

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

QUALTRICS, LLC

Petitioner

v.

OPINIONLAB, INC.

Patent Owner

Case IPR2014-00366

Patent 8,041,805

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 23313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OF THE '805 PATENT ARE PATENTABLE OVER THE PROPOSED COMBINATION.....	3
A. Overview of the Board's Decision	3
B. The '805 Patent	3
C. The CustomerSat Reference.....	7
1. The Status and Scope of CustomerSat	7
2. The Disclosure of CustomerSat	8
a) CustomerSat's "Feedback" Hyperlink Forces the User to a Separate Web Page to Provide Feedback.....	9
b) CustomerSat's "Pop-Up" Type Random Survey Also Forces the User to a Separate Web Page	9
c) CustomerSat Contains No Disclosure of a Reporting Capability to Compare Feedback for Particular Web Pages	11
D. The Medinets Reference.....	12
E. The HTML 4.0 Specification	14
F. The Proposed Combination Does Not Teach or Suggest All of the Features Recited in the Challenged Claims.....	14
1. Deficiency A – No "Page-Specific User Feedback" that has been "Provided by a User While the User Remained at the Particular Web Page"	15
a) CustomerSat Fails to Address Deficiency A.....	16
i. The "Feedback Link" Fails to Show Deficiency A.....	17
ii. The Pop!Up Fails to Show Deficiency A.....	17
iii. Conclusion.....	21
b) Medinets and HTML 4.0 Specification Fail to Address Deficiency A.....	22

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
c) Deficiency A Was a Distinguishing Feature During Prosecution of the '805 Patent.....	27
2. Deficiency B – No Ability to “Identify ... Particular Web Pages of the Website for Which the Page-Specific User Feedback Is Notable” Relative to Others.....	29
a) CustomerSat Does Not Address Deficiency B.....	30
b) Medinets and HTML 4.0 Specification Do Not Address Deficiency B	32
G. There Would Have Been No Motivation to Combine These Cited References at the Time of the Invention.....	34
1. Legal Standard	34
2. One of Ordinary Skill in the Art would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine These Cited References	36
3. Petitioner’s Arguments Are Incorrect.....	37
4. The Findings in the Decision Should Be Reconsidered	40
5. HTML 4.0 Specification Does Not Provide The Missing Motivation	42
6. The Remaining Comments in the Chisholm Declaration Do Not Support a Finding of Motivation to Combine.....	42
7. Conclusion	44
H. Secondary Considerations of Non-Obviousness.....	44
1. Legal Standard	44
2. Nexus.....	46
3. Commercial Success of the Covered OpinionLab Product	51
4. Industry Recognition of the Covered OpinionLab Product.....	53
5. Copying of the Claimed Invention.....	54
6. Conclusion	56
III. CONCLUSION.....	56

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.</i> , 732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	34
<i>Cheese Sys., Inc. v. Tetra Pak Cheese & Powder Sys., Inc.</i> , 725 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	36
<i>Crocs, Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 598 F.3d 1294	45
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	44
<i>Heart Failure Technologies, LLC v. Cardiokinetix, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00183 (P.T.A.B. July 31, 2013)	35, 38
<i>In re Huai-Hung Kao</i> , 639 F.3d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	45
<i>Intellectual Ventures Management, LLC v. Xilinx, Inc.</i> , IPR2012-00023 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 11, 2014).....	26
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	35
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	34, 35
<i>Leo Pharm. Prods., Ltd. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	45, 51
<i>Mintz v. Dietz & Watson, Inc.</i> , 679 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	45
<i>Monsanto Co. v. Pioneer Hi-Bred Int’l, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00022 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 11, 2013).....	21, 43
<i>Takeda Chem. Ind. v. Mylan Labs., Inc.</i> , 417 F.Supp.2d 341 (S.D. N.Y. 2006)	52

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

Page(s)

Cases

Tasco, Inc. v. David Pagnani,
IPR2013-00103 (P.T.A.B. May 23, 2013)25

Teva Pharms. USA, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.,
723 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2013)45

Statutes

35 U.S.C.

§ 103.....25

§ 312(a)(3)(B)26

§ 311(b).....7

37 C.F.R.

§ 42.120(a)1

§ 42.120(a)1

§ 42.100(b).....5

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.