

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE LLC,

PETITIONER,

V.

IPA TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

PATENT OWNER.

Case No. IPR2018-00476

U.S. Patent No. 6,757,718

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 313 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS IN DISPUTE	1
II.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
III.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL.....	2
IV.	OVERVIEW OF THE '718 INVENTION	2
V.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	9
VI.	STANDARD FOR GRANTING <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW.....	10
VII.	PETITIONER FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF PREVAILING	11
A.	Legal Standard for Printed Publications	13
B.	The Critical Date	15
C.	Petitioner Fails to Demonstrate that <i>Chey</i> is a Printed Publication	16
1.	Petitioner Offers No Testimonial Evidence in Support of Its Assertions that <i>Chey</i> is a Printed Publication.....	17
2.	The Date on <i>Chey</i> 's Front Page is Not Evidence of Dissemination or Publication Prior to the Critical Date.....	17
3.	Petitioner Submits No Evidence of Distribution or Publication of <i>Chey</i> at the CMC/95 Conference	21
4.	The Internet Archive / SRI Website Exhibits Fail to Show <i>Chey</i> is a Printed Publication	26
5.	The Petition's Evidence of a Citation to <i>Chey</i> in Another Publication Does Not Establish Public Accessibility.....	38
VIII.	CONCLUSION	42

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Activision Blizzard, Inc. et al. v. Acceleration Bay, LLC</i> , IPR2015-01951, Paper 107 (PTAB March 23, 2017)	30, 37
<i>Air Liquide Large Industries U.S. LP, v. Praxair Technology, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01074, Paper 11 (PTAB Oct. 26, 2015)	25
<i>American Megatrends, Inc. et al. v. Kinglite Holdings Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01191, Paper 40 (PTAB Nov. 4, 2016)	38
<i>Apple Inc. v. DSS Tech. Management, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00369, Paper 14 (Aug. 12, 2015)	18
<i>Apple Inc. v. Saint Lawrence Communications LLC</i> , IPR2017-01075, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 21, 2017)	40
<i>AstraZeneca AB v. Mylan Labs., Inc. (In re Omeprazole Patent Litig.)</i> , 490 F. Supp. 2d 381 (S.D.N.Y. 2007).....	20
<i>Bruckelmyer v. Ground Heaters, Inc.</i> , 445 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	14
<i>Celltrion, LLC v. Biogen, Inc. et al.</i> , IPR2017-01230, Paper 10 (PTAB Oct. 12, 2017)	13, 20, 30, 36
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (Aug. 29, 2014)	11
<i>CNET Networks, Inc. v. Etilize, Inc.</i> , 584 F. Supp. 2d 1260 (N.D. Cal. 2008)	19
<i>Constant v. Advanced Micro-Devices, Inc.</i> , 848 F.2d 1560 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	14
<i>Erfindergemeinschaft UroPep GbR v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> , No. 2:15-CV-1202-WCB, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 137318 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 25, 2017).....	15
<i>Ford Motor Company v. Versata Development Group, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-01019, Paper 9 (Oct. 4, 2016)	25
<i>Groupon, Inc. v. Blue Calypso, LLC</i> , CBM2013-00033, Paper 51 (PTAB Dec. 17, 2014).....	32
<i>Hilgraeve, Inc. v. Symantec Corp.</i> , 271 F. Supp. 2d 964 (E.D. Mich. 2003).....	19

<i>Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd. v. Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd.</i> , IPR2017-01980, Paper 9 (Feb. 27, 2018)	16
<i>Icon Health & Fitness, Inc. v. Strava, Inc.</i> , 849 F.3d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	22
<i>In re Cronyn</i> , 890 F.2d 1158 (Fed. Cir. 1989).....	15
<i>In re Hall</i> , 781 F.2d 897 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	14, 40
<i>In re Lister</i> , 583 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	19, 40
<i>In re Wyer</i> , 655 F.2d 221 (CCPA 1981)	15, 16, 25
<i>Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge, Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	11
<i>International Business Machines Corp. v. Envisionit, LLC</i> , IPR2017-01251, Paper 7 (PTAB Oct. 16, 2017)	13, 31, 40
<i>Kyocera Wireless Corp. v. ITC</i> , 545 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	14
<i>Laird Technologies Inc., v. A.K. Stamping Company Inc.</i> , IPR2017-02038, Paper 6 (March 14, 2018).....	12, 20, 31
<i>Luma Corp. v. Stryker Corp.</i> , Nos. 1:02-1132, 1:02-1479, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 50836 (S.D. W. Va. July 24, 2006)	15
<i>Mass. Inst. of Tech. v. AB Fortia</i> , 774 F.2d 1104 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	25
<i>Mass. Inst. of Tech. v. Harman Int’l Indus.</i> , 584 F. Supp. 2d 297 (D. Mass. 2008)	14
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Bradium Technologies LLC</i> , IPR2015-01435, Paper 15 (PTAB Dec. 23, 2015)	30, 33
<i>Norian Corp. v. Stryker Corp.</i> , 363 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	25
<i>Open Text S.A. v. Box, Inc.</i> , No. 13-cv-04910-JD, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 110963 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 19, 2015)	19

<i>Pfizer, Inc. v. Biogen, Inc.</i> , IPR2017-01166, Paper 9 (PTAB Nov. 13, 2017)	13
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	10
<i>Power Integrations, Inc. v. Semiconductor Components Industries, LLC</i> , IPR2017-01903, Paper 9 (PTAB March 19, 2018)	12, 23, 24
<i>Power Integrations, Inc. v. Semiconductor Components Industries, LLC</i> , IPR2017-01904, Paper 12 (PTAB April 30, 2018)	12, 24
<i>Power Integrations, Inc. v. Semiconductor Components Industries, LLC</i> , IPR2017-01904, Paper 9 (PTAB March 12, 2018)	13, 24
<i>Power Integrations, Inc. v. Semiconductor Components Industries, LLC</i> , IPR2017-01944, Paper 9 (PTAB March 12, 2018)	24
<i>Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd. v. Infobridge Pte. Ltd.</i> , IPR2017-00099, Paper 32 (PTAB April 23, 2018)	32, 34
<i>Sandoz Inc. v. Abbvie Biotechnology Ltd.</i> , IPR2017-01823, Paper 16 (PTAB Feb. 9, 2018).....	22
<i>Servicenow, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , IPR2015-00707, Paper 12 (PTAB Aug. 26, 2015)	13
<i>Servicenow, Inc., v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , IPR2015-00716, Paper 13 (PTAB Aug. 26, 2015)	12
<i>SRI Int’l, Inc. v. Internet Sec. Sys. Inc.</i> , 511 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	14, 19, 34
<i>Standard Innovation Corporation v. Lelo, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00148, Paper 41 (PTAB Apr. 23, 2015).....	19
<i>Thorner v. Sony Comp. Entm’t Am. LLC</i> , 669 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	10
<i>Toshiba Corp. v. Optical Devices LLC</i> , IPR2014-01447, Paper 34 (PTAB Mar. 9, 2016)	18
<i>Unified Patents Inc., v. Cuica, LLC</i> , IPR2016-01644, Paper 16 (PTAB Feb. 27, 2017).....	10
<i>Vivid Techs., Inc. v. Am. Sci. & Eng’g, Inc.</i> , 200 F.3d 795 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	10
<i>Voter Verified, Inc. v. Premier Election Sols., Inc.</i> , 698 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	30, 32, 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.