preexisting, Established Business Relationship With Apple..... | 34 |
| b. | The Apple Agreement Also Establishes That Apple Is An RPI..... | 36 |
| i. | Representations And Warranties Of Noninfringement | 39 |
| ii. | Indemnification Clauses..... | 41 |
| iii. | Product Inspection Clause..... | 42 |
| iv. | Insurance Coverage Clause | 44 |
| v. | Apple Appointed As Petitioners’ Agent | 45 |
| 3. | Apple Is A Clear Beneficiary Of The Petition..... | 45 |

| | | |
|------|--|----|
| 4. | The Petitioners Filed An IPR Petition Against The '039 Patent For Apple's Benefit..... | 46 |
| C. | Apple Is A Privy To This Proceeding | 47 |
| VII. | CONCLUSION..... | 47 |

| EXHIBIT | DESCRIPTION |
|---------|--|
| 2001 | Affidavit in Support of Patent Owner's Motion for Pro Hac Vice Admission of Steven M. Coyle Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c) |
| 2002 | Affidavit in Support of Patent Owner's Motion for Pro Hac Vice Admission of Nicholas A. Geiger Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c) |
| 2003 | Complaint filed in <i>CPC Patent Technologies Pty Ltd. v. Apple, Inc.</i> , No. 6:21-cv-00165 (W.D. Tex., Waco Division) (without exhibits) |
| 2004 | Affidavit of Service of Complaint filed in <i>CPC Patent Technologies Pty Ltd. v. Apple, Inc.</i> , No. 6:21-cv-00165 (W.D. Tex., Waco Division) |
| 2005 | Letter dated October 18, 2021 from Patent Owner's counsel to Yale Residential regarding '705 and '208 Patents with attached claim charts |
| 2006 | Letter dated November 4, 2021 from Patent Owner's counsel to Yale Residential |
| 2007 | Complaint for declaratory judgment filed in <i>ASSA ABLOY AB et al. v. CPC Patent Technologies Pty. Ltd. and Charter Pacific Corp Ltd.</i> , Civ. 3:22-cv-694 (D. Conn.) (without exhibits) |
| 2008 | Declaration of Kevin J. Dart filed in <i>ASSA ABLOY AB et al. v. CPC Patent Technologies Pty. Ltd. and Charter Pacific Corp Ltd.</i> , Civ. 3:22-cv-694 (D. Conn.) (without exhibits) |
| 2009 | Apple Developer Program License Agreement |
| 2010 | Email thread between Petitioners and Patent Owner's respective counsel regarding additional discovery |
| 2011 | Yale product literature (<i>Yale Assure Lock Touchscreen with Wi-Fi and Bluetooth</i>) downloaded from [https://shopyalehome.com/products/yale-assure-lock-touchscreen-with-wi-fi-and-bluetooth?variant=39341913079940] |
| 2012 | Yale product literature (<i>Yale Access Upgrade Kit with Wi-Fi for Assure Locks</i>) downloaded from [https://shopyalehome.com/products/yale-access-ugrade-kit-for-assure-locks-with-wifi?variant=34110396006532] |
| 2013 | Yale product literature (<i>Facial and Fingerprint Lock Verification for Yale Assure Smart Locks</i>) downloaded from [https://shopyalehome.com/blogs/yale-home-blog/new-facial-and-fingerprint-lock-verification-for-yale-assure-smart-locks] |

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.