

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

META PLATFORMS, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

ANGEL TECHNOLOGIES LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2023-00058  
U.S. Patent 9,959,291

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE  
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

**Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"**

Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

*Submitted Electronically via the Patent Review Processing System*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	BACKGROUND .....	3
	A. The '291 Patent .....	3
	1. Existing Technology .....	3
	2. Advantages Provided by the '291 Patent .....	4
	3. The '291 Patent Components .....	6
	4. The Operation of the '291 Patent Inventions .....	9
	B. ALLEGED PRIOR ART .....	10
	1. Sharpe .....	10
	2. Eintracht .....	13
	3. Carey .....	14
III.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL .....	15
IV.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	15
V.	Argument .....	16
	A. Sharpe Does Not Qualify as Prior Art .....	16
	As Shown Below, Patent Owner Had Conceived and Reasonably Continued Activity to Reduce to Practice the Claim Invention Prior to Sharpe's Priority Date .....	21
	B. Claim 24 is a Apparatus Corollary for Method Claim 1 and Was Likewise Conceived and Reduced to Practice Prior to Sharpe's Priority Date .....	28
	C. Claim 25 is a Non-Transitory Computer Readable Medium Corollary for Method Claim 1 and Was Likewise Conceived and Reduced to Practice Prior to Sharpe's Priority Date .....	29
	D. Dependent Claims 2-24 are Patentable for the Same Reasons as the Independent Claims from Which They Depend .....	29
	E. The Petition Failed To Present Proper Claim Construction As Statutorily Required. ....	29
	F. The Petition Fails to Establish a Proper Motivation to Combine References .....	32
VI.	CONCLUSION .....	34

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Biosig Instruments, Inc. v. Nautilus, Inc.</i> , 783 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	20
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	17
<i>Freebit AS v. Bose Corp.</i> , No. IPR2017-01308, 2017 WL 5202106 (PTAB Nov. 8, 2017).....	17, 20
<i>Heart Failure Techs., LLC v. Cardiokinetix Inc.</i> , No. IPR201300183 .....	33
<i>In re Ochiai</i> , 71 F.3d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1995) .....	32
<i>In re Scheiber</i> , 587 F.2d 59 (C.C.P.A. 1978) .....	19
<i>In re Steed</i> , 802 F.3d 1311 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	17, 18, 28
<i>In re Stempel</i> , 241 F.2d 755 (C.C.P.A. 1957) .....	17
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	32, 33, 34
<i>Mazzari v. Rogan</i> , 323 F.3d 1000 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	18
<i>Monsanto Co. v. Mycogen Plant Science, Inc.</i> , 261 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....	18
<i>NFC Tech., LLC v. Matal</i> , 871 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	18
<i>Perfect Surgical Techniques, Inc. v. Olympus Am., Inc.</i> , 841 F.3d 1004 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	18

*Phillips v. AWH Corp.*,  
415 F.3d 1303, Fed. Cir. 2005 ..... 15

*Tyco Healthcare Grp. v. Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc.*,  
774 F.3d 968 (Fed. Cir. 2014) ..... 18

**STATUTES**

35 U.S.C. § 120 ..... 19

35 U.S.C. § 313 ..... 1

35 U.S.C. § 316(e) ..... 16

35 U.S.C. § 322 ..... 30

35 U.S.C. §§ 324(a), 326(a)(2) ..... 29

35 U.S.C. § 326(b) ..... 31

U.S. Patent Act ..... 28

**OTHER AUTHORITIES**

37 C.F.R. §§ 42.65(a), 42.304(b)(5) ..... 30

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) ..... 31

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(5) ..... 34

37 C.F.R. § 42.107 ..... 1

37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c) ..... 3, 16

37 C.F.R. § 42.208(c) ..... 1

37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)(3) ..... 29

37 C.F.R. § 1.131 ..... 2, 20

77 Fed. Reg. at 48763 ..... 30

83 Fed. Reg. 51340 (October 11, 2018) ..... 15

IPR2012-00026, Paper 17 ..... 30

MPEP 2138.01(II).....18

No. 12, Decision Denying Institution of Inter Partes Review (P.T.A.B. July  
31, 2013) .....33

# 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.