

IPR2023-00701 (U.S. Patent No. 8,510,407)
PO's Sur-Reply

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,
Petitioner,
v.

DODOTS LICENSING SOLUTIONS LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2023-00701
U.S. Patent No. 8,510,407

**PATENT OWNER'S SUR-REPLY TO PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES*
REVIEW OF UNITED STATES PATENT NO. 8,510,407**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. THE BROWN/WECKER COMBINATIONS FAIL.....2

 A. Failure to establish a prima facie case.....2

 1. Undeveloped grounds.....2

 2. Improper new evidence and arguments.....4

 3. Unsupported, generalized obviousness assertions.4

 4. Ground 1A.....5

 5. Failure to address a reasonable expectation of success or
 predictable results.....6

 6. Failure to establish motivation to combine.6

 B. Petitioner's failure is not one of bodily incorporation.7

 1. Incompatibility.7

 2. Combining Brown and Wecker would eliminate the concept of
 separate NIM.11

 C. The prior art fails to disclose crucial claim limitations.....12

 1. Fully configurable.12

 2. Data structures / NIM template.14

 3. Content.15

 4. Request and storage of NIM template.....16

 D. No motivation to add Beer.17

III. THE SHIMADA/BUCHHOLZ COMBINATION FAILS17

A.	Failure to establish a prima facie case of obviousness.....	17
B.	Petitioner never addresses the structure in Buchholz.....	19
C.	Shimada does not disclose the claimed templates.	20
D.	Shimada does not disclose the claimed view characteristics.....	21
E.	Shimada does not disclose the claimed control characteristics.	21
F.	Shimada does not disclose the claimed NIM.	21
IV.	SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS	22
A.	Nexus.....	22
B.	Failure of others.....	25
C.	Industry praise.	25
D.	Commercial success.	26
E.	Long-felt need.	27

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>A/S v. Coolit Sys. Inc.</i> , 19-cv-00410-EMC, 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 246288 (N.D. Cal. Sep. 11, 2022)	5
<i>Adidas AG v. Nike, Inc.</i> , 963 F.3d 1355, 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	7
<i>Amarin Pharma v. Hikma Pharm</i> , 449 F. Supp. 3d 967 (D. Nev. 2020).....	27
<i>Apple Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	28
<i>Arctic Cat Inc. v. Bombardier Rec. Prods.</i> , 876 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	4
<i>Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC</i> , 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	3
<i>Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.</i> , 732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	5
<i>Dell Inc. v. Acceleron, LLC</i> , 818 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	3
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	17
<i>Google v. Home Bondholders</i> , IPR2015-00662, Paper 17 (August 20, 2015)	25
<i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	10
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 38 U.S. 1 (1966).....	3

IPR2023-00701 (U.S. Patent No. 8,510,407)
PO's Sur-Reply

Hulu, LLC v. Sound View Innovations, LLC,
IPR2018-00582, Paper 34 (August 5, 2019)4

Intel Corp. v. Pact XPP Schweiz AG,
2022-1038, 2023 U.S. App. LEXIS 4436 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 24, 2023).....7

Johns Manville Corp. v. Knauf Insulation, Inc.,
IPR No. 2018-008275, 7, 18, 19

KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007).....7, 8, 9, 10

In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.,
829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)17

Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Elm 3DS Innovations, LLC,
925 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2019)7

Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.,
713 F.2d 1530 (Fed. Cir. 1983)23

Teva Pharms. Int'l GmbH v. Eli Lilly & Co.,
8 F.4th 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2021)23

TriVascular, Inc. v. Samuels,
812 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2016)7, 10

Truswall Sys. Corp. v. Hydro-Air Engineering, Inc.,
813 F.2d 1207 (Fed. Cir. 1987)23

Volvo Penta of the Ams., LLC v. Brunswick Corp.,
81 F.4th 1202 (Fed. Cir. 2023)25

WBIP, LLC v. Kohler Co.,
829 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2016)25

Yita LLC v. MacNeil IP LLC,
69 F.4th 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2023)3

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.