UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

PARUS HOLDINGS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2020-00686
U.S. Patent No. 7,076,431

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.120(a)

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction....1

II. The '431 Patent....3

A. Prior Art Interactive Voice Systems Suffered From Numerous Drawbacks....4

1. Typical Prior Art Systems For Accessing Web Sites Were Not Sufficiently Portable, Comprehensive, And Affordable....4

2. Voice Enabled Options Introduced Additional Problems and Drawbacks....5

3. Prior Art "Interactive Voice Response" Systems Suffered From A Lack Of Fault Tolerance, Limited Webpage Resources, And Generic Search Options And Results....6

4. Prior Art Speaker-Dependent and Speaker-Independent Systems Suffered from Various Drawbacks....8

B. The '431 Patent's Solution....9

1. Overview Of The '431 Patent's Voice Browser System....11

2. Speaker-Independent Speech Recognition Device....14

3. Sequentially Accessing A Plurality of Pre-selected Web Sites....15

C. The Challenged '431 Patent Claims....18

D. Claim Construction....21

III. Apple's Petition & Grounds....24

A. Ladd....26

B. Kurosawa....28

C. Goedken....29

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

D. Houser....32

IV. Argument....33

A. All Grounds Fail Because The Petition Does Not Identify The "at least one speaker-independent speech recognition device, said speaker-independent speech recognition device operatively connected to said computer and to said voice enabled device" Limitation Required In Every Challenged Claim....34

B. The Petition Does Not Identify the "sequential[] access" of pre-selected web sites Limitation Required In Every Challenged Claim....38

1. *Goedken* does not teach sequentially accessing preselected web sites until the requested information is found or all pre-selected web sites have been accessed....38

2. *Kurosawa* does not teach sequentially accessing pre-selected web sites until the requested information is found or all pre-selected web sites have been accessed....40

C. The Petition Relies On Impermissible Hindsight To Support The Alleged Obviousness Combinations....41

1. There is no motivation to combine *Ladd* with *Kurosawa* from either reference....43

2. There is no motivation to combine *Goedken* with *Ladd* and *Kurosawa* in any of the references....46

3. The Petition relies on impermissible hindsight for its motivation to combine arguments....48

D. The Petition Does Not Establish It Was Obvious To Combine *Ladd*, *Kurosawa*, and *Goedken* As Required In All Asserted Grounds....48

1. A POSITA Would Not Combine *Ladd* With *Kurosawa*....49

2. A POSITA Would Not Combine *Ladd* With *Kurosawa* And *Goedken*....53

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

E. The Petition does not identify any reference that teaches "wherein said speaker-independent speech recognition device is configured to analyze phonemes to recognize said speech commands" limitation found in claim 5 56

F. The Petition does not identify any reference that teaches "wherein said speaker-independent speech recognition device is configured to recognize naturally spoken speech commands" limitation found in claim 6 57

G. Grounds 2 – 4 fail because the addition of *Houser*, *Madnick*, or *Rutledge* does not cure the shortcomings of the proposed combination of *Ladd*, *Kurosawa*, and *Goedken* 58

H. The Petition has not provided sufficient evidence that the proposed combination of *Ladd*, *Kurosawa*, and Goedken, could be further combined with *Houser*, *Madnick*, or *Rutledge* would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill 59

V. Conclusion 61

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

Intamin Ltd. v. Magnetar Techs., Corp.,
483 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2007) 22

Parus Holdings Inc. v. Apple Inc.,
No. 6:19-cv-00432-ADA, ECF No. 167 (W.D. Tex. Sept. 8, 2020).....24

Phillips v. AWH Corp.,
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) 22, 23

TQ Delta, LLC v. Cisco Sys.,
942 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2019) 42, 45, 48

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.