

IPR2023-00939 (U.S. Patent No. 8,510,407)
PO's Preliminary Response

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner

v.

DODOTS LICENSING SOLUTIONS LLC,
Patent Owner
Case IPR2023-00939
U.S. Patent No. 8,510,407

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. THE '407 PATENT.....	4
A. The background of the claimed invention.....	4
B. The previous Lenovo '407 IPR.	8
III. THE LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART.....	10
IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.	11
V. THE SLIVKA REFERENCE.....	12
A. The prosecution of the Slivka patent.....	13
B. Availability of the Slivka application, the Slivka FH, and the Slivka appendices to the public.	14
VI. APPLE FAILS TO ESTABLISH THAT THE PRIMARY REFERENCE IT <i>ACTUALLY</i> RELIES ON IS 102(E) PRIOR ART.....	17
A. Apple fails to identify with particularity the grounds for challenging each claim and the evidence that supports each of those grounds.....	17
B. Apple fails to establish that the Slivka documents it relies on as its primary reference are §102(e) prior art.	20
1. Slivka application is not §102(e) prior art.	20
2. The Slivka file history is not §102(e) prior art.	22
C. Apple fails to establish that the appendices are part of the patent or the patent application.	23
D. Even if the appendices were part of the unpublished application, the appendices are not 102(e) prior art.....	28

E.	The unavailability of the Slivka application and Slivka FH (along with the appendices) as §102(e) prior art is fatal to Apple's petition and necessitates its denial.....	30
VII.	PETITIONER FAILS TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF §§37 C.F.R. 42.104(B)(3) AND 42.104(B)(4).....	31
VIII.	PETITIONER DOES NOT EXPLAIN ANY DEFECT IN THE EXAMINER'S PRIOR CONSIDERATION OF SLIVKA UNDER THE TWO-PART <i>ADVANCED BIONICS</i> FRAMEWORK APPLYING THE <i>BECTON DICKINSON</i> FACTORS.....	35
IX.	CONCLUSION.....	37

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Advanced Bionics, LLC v. MED-EL Elektromedizinische Geräte GmbH,</i> IPR2019-01469, Paper 6 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 13, 2020).....	3, 35, 36
<i>Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG,</i> IPR2017-01586, Paper 8, 17-18 (Dec. 15, 2017).....	35, 37
<i>Benitec Biopharma Ltd. v. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory,</i> IPR2016-00014, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 23, 2016).....	36
<i>Carefusion Corporation v. Baxter International, Inc.,</i> IPR2016-01456, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 6, 2017).....	33, 34
<i>Clickbooth.com LLC v. Essociate, Inc.,</i> IPR2015-00464, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. July 9, 2015).....	32
<i>Duodecad IT Services Luxembourg S.A.R.L, et al. v. WAG Acquisition, LLC.,</i> IPR2015-01036, Paper 17 (P.T.A.B. October 20, 2016).....	22, 23
<i>Flotek Indus., Inc. v. Nat'l Oilwell DHT, L.P.,</i> IPR2015-01210, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 6, 2015).....	32
<i>Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.,</i> 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	17
<i>Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.,</i> 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	17
<i>Lenovo Holding Co, Inc. et al. v. DoDots Licensing Sols.,</i> IPR2019-00988 (PTAB September 9, 2020).....	8
<i>Lenovo Holding Co. v. DoDots Licensing Sols. LLC,</i> 2021 U.S. App. LEXIS 36126 (Fed. Cir. Dec. 8, 2021).....	1, 5, 10
<i>Lindsay Corporation v. Valmont Industries,</i> IPR2015-01039, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 24, 2015).....	32

IPR2023-00939 (U.S. Patent No. 8,510,407)
PO's Preliminary Response

Medshape, Inc. v. Cayenne Med., Inc.,
IPR2015-00848, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Sep 14, 2015).....33

Ex parte Miyazaki,
89 U.S.P.Q.2d 1207 (BPAI Nov. 19, 2008)33

On Demand Mach. Corp. v. Ingram Indus.,
2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 28275 (E.D. MO. 2003).....29

Phillips v AWH Corp.,
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc)11

Riverwood Int'l Corp. v R.A. Jones & Co.,
324 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2003)29

SAS Institute, Inc. v. Complementsoft, LLC,
IPR2013- 00226 Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 12, 2013).....32

*Sequenom, Inc., v. The Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford
Junior University*
IPR2014-00337, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. July 16, 2014).....21, 22

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102(e)*passim*

35 U.S.C. § 112(f).....31

35 U.S.C. §12215, 21

35 U.S.C. § 282(b)11

35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3).....17

35 U.S.C. § 316(e)17

35 U.S.C. §325(d)3

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. §1.11(a).....16, 23

37 C.F.R. §1.96*passim*

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.