

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner

v.

AIRE TECHNOLOGY LIMITED,
Patent Owner

IPR2022-01137
Patent 8,581,706

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. ALL <i>FINTIV</i> FACTORS WEIGH AGAINST INSTITUTION	1
A. <u>Factor 1</u> : The district court has not granted a stay, nor is there any evidence that a stay will be granted.	3
B. <u>Factor 2</u> : The district court trial will occur before the deadline for a final decision in this proceeding.	5
C. <u>Factor 3</u> : By the time an institution decision is reached, the parties and the court will have completed claim construction briefing and discovery will be well underway.	6
D. <u>Factor 4</u> : There is substantial overlap between this IPR and the district court proceedings.	8
E. <u>Factor 5</u> : Petitioner is a defendant in the district court litigation.....	9
F. <u>Factor 6</u> : The petition is without merit and unlikely to succeed.....	9
III. CONCLUSION.....	10

PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit No.	Description
2001	Notice of IPR Petitions, <i>Aire Technology Ltd. v. Apple Inc.</i> , Case No. 6:21-cv-01101-ADA, Dkt. No. 37 (W.D. Tex. Jun. 24, 2022)
2002	Amended Scheduling Order, <i>Aire Technology Ltd. v. Apple Inc.</i> , Case No. 6:21-cv-01101-ADA, Dkt. No. 61 (W.D. Tex. Feb. 11, 2022)
2003	Law360 Article: <i>West Texas Judge Says He Can Move Faster Than PTAB</i>
2004	Text Order Denying Motion to Stay Pending IPR, <i>Solas OLED Ltd. v. Google, Inc.</i> , Case No. 6:19-cv-00515-ADA (W.D. Tex. June 23, 2020)
2005	Order Denying Motion to Stay Pending IPR, <i>Multimedia Content Management LLC v. DISH Network L.L.C.</i> , Case No. 6:18-cv-00207-ADA, Dkt. No. 73 (W.D. Tex. May 30, 2019)
2006	Standing Order Governing Proceedings in Patent Cases, Judge Alan D. Albright
2007	Claim Construction Order, <i>Solas OLED Ltd. v. Apple Inc.</i> , Case No. 6:19-cv-00537-ADA, Dkt. No. 61 (W.D. Tex. Aug. 30, 2020)
2008	Plaintiff Aire Technology Ltd.'s Preliminary Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions to Apple Inc. in <i>Aire Technology Ltd. v. Apple Inc.</i> , Case No. 6:21-cv-01101-ADA (W.D. Tex.)
2009	Defendant Apple Inc.'s Preliminary Invalidity Contentions in <i>Aire Technology Ltd. v. Apple Inc.</i> , Case No. 6:21-cv-01101-ADA (W.D. Tex.)

I. INTRODUCTION

Patent Owner Aire Technology Ltd. (“Patent Owner”) submits this preliminary response to Petitioner Apple Inc.’s (“Petitioner”) petition for *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 8,581,706 (“the ’706 patent”).

The Board should exercise its discretion to deny the petition in light of a parallel district court case involving the same patent, the same claims, the same prior art, and the same parties. By the time the Board reaches an institution decision in this proceeding, the parties and the district court will have already invested significant time and resources in the case—claim construction briefing will be completed and discovery will be underway. The district court trial is also set to take place months before the deadline for a final written decision. Moreover, because the *Fintiv* factors so strongly favor a discretionary denial, the Board need not consider the merits. Thus, all six *Fintiv* factors strongly favor a discretionary denial.

Accordingly, the Board should deny institution.

II. ALL *FINTIV* FACTORS WEIGH AGAINST INSTITUTION

35 U.S.C. § 314(a) gives the Board discretion to deny institution of the requested *inter partes* review due to the advanced state of parallel district court litigation regarding the same issues. *See NHK Spring Co. v. Intri-Plex Techs., Inc.*, IPR2018-00752, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2018) (precedential, designated May 7, 2019) (“*NHK Spring*”). The Board has set forth six factors for determining whether

discretionary denial due to such parallel litigation is appropriate (the “*Fintiv* factors”):

1. whether the court granted a stay or evidence exists that one may be granted if a proceeding is instituted;
2. proximity of the court’s trial date to the Board’s projected statutory deadline for a final written decision;
3. investment in the parallel proceeding by the court and the parties;
4. overlap between issues raised in the petition and in the parallel proceeding;
5. whether the petitioner and the defendant in the parallel proceeding are the same party; and
6. other circumstances that impact the Board’s exercise of discretion, including the merits.

Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc., IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 at 5–6 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2020) (precedential, designated May 5, 2020) (“*Fintiv I*”); *Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.*, IPR2020-00019, Paper 15 at 7–8 (PTAB May 13, 2020) (decision denying institution of *inter partes* review) (“*Fintiv II*”). “These factors relate to whether efficiency, fairness, and the merits support the exercise of authority to deny institution in view of an earlier trial date in the parallel proceeding.” *Fintiv I* at 6. In evaluating the factors, “the Board takes a holistic view of whether efficiency and integrity of the system are best served by denying or instituting review.” *Id.*

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.