

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

INTELLECTUAL INTEGRITY, LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

APPLE INC.,
Patent Owner/Assignee.

IPR No.: IPR2016-00500
Patent No. 7,864,163

PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,864,163
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.100 *et seq.*

Filed on behalf of Petitioner By:

Ronald W. Burns (Reg. No. 44,044)
15139 Woodbluff Dr.
Frisco, TX 75035
(972) 632-9009
rwburns@intellectualintegrity.net

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	MANDATORY NOTICES	2
	A. Real Parties in Interest	2
	B. Related Matters	3
	C. Counsel and Service Information	3
	D. Certification of Service on Patent Owner/Assignee	3
III.	NOTICE OF FEES PAID	4
IV.	CERTIFICATION OF GROUNDS FOR STANDING	4
V.	PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED	5
VI.	RELEVANT INFORMATION CONCERNING THE ‘163 PATENT	5
	A. Background of the ‘163 Patent	5
	B. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art	6
VII.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	7
	A. “box[es] of content” (Claims 2, 50, 52)	8
	B. “structured electronic document” (Claims 2, 50, 52)	9
	C. “gesture” (Claims 2, 50, 52)	9
VIII.	DETAILED ANALYSIS OF GROUNDS FOR INVALIDITY OR UNPATENTABILITY OF CLAIMS 2, 50, and 52	10
	A. Ground 1: Claims 2, 50, and 52 of the ‘163 Patent are Anticipated Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by Harada (Ex. 1009)	10
	1. <i>Harada</i> Anticipates Claim 2 of the ‘163 Patent Under §102(b)	13
	2. <i>Harada</i> Anticipates Claim 50 of the ‘163 Patent Under §102(b)	18

3. *Harada* Anticipates Claim 52 of the ‘163 Patent Under §102(b)
..... 21

IX. CONCLUSION 22

APPENDICES:

Appendix A: Listing of Exhibits.

Appendix B: Copies of Exhibits 1001 – 1010.

I. INTRODUCTION

This petition (“**Petition**”) challenges the validity of Claims 2, 50, and 52 of U.S. Patent No. 7,864,163 (“**the `163 Patent**”) (Ex 1001). Claims 2, 50, and 52 (“**the challenged claims**”) recite variations of elements for a portable electronic device having a touch screen display, and method/means for enlargement and centering of content on the touch screen responsive to a gesture performed.

Independent Claim 2 recites a method comprising: at a portable electronic device with a touch screen display; displaying at least a portion of a structured electronic document on the touch screen display, wherein the structured electronic document comprises a plurality of boxes of content; detecting a first gesture at a location on the displayed portion of the structured electronic document; determining a first box in the plurality of boxes at the location of the first gesture; enlarging and translating the structured electronic document so that the first box is substantially centered on the touch screen display; while the first box is enlarged, a second gesture is detected on a second box other than the first box; and in response to detecting the second gesture, the structured electronic document is translated so that the second box is substantially centered on the touch screen display. (*Id.*: Claim 2). Independent Claims 50 and 52 recite devices performing the method of Claim 2, in means plus function forms. (*Id.*: Claims 50, 52).

The method and devices of the challenged claims were not novel as of September 6, 2006 – the earliest of the `163 Patent’s alleged priority dates. The art of that time was replete with: touch-screen user interfaces; structured electronic documents comprising “boxes of content”; and graphically centering and enlarging content on a touch screen responsive to gestures performed on the touch screen. When the challenged claims are properly scrutinized against the prior art, it becomes clear that all elements of the challenged claims are anticipated by the art as it was well known at that time.

As shown in detail, *infra*, the challenged claims of the `163 Patent recite subject matter that is fully anticipated by the prior art. This Petition shows – compellingly – that the challenged claims are invalid and/or unpatentable over the prior art, under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

II. MANDATORY NOTICES

A. Real Parties-in-Interest

Intellectual Integrity, LLC (“**I²**” or “**Petitioner**”) – a Texas limited liability company having its principal place of business at 2591 Dallas Parkway, Suite 300, Frisco, Texas 75034 – is a real party in interest. **I²** is owned and operated by Ronald W. Burns, an individual residing in Frisco, Texas – the sole proprietor, and sole/managing member, of **I²**. Individual Ronald W. Burns declares that no other parties are funding this Petition, nor participating in any manner in this Petition.

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.