

Case IPR2017-02039
U.S. Patent No. 7,199,715

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FEDEX CORP.
Petitioner

v.

INTELLECTUAL VENTURES II LLC
Patent Owner

Case IPR2017-02039

U.S. Patent No. 7,199,715
TITLE: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR TRACKING ID TAGS USING A DATA
STRUCTURE OF TAG READS
Issue Date: April 3, 2007

INTELLECTUAL VENTURES II LLC'S
PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

Mail Stop Patent Board
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	4
A. Overview Of The '715 Patent	4
B. Overview Of Petitioner's First Petition And The First Institution Decision	6
C. Overview Of Petitioner's Second Petition	7
III. THE BOARD SHOULD EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 314(a), 37 C.F.R. § 42.108(a), AND <i>GENERAL PLASTIC</i> TO DENY INSTITUTION ON THIS FOLLOW-ON PETITION.....	7
A. All Seven <i>General Plastic</i> Factors Favor Denying Institution.	8
1. Factor 1 Favors Denying Institution Because Petitioner Previously Filed A Petition Against The Same Claims Challenged In The Second Petition.	8
2. Factor 2 Favors Denying Institution Because Petitioner Cited Bauer In The First Petition And Because Petitioner Knew About Smith Either When It Filed The First Petition Or Shortly Thereafter.	9
3. Factor 3 Favors Denying Institution Because When Petitioner Filed The Second Petition, It Had Received Both IV's Preliminary Response And The Board's Institution Decision For The First Petition.	12
4. Factor 4 Favors Denying Institution Because Petitioner Has Known About Bauer Since At Least January 2017 And Has Known About Smith Since At Least March 2017, If Not Earlier.	15

5.	Factor 5 Favors Denying Institution Because Petitioner Waited For The Board’s First Institution Decision To Use It As A Roadmap For The Second Petition.	16
6.	Factor 6 Favors Denying Institution Because The Board’s Finite Resources Are Better Spent On First-Time Petitions, Not Follow-On Petitions That Challenge The Same Claims.	18
7.	Factor 7 Favors Denying Institution Because Follow-On Petitions Impair The Board’s Ability To Issue A Final Written Decision Within One Year Of Institution Of Review.	20
B.	Petitioner’s Abuse Of The <i>Inter Partes</i> Review Process—Not Only By Filing This Follow-On Petition, But Also By Filing Three Other Follow-On Petitions That Use Prior Institution Decisions As Roadmaps—Also Favors Denying Institution.....	22
C.	Petitioner’s Arguments In Favor Of Instituting Trial Are Meritless.	25
IV.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	30
A.	“a tool for modifying part of the information stored in the database as a function of other information stored in the database” (claim 11).....	30
B.	“supply chain” (claims 4, 5, 7, 9, 14, 15, 17, 19, 23, 25).....	31
V.	THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION BECAUSE PETITIONER DID NOT ESTABLISH A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF PREVAILING AS TO ANY CLAIM.	32
A.	The Board Should Deny Institution On Every Challenged Claim Because Petitioner Failed To Establish That Smith And Bauer, Whether Taken Alone Or In Combination, Teach, Suggest, Or Disclose The Tag “Reading” Limitations.	33
1.	Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, And 9	33

2.	Claims 11, 14, 15, And 17	36
3.	Claims 19, 22, 23, And 25	37
B.	The Board Should Deny Institution On Every Challenged Claim Because Petitioner Failed To Analyze All Of The <i>Graham</i> Factors For Challenged Independent Claims 1, 11, And 19.	38
1.	Claim 1	41
2.	Claim 11	44
3.	Claim 19	45
C.	The Board Should Deny Institution On Every Challenged Claim Because Petitioner Failed To Establish A Reason To Combine Smith And Bauer.	47
D.	The Board Should Deny Institution On Claims 11, 14, 15, And 17 Because Petitioner—Despite Persuading The District Court That Claim 11’s “Tool” Limitation Is A Means-Plus-Function Limitation—Neither Identified It As A Means-Plus-Function Limitation Nor Identified Corresponding Structure.....	54
VI.	<i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL.	58
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	58

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc 'ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	45, 49
<i>Adidas AG v. Nike, Inc.</i> , Case IPR2017-00263, Paper 9 (PTAB June 7, 2017)	29
<i>Akamai Techs. v. Limelight Networks</i> , Case IPR2017-00358, Paper 9 (PTAB May 2, 2017)	13
<i>Alarm.com, Inc. v. Vivint, Inc.</i> , Case IPR2016-01091, Paper 11 (PTAB Nov. 23, 2016).....	21, 22, 25
<i>Alere, Inc. v. Rembrandt Diagnostics, LP</i> , Case IPR2017-01130, Paper 10 (PTAB Sept. 28, 2017).....	18
<i>Apple Inc. v. Immersion Corp.</i> , Case IPR2017-00887, Paper 7 (PTAB Aug. 25, 2017).....	21
<i>Apple Inc. v. Immersion Corp.</i> , Case IPR2017-01368, Paper 8 (PTAB Nov. 7, 2017).....	10, 11
<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elec. Co., Ltd.</i> , 839 F.3d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (en banc)	passim
<i>Apple Inc. v. Smartflash LLC</i> , Case CBM2015-00029, Paper 11 (PTAB May 28, 2015).....	40, 41
<i>Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC</i> , 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	51
<i>Conopco, Inc. v. Proctor & Gamble Co.</i> , Case IPR2014-00506, Paper 17 (PTAB July 7, 2014)	11
<i>Dali Wireless Inc. v. CommScope Techs. LLC</i> , Case IPR2017-01324, Paper 6 (PTAB Nov. 1, 2017).....	39, 41, 44

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.