

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

GOOGLE LLC,  
Petitioner,

v.

BLACKBERRY LTD.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case No. IPR2017-00911  
U.S. Patent No. 8,745,149

---

**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Exhibit List.....	v
I. Introduction.....	1
II. The ’149 Patent.....	2
A. Overview of the ’149 Patent.....	2
B. Priority Date and Relevant Prosecution History .....	5
C. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art .....	9
III. Claim Construction.....	10
A. “First Input” (All Claims) .....	11
B. “Automatically Changing ... and Displaying” (All Claims) .....	11
i. “Automatically” Means Not Manually Initiated.....	12
ii. The Claims Require “Automatically Changing” and “Automatically ... Displaying” .....	16
iii. The Board’s Clarification Reads Out the “Automatically ... Displaying” Requirement.....	18
IV. Petitioner Has Failed to Show That the Grounds of the Petition Render the Challenged Claims Unpatentable .....	20
A. Neither Toshio Nor Milton Disclose “Automatic” Operation .....	20
i. Toshio Does Not Disclose “Automatically Changing ... and Displaying” .....	21
ii. Milton Does Not Disclose “Automatically Changing ... and Displaying” .....	27
iii. Petitioner’s Expert Repudiated Its Backup Argument That “Automatic” Operation Would Have Been Obvious, and for Good Reason .....	33

B. Appelman Would Not Have Been Combined with Toshio as Petitioner Alleges (Grounds 1 and 3) .....39

    i. Appelman Discloses a “Dynamic, Urgent and Interactive” Communication Scheme Entirely Unlike Toshio .....39

    ii. Petitioner’s Motivation to Combine Is Derived from Hindsight.....43

C. Appelman Would Not Have Been Combined with Milton as Petitioner Alleges (Grounds 2 and 4) .....47

    i. Milton is Non-Analogous Art to the ’149 Patent.....47

    ii. Petitioner Repeats Its Obviousness Mistakes from the Toshio Grounds with the Milton Grounds .....52

V. Reservation of Rights .....54

VI. Conclusion .....55

Certificate Of Compliance .....56

Certificate Of Service.....57

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	35, 37, 38
<i>In re Bigio</i> , 381 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	47, 48, 49
<i>Cheese Sys., Inc. v. Tetra Pak Cheese and Powder Sys., Inc.</i> , 725 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	40
<i>CollegeNet, Inc. v. ApplyYourself, Inc.</i> , 418 F.3d 1225 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	15
<i>Dexcowin Glob., Inc. v. Aribex, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00440, Paper 13 (PTAB July 7, 2016) .....	45, 53
<i>In re Hughes</i> , 345 F.3d 184 (CCPA 1965) .....	27
<i>K/S HIMPP v. Hear-Wear Techs., LLC</i> , 751 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	35, 36
<i>In re Klein</i> , 647 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	50, 51, 52
<i>KSR Intern. Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007) .....	42, 44
<i>McGinley v. Franklin Sports, Inc.</i> , 262 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....	43, 54
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxycorr, Inc.</i> , 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015), <i>overruled on other grounds</i> , <i>Aqua Prod., Inc. v. Matal</i> , 872 F.3d 1290 (Fed. Cir. 2017) (en banc) .....	10, 16
<i>Mintz v. Dietz &amp; Watson, Inc.</i> , 679 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	44

*Monarch Knitting Mach. Corp. v. Sulzer Morat GmbH*,  
139 F.3d 877 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....44

*Oil States Energy Servs., LLC v. Greene’s Energy Grp., LLC*,  
No. 2015-1855, 639 F. App’x 639 (Fed. Cir. May 4, 2016), *cert.*  
*granted*, No. 16-712 (U.S. June 12, 2017) .....54

*Tempo Lighting Inc. v. Tivoli LLC*,  
742 F.3d 973 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....11, 14, 15

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 112(b) .....16

35 U.S.C. § 316(e) .....1

**Other Authorities**

37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(3).....37

37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a).....37

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4).....35

# 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.