

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

AIRE TECHNOLOGY LIMITED,
Patent Owner.

IPR2023-00080
U.S. Patent No. 8,205,249

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 312 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.104**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PETITIONER’S EXHIBIT LIST5

I. INTRODUCTION7

II. GROUNDS FOR STANDING.....8

III. NOTE.....8

IV. SUMMARY OF THE ’249 PATENT8

V. PROSECUTION HISTORY11

VI. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART13

VII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION14

VIII. RELIEF REQUESTED AND THE REASONS FOR THE REQUESTED RELIEF16

IX. DISCRETIONARY DENIAL WOULD BE INAPPROPRIATE.....16

 A. Discretionary denial under the *Fintiv* factors is not appropriate..... 16

 1. No evidence regarding a stay 16

 2. Parallel proceeding trial date 17

 3. Investment in the parallel proceeding 18

 4. Overlapping issues with the parallel proceeding 19

 5. Petitioner is a defendant..... 19

 6. Other circumstances..... 19

 B. The *Fintiv* Framework Should Be Overturned..... 20

 C. Discretionary denial under *General Plastic* is not appropriate..... 20

1.	Factor 1: Whether the same petitioner previously filed a petition directed to the same claims of the same patent.	21
2.	Factor 2: Whether at the time of filing of the first petition the petitioner knew of the prior art asserted in the second petition or should have known of it.	24
3.	Factor 3: Whether at the time of filing of the second petition the petitioner already received the patent owner’s preliminary response to the first petition or received the Board’s decision on whether to institute review in the first petition.	25
4.	Factor 4: The length of time elapsed between learning of prior art and filing second petition	25
5.	Factor 5: whether the petitioner provides adequate explanation for the time elapsed between filings of multiple petitions directed to the same claims of the same patent.....	26
6.	Factors 6 and 7: The finite resources of the Board and the requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11).	27
D.	Discretionary denial under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) is not appropriate	28
X.	IDENTIFICATION OF HOW THE CLAIM IS UNPATENTABLE	29
A.	Challenged Claim.....	29
B.	Statutory Grounds for Challenges	29
C.	Ground 1: Claim 13 is obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Burger and Cheng.....	30
1.	Summary of Burger.....	30
2.	Summary of Cheng	35
3.	Reasons to Combine Burger and Cheng	37

a)	A POSITA would have found it obvious to add Cheng’s authentication level information to Burger’s Pocket Vault.....	38
b)	A POSITA would have found it obvious to add Cheng’s authentication method selection technique to Burger’s Pocket Vault.....	42
c)	A POSITA would have had a reasonable expectation of success combining Burger and Cheng	45
4.	Claim 13.....	47
XI.	CONCLUSION.....	68
XII.	MANDATORY NOTICES	69
A.	Real Party-in-Interest	69
B.	Related Matters.....	69
C.	Lead and Back-up Counsel and Service Information	69
	CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT.....	71
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	72

PETITIONER'S EXHIBIT LIST

Ex.1001	U.S. Patent No. 8,205,249
Ex.1002	Prosecution History of U.S. Patent No. 8,205,249
Ex.1003	Declaration of Dr. Clifford Neuman under 37 C.F.R. § 1.68
Ex.1004	<i>Curriculum Vitae</i> of Dr. Clifford Neuman
Ex.1005	U.S. Patent No. 7,080,037 to Burger et al.
Ex.1006	U.S. Application Publication No. 2004/0039909 to Cheng
Ex.1007	U.S. Application Publication No. 2003/0101348 to Russo et al.
Ex.1008	U.S. Patent No. 7,127,606 to Wheeler et al.
Ex.1009	U.S. Patent No. 7,260,724 to Dickinson et al.
Ex.1010	U.S. Patent No. 6,941,285 to Sarcanin
Ex.1011	U.S. Patent No. 5,422,953 to Fischer
Ex.1012	U.S. Patent No. 7,941,669 to Foley et al.
Ex.1013	U.S. Patent No. 7,137,008 to Hamid et al.
Ex.1014	U.S. Patent No. 5,721,781 to Deo et al.
Ex.1015	U.S. Application Publication No. 2002/0016913 to Wheeler et al
Ex.1016	Complaint, <i>Aire Technology Ltd. v. Apple Inc.</i> 6-21-cv-01101 (W.D. Tex. Oct. 22, 2021)
Ex.1017	Complaint, <i>Aire Technology Ltd v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.</i> , 6:21-cv-00955 (W.D. Tex. Sep. 15, 2021)
Ex.1018	Plaintiff's Preliminary Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions to Defendant Apple Inc, <i>Aire Technology Ltd. v. Apple Inc.</i> 6-21-cv-01101 (W.D. Tex. Jan. 20, 2022)

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.