

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Under Armour Inc.

Petitioner

v.

adidas AG,

Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2015-00698

Patent No. 8,092,345

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE ‘345 PATENT	2
III.	RELATED PROCEEDINGS	3
IV.	LEGAL STANDARDS	4
	A. Petitioner bears the burden of demonstrating that there is a reasonable likelihood that at least one of the claims challenged in the petition is unpatentable.....	4
	B. The Law of Obviousness.....	4
V.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	7
	A. Legal Standard.....	7
	B. Patent Owner’s Proposed Construction	7
VI.	THE PETITION DOES NOT SATISFY ITS BURDEN UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 314(A)	8
	A. Ground 1 – The Combination of Mault in view of DeLorme does not render the Challenged Claims Obvious	8
	1. Petitioner has not demonstrated a motivation to combine Mault and DeLorme	8
	2. Petitioner has not demonstrated that Mault in view of DeLorme discloses “journal software with which a user interacts and creates a new journal and is capable of”	16
	3. Petitioner has not demonstrated that Mault in view of DeLorme discloses “software to format the journal entries to a common file format”	19
	4. Petitioner has not demonstrated that Mault in view of DeLorme discloses “[t]he journal of claim 1 further comprising a database comprising a plurality of database	

	entries wherein a journal entry may be tagged with one of the plurality of database entries”.....	21
5.	Petitioner has not demonstrated that Mault in view of DeLorme discloses “[t]he journal of claim 6 wherein the database comprises an athletic database, a nutrition database, a treatment database, a diagnostic database, a patient database, a pharmaceutical database, an insurance database, a medical instrument database, a health alert database, a competition database, or a personal database”	22
6.	Petitioner has not demonstrated that Mault in view of DeLorme discloses “[t]he journal of claim 1 further configured to provide route guidance”	23
7.	Petitioner has not demonstrated that Mault in view of DeLorme discloses “[t]he journal of claim 1 further configured to provide localized advertisements or discounts”	23
8.	Petitioner has not demonstrated that Mault in view of DeLorme discloses “formatting the journal entry to a common file format”	25
B.	Ground 2 – The Combination of Telemedicine Kit in view of DeLorme does not render the Challenged Claims Obvious.....	25
1.	Petitioner has not demonstrated that Telemedicine Kit is Prior Art Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).....	25
2.	Petitioner has not demonstrated that Telemedicine Kit in view of DeLorme discloses “software to format the journal entries to a common format”	29
3.	Petitioner has not demonstrated that Telemedicine Kit in view of DeLorme discloses “[t]he journal of claim 1 further comprising a database comprising a plurality of database entries wherein a journal entry may be tagged with one of the plurality of database entries”	31
4.	Petitioner has not demonstrated that Telemedicine Kit in view of DeLorme discloses “[t]he journal of claim 6	

	wherein the database comprises an athletic database, a nutrition database, a treatment database, a diagnostic database, a patient database, a pharmaceutical database, an insurance database, a medical instrument database, a health alert database, a competition database, or a personal database”	33
5.	Petitioner has not demonstrated that Telemedicine Kit in view of DeLorme discloses “[t]he journal of claim 1 further configured to allow the user to download information related to a region into the journal”	33
6.	Petitioner has not demonstrated that Telemedicine Kit in view of DeLorme discloses “[t]he journal of claim 15 wherein the information related to a region comprises language information, dialect information, currency exchange rate information, time zone information, location information, business information, custom information, law information, geography information, wildlife information, climate information, weather forecasts, transit schedules, entertainment schedules, attractions information, park information, or plant information”	35
7.	Petitioner has not demonstrated that Telemedicine Kit in view of DeLorme discloses “formatting the journal entry to a common file format”	35
VII.	THE PETITION IGNORES THE BOARD’S RULES	36
A.	Redundancy	36
B.	The Petition fails to adequately present the asserted grounds for relief.....	38
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	41

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>adidas AG, et. al. v. Under Armour, Inc. and MapMyFitness, Inc.</i> , Case No. 14-130-GMS (D. Del.)	3
<i>Advanced Display Systems v. Inc. v. Kent State University</i> , 212 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	16, 17
<i>Alza Corp. v. Mylan Labs., Inc.</i> , 464 F.3d 1286 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	4
<i>Cisco Systems, Inc. v. C-Cation Technologies, LLC</i> , Case No. IPR2014-00454, Paper 12	39
<i>Cooper Cameron Corp. v. Kvaerner Oilfield Prods., Inc.</i> , 291 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	27
<i>DePuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	13
<i>DeSilva v. DiLeonardi</i> , 181 F.3d 865 (7th Cir. 1999).....	39
<i>Fontaine Engineered Products, Inc. v. Raildecks (2009), Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00360, 2013 WL 8595308 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 13, 2013)	40
<i>Gracernote, Inc. v. Iceberg Indus. LLC</i> , IPR2013-00551, 2014 WL 2527812 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 28 2014).....	5, 14
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	4, 5
<i>Heart Failure Technologies, LLC v. Cardiokinetix, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00183, 2013 WL 4181227 (P.T.A.B. July 31, 2013)	6, 9
<i>I.C.E. Corp. v. Armco Steel Corp.</i> , 250 F. Supp. 738 (S.D.N.Y. 1966).....	27
<i>In re Bayer</i> , 568 F.2d 1357 (CCPA 1978)	28

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.