

Patent Owner's Preliminary Response
IPR2024-00556 (U.S. Patent No. 8,749,507)

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

VALVE CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

v.

IMMERSION CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2024-00556
U.S. Patent No. 9,748,507

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-19 AND 37 C.F.R. § 41.100, ET SEQ.**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. BACKGROUND3

A. Immersion Corporation – A Pioneer in Haptics Technology3

B. The Challenged ’507 Patent6

C. Prosecution History11

III. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART (POSA)16

IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....17

V. THE ASSERTED REFERENCES.....19

A. Astala (Ex. 1005).....19

B. The Shahoian Reference (Ex. 1004)20

C. The Keely Reference (Ex. 1007).....21

D. Kolmykov-Zotov Reference (Ex. 1008)22

VI. ASTALA + SHAHOIAN DOES NOT DISCLOSE OR SUGGEST USING PRESSURE, CHANGE IN PRESSURE AND ELAPSED TIME TO “DETERMINE A PRESS”24

A. Astala + Shahoian does not teach determining an initial press of the touch sensitive input device as required by the claim language “determining a press”24

B. Astala + Shahoian does not use a “change in pressure” to determine an initial press.....27

VII. NEITHER KEELY NOR KOLMYKOV-ZOTOV DISCLOSE OR TEACH “DETERMIN[ING] A PRESS” OR “A CHANGE IN PRESSURE THRESHOLD” AND THEREFORE DO NOT RENDER THE CLAIMS UNPATENTABLE35

A. Keely and Kolmykov-Zotov do not teach “determining a press” as required by all challenged claims, but rather describe identifying gestures that simulate mouse inputs.35

B. The Petition does not identify evidence relating to “determining a press” in the first instance but rather whether a the “hold” portion of a press-and-hold event has occurred.....37

VIII. INSTITUTION SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 314(a)43

A. Whether the Court Granted a Stay or Evidence Exists That One
May Be Granted if a Proceeding Is Instituted.....45

B. Proximity of the Court’s Trial Date to the Board’s Projected
Deadline for a Final Written Decision46

C. Investment in the Parallel Proceeding by the Court and the
Parties47

D. Overlap Between the Issues Raised in the Petition and the
Parallel Proceeding.....48

E. Whether the Petitioner and the Defendant in the Parallel
Proceeding are the Same Party.....49

F. Other Circumstances That Impact the Board’s Exercise of
Discretion, Including the Merits.....49

IX. CONCLUSION49

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc., IPR2020-00019,
Paper 11 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2020).....44

Apple Inc. v. Immersion Corp.,
Case IPR2016-01371, Paper 7 (PTAB Jan. 11, 2017)..... 3, 33, 36

Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc., 832 F.3d (Fed. Cir. 2016)33

Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Oyster Optics, LLC,
IPR2021-00238, Paper 10 (PTAB Jun. 1, 2021) 44, 48

CommScope Technologies LLC, v. Dali Wireless, Inc.,
IPR2022-01242, Paper 23 (PTAB Feb. 27, 2023).....42

In re. Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr., 367 F.3d (Fed. Cir. 2004).....33

Nidec v. Zhongshan, 868 F.3d (Fed. Cir. 2017).....18

Zhuhai Cosmox Battery Co., Ltd. v. Ningde Amperex Technology Limited,
IPR2023-00587, Paper 12 (PTAB Sept. 22, 2023).....43

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 314(a)42

REGULATIONS

77 Fed. Reg. 48680-01 (Aug. 14, 2012)47

EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit No.	Exhibit Description
2001	Declaration of Craig Rosenberg, Ph.D. in Support of Immersion Corporation's Patent Owner Preliminary Response, dated May 15, 2024
2002	Curriculum Vitae of Craig Rosenberg, Ph.D.
2003	File History of U.S. Patent SN 10/723,778
2004	<i>Immersion Corp. v. Valve Corp.</i> , 2:23-cv-000712-TL, Order on Motion to Stay Pending <i>Inter Partes</i> Review, Dkt. # 69
2005	<i>Immersion Corp. v. Valve Corp.</i> , 2:23-cv-000712-TL, Case Scheduling Order, Dkt. # 46
2006	<i>Immersion Corp. v. Valve Corp.</i> , 2:23-cv-000712-TL, Valve Corp.'s Invalidity Contentions

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.