

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

BLACKBERRY LTD.,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2017-00912
U.S. Patent No. 8,745,149

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Exhibit List.....	iv
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	7
III. Claim Construction.....	8
A. “First Input” (All Claims)	9
B. “Automatically Changing ... and Displaying” (All Claims)	9
i. “Automatically” Means Not Manually Initiated.....	10
ii. The Claims Require “Automatically Changing” and “Automatically ... Displaying”	14
iii. The Board’s Clarification Reads Out the “Automatically ... Displaying” Requirement.....	16
IV. Petitioner Has Failed to Show That the Grounds of the Petition Render the Challenged Claims Unpatentable	18
A. Graham’s Mixed Media Embodiment Relies on Email, Not “Instant Messages,” and Petitioner’s Deshpande Grounds Cannot Cure This Deficiency (All Grounds).....	18
i. Graham’s Mixed Media Embodiment Relies on Email, Not SMS (Grounds 1-6).....	21
ii. Graham’s Use of Email Does Not Show “Instant Messages” ..	25
B. Deshpande Cannot Cure Petitioner’s “Conversation of Instant Messages” Deficiency in Graham (Grounds 7-12).....	28

C.	Graham Does Not Disclose “Automatically Changing ... and Displaying” (Grounds 1, 4, 7, and 10)	31
i.	Graham’s Relative Timestamp Is Not “Automatically Chang[ed] ... and Display[ed]”	32
ii.	Graham’s Input Key Is Not “Automatically Chang[ed]”	37
iii.	Dr. Olsen’s Attempts to Justify Graham’s “Automatic” Functionality are Not Credible.....	40
iv.	Dr. Olsen Repudiated Petitioner’s Backup Argument That “Automatic” Operation Would Have Been Obvious, and for Good Reason	43
D.	Graham and Toshio Do Not Render Claims 1-5, 9-13, and 17 Obvious (Grounds 3, 6, 9, and 12).....	48
E.	Graham and Milton Do Not Render Claims 1, 5-7, 9, 13-15, and 17 Obvious (Grounds 2, 5, 8, and 11).....	53
i.	Milton is Non-Analogous Art to the ’149 Patent.....	54
ii.	Milton Does Not Disclose “Automatically Changing ... and Displaying”	58
V.	Reservation of Rights	62
VI.	Conclusion	62
	Certificate Of Compliance	63
	Certificate Of Service.....	64

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	45, 46, 48
<i>In re Bigio</i> , 381 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	54, 56
<i>CollegeNet, Inc. v. ApplyYourself, Inc.</i> , 418 F.3d 1225 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	13
<i>Google Inc. v. Koninklijke Philips N.V.</i> , IPR2017-00447, Paper 7 (PTAB June 8, 2017)	30
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	29
<i>In re Hughes</i> , 345 F.2d 184 (CCPA 1965)	37, 52
<i>K/S HIMPP v. Hear-Wear Techs., LLC</i> , 751 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	45, 46
<i>In re Klein</i> , 647 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	56, 57, 58
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, 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).....	8, 14
<i>Oil States Energy Servs., LLC v. Greene's Energy Grp., LLC</i> , No. 2015-1855, 639 F. App'x 639 (Fed. Cir. May 4, 2016), <i>cert. granted</i> , No. 16-712 (U.S. June 12, 2017)	62
<i>Ryko Mfg. Co. v. Nu-Star, Inc.</i> , 950 F.2d 714 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	42
<i>SecureNet Techs., LLC v. Icontrol Networks, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-01919, Paper 9 (PTAB Mar. 30, 2017)	29

<i>Tempo Lighting Inc. v. Tivoli LLC</i> , 742 F.3d 973 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	8, 12
---	-------

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 112(b)	13
35 U.S.C. § 316(e)	1

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(3)	47
37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a)	47
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4)	45

EXHIBIT LIST

No.	Exhibit Description
2001	U.S. Patent No. 7,181,497 to Appelman et al.
2002	U.S. Patent No. 7,219,109 to Lapuyade et al.
2003	The American Heritage College Dictionary (4th Ed. 2004) (Excerpt)
2004	Declaration of Sharon Lee
2005	CV of Dr. George Ligler [NEW]
2006	Deposition Transcript of Dr. Daniel R. Olsen, Jr. (Nov. 17, 2017) [NEW]
2007	Declaration of Dr. George Ligler [NEW]

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.