

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

INTELLECTUAL INTEGRITY, LLC,
Petitioner

v.

APPLE INC.,
Patent Owner

Patent No. 7,864,163

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2016-00500

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

sf-3645696

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	2
A. The '163 Patent	2
B. The “Translation” Limitations of Claims 2, 50, and 52.....	3
C. Allowance of the Claims in Light of the “Translation” Limitations.....	6
D. Harada’s Separate Screens and Lack of Translation.....	10
III. ARGUMENT	13
A. Intellectual Integrity Fails to Show that Harada Satisfies the “Translating” Limitations.....	14
B. Harada Does Not Satisfy the “Translating” Limitations.....	16
1. Harada Does Not Disclose “Translating the Structured Electronic Document” in Response to a First Gesture	16
2. Harada Does Not Disclose “Translating The Structured Electronic Document” in Response to a Second Gesture.....	18
3. Harada’s Disclosures Are No Different than the “Closest Available Prior Art References” During Prosecution.....	19
IV. CONCLUSION.....	22

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

Eli Lilly & Co. v. Zenith Goldline Pharms., Inc.,
471 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2006) 1

Whitserve, LLC v. Computer Packages, Inc.,
694 F.3d 10 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 1

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 314(a) 13

REGULATIONS

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3)..... 13, 14

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4)..... 13, 15, 16

37 C.F.R. § 42.108 13

EXHIBIT LIST

Title	Exhibit No.
<i>U.S. Patent Appl. No. 11/850,013, filed on Sept. 4, 2007 (Original Claims)</i>	2001
<i>Non-Final Rejection, dated June 11, 2010</i>	2002
<i>Response to Office Action and Interview Summary, dated Sept. 13, 2010</i>	2003
<i>Notice of Allowability, dated Oct. 20, 2010</i>	2004
<i>U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0103371 to Chen et al.</i>	2005
<i>U.S. Patent Application No. 2007/0250768 to Funakami et al.</i>	2006

I. INTRODUCTION

To anticipate a claim, a prior art reference must disclose each and every claim limitation expressly or inherently.¹

In its petition for *inter partes* review, Intellectual Property fails to demonstrate that the Harada reference² satisfies the “translation” limitations of all challenged claims of the ’163 patent.³ Intellectual Integrity focuses only on the “enlargement” and “substantially centered” limitations of claims 2, 50, and 52, ignoring their “translation” limitations entirely.

¹ See, e.g., *Whitserve, LLC v. Computer Packages, Inc.*, 694 F.3d 10, 21 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (“[A] claim is anticipated if each and every limitation is found either expressly or inherently in a single prior art reference.”) (internal quotation marks omitted); *Eli Lilly & Co. v. Zenith Goldline Pharms., Inc.*, 471 F.3d 1369, 1375-76 (Fed. Cir. 2006) (to anticipate, a “prior art reference must disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention, either explicitly or inherently”).

² S. Harada et al., “Lost in Memories: Interacting with Photo Collections on PDAs,” *Proceedings of the Fourth ACM/IEEE-CS Joint Conference on Digital Libraries* (2004) (Ex. 1008).

³ U.S. Patent No. 7,864,163 (filed Jan. 4, 2011) (Ex. 1001).

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.