

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC. and APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

SMART MOBILE TECHNOLOGIES LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2022-01249
Patent 9,019,946 B1

Before HYUN J. JUNG, GARTH D. BAER, and AARON W. MOORE,
Administrative Patent Judges.

JUNG, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

ERRATA

The panel modifies the Final Written Decision (Paper 53, “Decision”) to address the erroneous inclusion of claim 26 as not being shown to be unpatentable. As discussed in Section II.H.3. of the Decision, Petitioner persuaded us by a preponderance of the evidence that claim 26 is unpatentable. Paper 53, 70–71.

On page 2 of the Decision, the first paragraph reads:

We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6. This Final Written Decision is issued pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 318(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.73. For the reasons that follow, we determine that Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., Samsung Electronics America, Inc., and Apple Inc. (collectively, “Petitioner”) have shown by a preponderance of the evidence that claims 14, 15, 17–21, and 27–30, but not claims 1–13, 16, and 26, of U.S. Patent No. 9,019,946 B1 (Ex. 1001, “the ’946 patent”) are unpatentable. We also grant Petitioner’s Motion to Submit Supplemental Information.

We change the first paragraph on page 2 to read:

We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6. This Final Written Decision is issued pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 318(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.73. For the reasons that follow, we determine that Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., Samsung Electronics America, Inc., and Apple Inc. (collectively, “Petitioner”) have shown by a preponderance of the evidence that claims 14, 15, 17–21, and 26–30, but not claims 1–13, and 16, of U.S. Patent No. 9,019,946 B1 (Ex. 1001, “the ’946 patent”) are unpatentable. We also grant Petitioner’s Motion to Submit Supplemental Information.

On page 87 of the Decision, the table reads:

In summary:

Claims	35 U.S.C. §	References/Basis	Claims Shown Unpatentable	Claims Not Shown Unpatentable
14, 15	103(a)	Yegoshin, Johnston, Billström	14, 15	
1–11, 16–21	103(a)	Yegoshin, Johnston, Billström, Bernard	17–21	1–11, 16
12	103(a)	Yegoshin, Johnston, Billström, Bernard, WO748		12
13, 26	103(a)	Yegoshin, Johnston, Billström, Bernard, Sinton		13, 26
27–30	103(a)	Yegoshin, Johnston, Billström, Bernard, Preiss	27–30	
Overall Outcome			14, 15, 17–21, 27–30	1–13, 16, 26

We change the table to read:

In summary:

Claims	35 U.S.C. §	References/Basis	Claims Shown Unpatentable	Claims Not Shown Unpatentable
14, 15	103(a)	Yegoshin, Johnston, Billström	14, 15	
1–11, 16–21	103(a)	Yegoshin, Johnston, Billström, Bernard	17–21	1–11, 16
12	103(a)	Yegoshin, Johnston, Billström, Bernard, WO748		12
13, 26	103(a)	Yegoshin, Johnston, Billström, Bernard, Sinton	26	13
27–30	103(a)	Yegoshin, Johnston, Billström, Bernard, Preiss	27–30	
Overall Outcome			14, 15, 17–21, 26–30	1–13, 16

On page 88 of the Decision, the sentence segment that reads “ORDERED that claims 14, 15, 17–21, and 27–30 of U.S. Patent No. 9,019,946 B1 have been shown, by a preponderance of the evidence, to be unpatentable” is changed to read “ORDERED that claims 14, 15, 17–21, and 26–30 of U.S. Patent No. 9,019,946 B1 have been shown, by a preponderance of the evidence, to be unpatentable.”

Also, on page 88 of the Decision, the sentence segment that reads “FURTHER ORDERED that claims 1–13, 16, and 26 of U.S. Patent No.

IPR2022-01249
Patent 9,019,946 B1

9,019,946 B1 have not been shown, by a preponderance of the evidence, to be unpatentable” is changed to read “FURTHER ORDERED that claims 1–13, and 16 of U.S. Patent No. 9,019,946 B1 have not been shown, by a preponderance of the evidence, to be unpatentable.”

In all other respects, the Decision is unchanged.

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.