

Filed on behalf of: Google Inc.

By: Naveen Modi (Google-IXI-IPR@paulhastings.com)  
Joseph E. Palys (Google-IXI-IPR@paulhastings.com)  
Daniel Zeilberger (Google-IXI-IPR@paulhastings.com)  
Arvind Jairam (Google-IXI-IPR@paulhastings.com)  
Paul Hastings LLP

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

GOOGLE INC.<sup>1</sup>  
Petitioner

v.

IXI IP, LLC  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2016-01669  
Patent No. 7,552,124

---

**PETITIONER'S REPLY BRIEF**

---

<sup>1</sup> As per Paper No. 18, Google Inc. is now Google LLC.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION .....1

II. CLAIMS 1-5 ARE UNPATENTABLE IN VIEW OF THE PRIOR ART. ....2

    A. Claims 1-5 Are Obvious in View of *Maes* and *Preston*. ....2

        1. *Maes* Discloses “Parsing the High-Level Code for the Keywords” .....3

        2. *Maes* Discloses the Claimed “Implementation” Feature .....9

    B. Claims 1-5 Are Obvious in View of *Pazandak*, *White*, and *Manson* .....12

        1. *Pazandak* Discloses the Claimed “Without Having to Select from Menu Items” Features .....12

        2. *Pazandak* Discloses the Claimed “Parsing” Features.....14

        3. *Pazandak* Discloses “Determining Whether High-Level Code Comprises Keywords Defining One or More Relationships and Conditions Corresponding to the Operative Language” .....16

        4. *White* Discloses the “Implementation” Recitation .....17

        5. Patent Owner’s Arguments Regarding Lack of Motivation to Combine References Should Be Rejected .....19

III. PATENT OWNER’S CONTENTION THAT EX.1002 IS ENTITLED TO LITTLE WEIGHT IS WITHOUT MERIT .....20

IV. PATENT OWNER’S CONSTITUTIONALITY ARGUMENT SHOULD BE REJECTED .....21

V. CONCLUSION.....22

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Apple Inc. v. Chestnut Hill Sound Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00794, Paper No. 32 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 25, 2017).....	21
<i>Bungie, Inc. v. Worlds Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01321, Paper No. 42 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 28, 2016).....	21
<i>Golight, Inc. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</i> , 355 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	8
<i>GSI Tech., Inc. v. Cypress Semiconductor Corp.</i> , IPR2014-00202, Paper No. 44 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 9, 2015); .....	20
<i>LG Elecs. Inc. v. ATI Techs. ULC</i> , IPR2015-00325, Paper No. 62 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 14, 2016) .....	20
<i>MCM Portfolio LLC v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , 812 F.3d 1284 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	21
<i>MexiChem Amanco v. Honeywell Int’l</i> , IPR2013-00576, Paper No. 36 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 5, 2014).....	2
<i>Nichia Corp. v. Emcore Corp.</i> , IPR2012-00005, Paper No. 68 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 11, 2014).....	2
<i>SAS Inst., Inc. v. ComplementSoft, LLC</i> , 825 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	4
<i>Square, Inc. v. Unwired Planet LLC</i> , IPR2014-01165, Paper No. 32 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 30, 2015).....	21
<i>Universal Remote Control, Inc. v. Universal Elecs., Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01146, Paper No. 36 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 10, 2015) .....	7, 8
<i>Vasudevan Software, Inc. v. MicroStrategy, Inc.</i> , 782 F.3d 671 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	7

**Federal Regulations**

37 C.F.R. § 42.24 .....23  
37 C.F.R. § 42.24(d) .....23

### LIST OF EXHIBITS

<b>Exhibit No.</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Previously Submitted</b>
1001	U.S. Patent No. 7,552,124	X
1002	Declaration of Dr. Jason Flinn, Ph.D.	X
1003	Prosecution History of U.S. Patent No. 7,552,124	X
1004	Office Action dated July 27, 2010 in European Application No. 05 752 631.1 - 1243	X
1005	U.S. Patent No. 7,003,463 (“ <i>Maes</i> ”)	X
1006	U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0046061 (“ <i>Preston</i> ”)	X
1007	U.S. Patent No. 7,027,975 (“ <i>Pazandak</i> ”)	X
1008	U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0072918 (“ <i>White</i> ”)	X
1009	U.S. Patent No. 7,085,708 (“ <i>Manson</i> ”)	X
1010	IXI’s Supplemental Claim Chart	X
1011	PCT Application Publication No. WO 02/12982 to Applicant Object Services and Consulting, Inc. (“ <i>Object</i> ”)	X
1012	U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0182132 (“ <i>Niemoeller</i> ”)	X
1013	U.S. Patent No. 7,693,720 to Kennewick (“ <i>Kennewick</i> ”)	X
1014	Withdrawal dated January 12, 2011 in European Application No. 05 752 631.1 – 1243	X
1015	Request for Ex Parte Reexamination of U.S. Patent No. 7,552,124, Control No. 90/013,988, and Appendix M, Amended Claims Presented With Request	X
1016	Garner, B., <i>Garner’s Modern American Usage</i> , Oxford University Press (2003)	

# 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.