

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. IPR2022-01093
Patent No. 8,620,039

Before SCOTT A. DANIELS, AMBER L. HAGY and
FREDERICK C. LANEY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

PETITIONERS' REPLY TO

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	5
II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	6
A. PO’s proposed construction of “defining, dependent upon the received card information, a memory location...” is incorrect	6
B. “Method of enrolling” is not limiting	13
III. HSU-SANFORD RENDERS ALL CHALLENGED CLAIMS OBVIOUS (GROUND 1).....	14
A. Hsu-Sanford teaches Limitation 1[C]’s defining step under Petitioners’ First Construction and the Board’s preliminary construction.....	14
B. Hsu-Sanford teaches Limitation 1[C]’s defining step under PO’s construction.....	16
IV. HSU-SANFORD-TSUKAMURA RENDERS ALL CHALLENGED CLAIMS OBVIOUS (GROUND 2).....	17
A. Alleged deficiencies of Tsukamura are irrelevant	17
1. Petition does not rely on Tsukamura’s IC card 21 for disclosing “card information”	17
2. Tsukamura’s index-based system is materially the same as the ’039 Patent’s pointer system	18
3. The differences between Tsukamura and the ’039 Patent are immaterial to unpatentability of the Challenged Claims	19
B. A POSITA would have been motivated to combine Hsu-Sanford with Tsukamura.....	20
1. The Challenged Claims do not require a particular type of data storage.....	20
2. The law does not require the combination be the best option.....	22
3. Tsukamura’s array is not undesirable	23
V. THE PETITION IS NOT TIME BARRED AS THE BOARD HAS ALREADY CORRECTLY DETERMINED.....	25
A. Apple is not a Real Party in Interest	25
1. This Petition was not filed at Apple’s behest.....	25
2. The business relationship does not support an RPI theory	26
B. The Developer Agreement does not support Apple being an RPI.....	27

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
C. Sending products to Apple for routine compliance/certification does not make Apple an RPI	30
D. CPC’s “clear beneficiary” argument is meritless.....	30
VI. APPLE IS NOT IN PRIVACY WITH PETITIONERS.....	31
Factor 1: No agreement binds the Petitioners to the Apple action	32
Factor 2: No privity in business relationship between Apple and Petitioners	32
Factors 3-4: Petitioners have no control or representation in the Apple action.....	32
Factor 5: Petitioners are not acting as Apple’s proxy	32
Factor 6: No special statutory scheme foreclosing successive litigation.....	32

..

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Catalina Mktg. Int'l, Inc. v. Coolsavings.com, Inc.</i> , 289 F.3d 801 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	13
<i>Freedman Seating Co. v. Am. Seating Co.</i> , 420 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	19
<i>Intel Corp. v. Qualcomm Inc.</i> , 21 F.4th 784 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	22
<i>Pacing Techs., LLC v. Garmin Int'l, Inc.</i> , 778 F.3d 1021 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	13
<i>Rexnord Corp. v. Laitram Corp.</i> , 274 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	10
<i>Soverain Software LLC v. Newegg Inc.</i> , 705 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	19
<i>Taylor v. Sturgell</i> , 553 U.S. 880 (2008).....	31
<i>Valve Corp. v. Ironburg Inventions Ltd.</i> , IPR2017-00136, Paper 12, 9-10 (P.T.A.B. May 4, 2017)	14
<i>Ventex Co., Ltd., v. Columbia Sportswear North America, Inc.</i> , IPR2017-00651 (PTAB Jan. 24, 2019).....	28
<i>WesternGeco LLC v. ION Geophysical Corp.</i> , 889 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	31, 32
<i>Wi-Fi One v. Broadcom Corp., LLC</i> , 887 F.3d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	27
<i>Worlds, Inc. v. Bungie, Inc.</i> , 903 F.3d 1237 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	27, 28

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

<u>Exhibit</u>	<u>Description</u>
EX-1001	U.S. Patent No. 8,620,039 (“’039 Patent”)
EX-1002	Patent Prosecution History of U.S. Patent No. 8,620,039
EX-1003	European Patent Pub. No. EP 0924655A2 to Hsu <i>et al.</i> (“Hsu”)
EX-1004	World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) Int. Pub. No. WO 2003077077A2 (03/077077) to Kirk Sanford (“Sanford”)
EX-1005	U.S. Patent No. 6,963,660 to Yoshihiro Tsukamura and Takeshi Funahashi (“Tsukamura”)
EX-1006	Declaration of Stuart Lipoff Regarding Invalidity of U.S. Patent No. 8,620,039
EX-1007	Curriculum Vitae of Stuart Lipoff
EX-1008	European Patent Pub. No. EP 0881608A1 to Walter Leu (“Leu Original”)
EX-1009	Certified English Translation of European Patent Pub. No. EP 0881608A1 to Walter Leu (“Leu”)
EX-1010	U.S. Patent No. 5,790,674 to Robert C. Houvener and Ian P. Hoenisch (“Houvener”)
EX-1011	U.S. Patent No. 5,956,415 to McCalley <i>et al.</i> (“McCalley”)

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.