

Exhibit 32

No. 2018-1404

**United States Court of Appeals
for the Federal Circuit**

ANCORA TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

HTC AMERICA, INC., HTC CORPORATION,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western
District of Washington, Case No. 2:16-cv-01919-RAJ

REPLY BRIEF OF APPELLANT

Mark A. Cantor
Marc Lorelli
John S. LeRoy
John P. Rondini
BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center
Twenty-Second Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
(248) 358-4400

May 7, 2018

Counsel for Appellant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ii

I. REPLY INTRODUCTION 1

II. REPLY ARGUMENT – *ALICE* STEP ONE 5

 A. Ancora’s Technological Invention Was Ignored 5

 1. The Specification Teachings Confirm the Technological Invention of the ‘941 Patent 9

 2. HTC’s Arguments Regarding Hardware Changes are a Red-Herring 11

 3. Ancora’s Claim is not Directed to Restricting Access on a Computer 14

 B. HTC’s Non-Published Opinion Is Inapplicable 15

III. REPLY ARGUMENT – *ALICE* STEP TWO 17

 A. Ancora’s Technological Invention Was Ignored 17

 1. The Intrinsic Record Confirms the Inventive Concept 18

 a. BIOS Modification 18

 b. BIOS / Program Interaction 20

 2. BASCOM is Informative 21

 B. Judgment on the Pleading Is Inappropriate 24

IV. CONCLUSION AND RELIEF SOUGHT 26

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH TYPE-VOLUME, TYPEFACE AND TYPE STYLE REQUIREMENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd v. CLS Bank International</i> , 134 S.Ct. 2347 (2014).....	7, 18, 23
<i>Ancora Technologies, Inc. v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 744 F.3d 732 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	1, 2, 21
<i>Ancora Techs., Inc. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 2012 US. Dist. LEXIS 183045 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 31, 2012)	3, 5, 18, 19
<i>BASCOM Global Internet Servs., Inc. v. AT&T Mobility LLC</i> , 827 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	20, 21, 22, 23
<i>Berkmeimer v. HP, Inc.</i> , 881 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	25
<i>Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 822 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16
<i>Internet Patents Corp. v. Active Network, Inc.</i> , 790 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	6
<i>Prism Techs. LLC v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.</i> , 696 F.App'x 1014 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	15, 16
<i>Thales Visionix Inc. v. US</i> , 850 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	7, 9, 14, 15, 16
<i>Visual Memory LLC v. NVIDIA Corp.</i> , 867 F.3d 1253 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16

I. REPLY INTRODUCTION

Like the district court, HTC unfairly casts the claimed invention as “controlling access to something.” (Red Br. at 21-22.) Redefining the claimed invention at such a high level enabled the district court and HTC to make broad, but incorrect, assertions that the claims are abstract, that they do not reflect an improvement in computer technology and that they lack an inventive concept. By HTC’s measure, all computer *software* is unpatentable unless the claims also recite a distinct patentable innovation in computer *hardware*. As this Court has repeatedly held, that is not the law.

The district court and HTC largely ignore an entire limitation of claim 1 which expressly recites a *change* to a conventional computer in which a software agent sets up a new licensing “verification structure” in an “erasable” memory area of the BIOS, as opposed to the more conventional “ROM” or *non-erasable* BIOS. The file history confirms that this approach was innovative at the time of the invention. As this Court previously stated: “[t]he applicants explained that their invention differed from the prior art in that it both operated as an application running through an operating system and used the BIOS level for data storage and retrieval – a combination that was not previously taught and that an ordinary skilled application writer would not employ.” *Ancora Technologies, Inc. v. Apple, Inc.*, 744 F.3d 732, 736 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (“*Ancora I*”).

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.