

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

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

Petitioners,

v.

JAWBONE INNOVATIONS, LLC,

Patent Owner.

Patent No. 11,122,357  
Filing Date: August 5, 2013  
Issue Date: September 14, 2021

Inventor: Gregory C. Burnett  
Title: FORMING VIRTUAL MICROPHONE ARRAYS USING DUAL  
OMNIDIRECTIONAL MICROPHONE ARRAY (DOMA)

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

Case No. IPR2022-01321

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page(s)</u></b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. THE '357 PATENT .....	2
III. THE ALLEGED PRIOR ART .....	2
A. Kanamori (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0185804).....	2
B. McCowan (Iain A. McCowan et al., <i>Near-Field Adaptive Beamformer for Robust Speech Recognition</i> , Digital Signal Processing, Vol. 12, Issue 1 (2002), 87-106).....	4
C. Elko (U.S. Patent No. 8,942,387).....	6
IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	6
V. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....	6
VI. ARGUMENT.....	7
A. Kanamori and McCowan Do Not Render Obvious Claims 1-20 .....	7
1. Dr. Vipperman’s Analysis is Based Entirely on Hindsight.....	7
2. Petitioner’s Combination Does Not Disclose or Render Obvious “wherein the first virtual microphone and the second virtual microphone are distinct virtual directional microphones with substantially similar responses to noise and substantially dissimilar responses to speech;” as Required by Claims 1-20.....	9
3. Petitioner Does Not Show That a POSITA Would Be Motivated to Combine Kanamori with McCowan .....	11
VII. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION IN THE DISCRETION OF THE DIRECTOR UNDER 35 U.S.C. §314(A).....	14

A. No Stay of the Parallel District Court Litigation .....16

B. The Board’s Written Decision Deadline Will Come Long  
After the Trial Date .....17

C. Significant Investment by the Time of Institution Favors  
Discretionary Denial.....18

D. The District Court Litigation Involves the Same Claims and  
the Same Arguments .....19

E. The Parallel District Court Litigation and the Petition Involve  
the Same Parties .....20

F. Other Circumstances Favor Denial of Institution .....20

VIII. CONCLUSION.....21

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>AGIS Software Dev. LLC v. Google LLC</i> , No. 2:19-cv-00361-JRG, 2021 WL 465424 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 9, 2021) .....	17
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 20, 2020) .....	14, 15, 19
<i>Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.</i> , 732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	12
<i>Chemours Co. FC, LLC v. Daikin Indus.</i> , No. 2020-1289, 2021 WL 3085514 (Fed. Cir. July 22, 2021) .....	13
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Ramot at Tel Aviv Univ. Ltd.</i> , IPR2020-00122, Paper 15 (P.T.A.B. May 15, 2020) .....	18
<i>Gen. Plastic Indus. Co. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , IPR2016-01357, Paper 19 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 6, 2017).....	16
<i>Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbott Lab'ys</i> , 512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	12
<i>Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	11
<i>Jawbone Innovations, LLC v. Google LLC</i> , No. 6:21-cv-00985-ADA, Dkt. 23 (W.D. Tex. Dec. 23, 2021).....	16
<i>Los Angeles Biomedical Rsch. Inst. at Harbor-UCLA Med. Ctr. v. Eli Lilly and Co.</i> , 849 F.3d 1049 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	11
<i>Next Caller Inc. v. TrustID, Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00961, -00962, Paper 10, at 8-16 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 16, 2019) .....	17

*NHK Spring Co. v. Intri-Plex Techs., Inc.*,  
IPR2018-00752, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 12, 2018).....15

*Pers. Web Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc.*,  
848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....*passim*

*RF Cyber Corp. v. Google LLC*,  
No. 2:20-cv-00274-JRG, Dkt. 201 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 4, 2022).....16

*Samsung Elecs. Am., Inc. v. Uniloc 2017 LLC*,  
IPR2019-01218, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 7, 2020) .....17

*Sotera Wireless, Inc. v. Masimo Corp.*,  
IPR2020-01019, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 1, 2020) .....20

*Supercell Oy v. Gree, Inc.*,  
IPR2020-00513, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. June 24, 2020) .....19

*Trivascular, Inc. v. Samuels*,  
812 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....13

*In re Van Os*,  
844 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....12

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 314(a) .....15, 21

35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11).....17

# 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.