

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
WACO DIVISION**

CPC PATENT TECHNOLOGIES PTY LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 6:21-cv-00165-ADA

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

**DEFENDANT APPLE INC.'S ANSWER**

Defendant Apple Inc. (“Apple”) by and through its attorneys files its Answer to the Complaint for Patent Infringement (Dkt. No. 1) filed by Plaintiff CPC Patent Technologies Pty Ltd. (“CPC”). Apple denies the allegations and characterizations in CPC’s Complaint unless expressly admitted in the following numbered paragraphs, which correspond to the numbered paragraphs in the Complaint:

**NATURE OF THE ACTION**

1. Apple admits that this is an action for purported patent infringement arising under 35 U.S.C. § 271 of U.S. Patent Nos. 9,269,208 (“the ’208 Patent”) and 9,665,705 (“the ’705 Patent”) and 8,620,039 (“the ’039 Patent),” collectively “the Patents-in-Suit.” To the extent Paragraph 1 of the Complaint calls for a legal conclusion, no response is required. Apple denies that it infringes or has infringed any claim of the Patents-in-Suit, directly or indirectly, literally or under the Doctrine of Equivalents. Except as specifically admitted and to the extent that a response is required, Apple denies the allegations and characterizations contained in Paragraph 1.

2. Apple admits that CPC accuses Apple iPhones and iPads equipped with Touch or Face ID of infringing the '208 Patent and the '705 Patent and accuses Apple iPhones and iPads with an Apple Card loaded in the Apple Wallet app of infringing the '039 Patent, collectively “the Accused Products.” Apple denies that it infringes or has infringed any claim of the Patents-in-Suit, directly or indirectly, literally or under the Doctrine of Equivalents. Except as specifically admitted and to the extent that a response is required, Apple denies the allegations and characterizations contained in Paragraph 2.

### **THE PARTIES<sup>1</sup>**

3. To the extent that the allegations of Paragraph 3 set forth legal conclusions, no response is required. Apple lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 3 of the Complaint, and therefore denies them.

4. To the extent that the allegations of Paragraph 4 set forth legal conclusions, no response if required. Apple lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 4 of the Complaint, and therefore denies them.

5. Apple admits that it is a California corporation having a place of business at One Apple Park Way in Cupertino, California 95014 and a place of business at 12535 Riata Vista Circle in Austin, Texas and 5501 West Parmer Lane in Austin, Texas.

6. Apple admits that it employs over one thousand people in Austin, Texas.

7. Apple admits that it is building a facility in Austin, Texas, but otherwise denies the characterizations contained in Paragraph 7.

---

<sup>1</sup> Apple repeats the headings set forth in the Complaint to simplify comparison of the Complaint and this response. In doing so, Apple makes no admissions regarding the substance of the headings or any other allegations of the Complaint. Unless otherwise stated, to the extent that a particular heading can be construed as an allegation, Apple specifically denies all such allegations.

8. To the extent Paragraph 8 calls for a legal conclusion, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Apple admits that it has retail establishments in Austin, Texas.

9. Apple admits that it can be served with process through its registered agent CT Corporation System at 1999 Bryan Street, Suite 900, Dallas, Texas 75201.

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

10. Apple admits that this is a purported action for patent infringement arising under the Patent Laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code. Apple further admits that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over actions for alleged patent infringement pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

11. Apple does not contest whether specific personal jurisdiction properly lies over Apple by this Court, solely for purposes of this action. Apple denies that it infringes or has infringed any claim of the Asserted Patents, directly or indirectly, literally or under the Doctrine of Equivalents. Apple denies the remaining allegations and characterizations contained in Paragraph 11.

12. Apple does not contest whether general personal jurisdiction properly lies over Apple by this Court, solely for purposes of this action. Apple denies that it infringes or has infringed any claim of the Asserted Patents, directly or indirectly, literally or under the Doctrine of Equivalents. Apple denies the remaining allegations and characterizations contained in Paragraph 12.

13. CPC's venue allegations call for a legal conclusion and therefore no answer is required. For at least the reasons stated in Apple's Motion to Transfer Venue (Dkt. No. 22), Apple denies that venue in this District is convenient or in the interest of justice, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §

1404(a). Apple admits that it has a place of business in this District. Apple admits that Apple's products are used, offered for sale, and sold in this District. Apple denies that it infringes or has infringed any claim of the Asserted Patents, directly or indirectly, literally or under the Doctrine of Equivalents. Apple denies the remaining allegations and characterizations contained in Paragraph 13.

**SECURICOM'S [ALLEGED] INNOVATION OF BIOMETRIC SECURITY TECHNOLOGY**

14. Denied.

15. Denied.

16. Denied.

**APPLE'S [ALLEGED] FORAY INTO THE BIOMETRIC SECURITY TECHNOLOGY**

17. To the extent Paragraph 17 calls for a legal conclusion, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Apple admits that it introduced Apple Touch ID in 2013 and Apple Face ID in 2017. Apple denies that it infringes or has infringed any claim of the Asserted Patents, directly or indirectly, literally or under the Doctrine of Equivalents. Apple also denies, as explained in its September 29, 2020 Preliminary Invalidity Contentions, that the '208 Patent and '705 Patent are entitled the alleged priority date CPC asserts. Apple denies the remaining allegations and characterizations contained in Paragraph 17.

18. Apple admits that it introduced the Apple Card in 2019. Apple denies that it infringes or has infringed any claim of the Asserted Patents, directly or indirectly, literally or under the Doctrine of Equivalents. Apple denies the remaining allegations and characterizations contained in Paragraph 18.

### **THE PATENTS-IN-SUIT**

19. To the extent Paragraph 19 calls for a legal conclusion, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Apple admits that CPC purports to attach a true and accurate copy of the '039 Patent, entitled "Card Device Security using Biometrics," as Exhibit A to its Complaint and that the first page of the '039 Patent displays December 31, 2013. Apple denies the remaining allegations and characterizations contained in Paragraph 19.

20. To the extent Paragraph 20 calls for a legal conclusion, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Apple admits that CPC purports to attach a true and accurate copy of the '208 Patent, entitled "Remote Entry System," as Exhibit B to its Complaint and that the first page of the '208 Patent displays February 23, 2016. Apple denies the remaining allegations and characterizations contained in Paragraph 20.

21. To the extent Paragraph 21 calls for a legal conclusion, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Apple admits that CPC purports to attach a true and accurate copy of the '705 Patent, entitled "Remote Entry System," as Exhibit C to its Complaint and that the first page of the '705 Patent displays May 30, 2017. Apple denies the remaining allegations and characterizations contained in Paragraph 21.

### **APPLE'S [ALLEGED] KNOWLEDGE OF THE PATENTS-IN-SUIT**

22. To the extent Paragraph 22 calls for a legal conclusion, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Apple admits that CPC purports to attach correspondence from CPC to an Apple employee dated March 19, 2020 as Exhibit D to its Complaint. Apple denies the correspondence CPC purports to attach as Exhibit D constitutes specific notice of infringement regarding the '705 Patent or the '039 Patent. Apple denies the remaining allegations and characterizations contained in Paragraph 22.

# 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.