

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FACEBOOK, INC., INSTAGRAM, LLC, and WHATSAPP INC.,
Petitioners,

v.

BLACKBERRY LIMITED,
Patent Owner

IPR2019-00706
U.S. Patent No. 9,349,120

PATENT OWNER'S SUR-REPLY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE BOARD’S CONSTRUCTION OF “NOTIFICATION” IS WELL-REASONED AND DOES NOT RELY ON A “SUBJECTIVE INQUIRY”	2
A. The Board’s construction does not require a “subjective inquiry”	2
B. The claims support the Board’s construction	4
C. The specification supports the Board’s construction	6
D. The prosecution history supports the Board’s construction	8
E. Petitioners’ reliance on <i>Interval Licensing</i> and <i>Datamize</i> is misplaced	10
F. The District Court’s orders do not support petitioners’ reading of “notification”	12
G. Petitioners’ construction is overly broad as it would make any display a “notification”	14
III. DALLAS DOES NOT DISCLOSE AND IS INCOMPATIBLE WITH “NOTIFICATIONS”	15
A. Notifications have no place in Dallas’ system, which uses message icons to fight information overload	15
B. Dallas teaches away from LeBlanc’s “notifications”	17
C. Petitioners’ attempt to distance their grounds from Dallas’ teaching away is without merit	19
IV. NEITHER DALLAS NOR LEBLANC TEACHES “SILENCING”	21
V. NONE OF THE PRIOR ART TEACHES “DISPLAYING” SILENCED MESSAGES	22
VI. CONCLUSION	27

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

Cases

Aptalis Pharmatech, Inc. v. Apotex Inc.,
718 F. App'x 965 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....9

BASF Corp. v. Johnson Matthey Inc.,
875 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2017)11

CollegeNet, Inc. v. ApplyYourself, Inc.,
418 F.3d 1225 (Fed. Cir. 2005) 24, 25, 26

Datamize, LLC v. Plumtree Software, Inc.,
417 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2005)11

Dippin' Dots, Inc. v. Mosey,
476 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2007)24

Interval Licensing v. AOL, Inc.,
766 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2014)11

K/S Himpp v. Hear-Wear Techs., LLC,
751 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2014)21

Meiresonne v. Google, Inc.,
849 F. 3d 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2017)17

Polaris Indus., Inc. v. Arctic Cat, Inc.,
882 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2018)18

Sonix Tech. Co. v. Publications Int'l, Ltd.,
844 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2017)11

Vivid Techs. v. Am. Science & Eng'g, Inc.,
200 F.3d 795 (Fed. Cir. 1999)24

Rules and Regulations

37 C.F.R. §§ 42.24(D)28

37 C.F.R. §§ 42.6(E), 42.105(A))29

PATENT OWNER'S LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit #	Description
Ex. 2001	Excerpts from the Prosecution History of the '120 Patent
Ex. 2002	Deposition Transcript of Dr. S. Chatterjee
Ex. 2003	Expert Declaration of Dr. Hugh Smith
Ex. 2004	<i>BlackBerry v. Facebook, Inc., et al.</i> , 2:18-cv-01844-GW-(KSx), Dkt. 157, Corrected Final Ruling on Claim Construction/ <i>Markman</i> Hearing (“ <i>Markman Order</i> ”)
Ex. 2005	<i>BlackBerry v. Facebook, Inc., et al.</i> , 2:18-cv-01844-GW-(KSx), Dkt. 117, Facebook Defendants’ Opening Claim Construction Brief

I. INTRODUCTION

The Board correctly adopted the district court’s conclusion that a “notification” is “some form of visual, auditory, or physical cue to draw attention to an incoming message *that would not otherwise have been noticed, at the time of the incoming message.*” The Board’s construction recognizes the express distinction made by the ’120 patent between a “notification” and a message’s “manner of display.” Indeed, “notifications” are ordinarily understood to be the kinds of “alarms” or “alerts” discussed in the claims and specification—such as vibrations, ring tones, and pop-ups—that are used to “draw attention to an incoming message.” These notifications prevent incoming messages from blending in with other unread messages in the inbox, where the new message “would not otherwise have been noticed.” This is in contrast to a message’s manner of display for read versus unread messages, which is employed to distinguish one message’s status from the other.

Petitioners respond by encouraging the Board to abandon its construction in favor of encompassing any display characteristic “that *increases the likelihood* of a user noticing a new message.” But this construction is so broad that it is unclear what, if anything, is *not* encompassed by Petitioners’ definition—a time stamp, file

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.