

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SONY INTERACTIVE ENTERTAINMENT LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

BOT M8, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2020-01288
U.S. Patent No. 7,664,988

PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE '988 PATENT	2
A. Overview	2
B. Challenged Claims	5
C. Petition Grounds.....	7
III. OVERVIEW OF THE STATE OF THE ART.....	8
A. Embedded System Design.....	8
B. Operating Systems.....	9
C. BIOS	12
D. Power-On Self-Test (“POST”).....	13
E. Authentication Program	16
F. ROM for BIOS	17
G. Bad Sector On Mass Storage Media	18
H. How A CPU Executes A Program	20
IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	21
A. “fault inspection program”	21
1. A “fault inspection program” must be capable of inspecting both hardware <i>and</i> software faults.	21
2. A “fault inspection program” must be distinct from and mutually exclusive of a “boot program.”	24
B. “boot program”	27
V. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL	31
VI. OVERVIEW OF THE ASSERTED REFERENCES	31
A. <i>Sugiyama</i> (Ex. 1005).....	31
B. <i>Gatto</i> (Ex. 1006).....	32
C. <i>Morrow</i> '952 (Ex. 1007) and <i>Morrow</i> '771 (Ex. 1008).....	34

D.	<i>Yamaguchi</i> (Ex. 1039).....	34
E.	<i>Cheston</i> (Ex. 1025).....	35
F.	<i>Proudler</i> (Ex. 1038)	35
VII.	THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE PATENTABLE	36
A.	Ground 1: Claims 1–9 Are Patentable Over <i>Sugiyama</i> and <i>Gatto</i>	36
1.	Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated That <i>Sugiyama</i> in View of <i>Gatto</i> Discloses the Claimed Fault Inspection Program (Claims 1–9)	36
a.	<i>Sugiyama</i> Does Not Disclose a Fault Inspection Program.....	37
b.	<i>Sugiyama</i> Cannot Determine Whether a Fault Occurred in Hardware or Software	43
2.	Petitioner Fails to Show That a POSITA Would Have Been Motivated to Combine <i>Sugiyama</i> and <i>Gatto</i> Nor A Reasonable Expectation of Success from Combining.....	45
a.	Petitioner Fails to Demonstrate Why or How a POSITA Would Have Been Motivated to Combine <i>Sugiyama</i> and <i>Gatto</i>	46
b.	Petitioner’s Proposed Combination Does Not Have a Reasonable Expectation of Success.....	48
c.	Combined Teachings of <i>Sugiyama</i> and <i>Gatto</i> Render Them Inoperable for their Intended Purpose	51
3.	Petitioner Has Not Demonstrated That <i>Sugiyama</i> in View of <i>Gatto</i> Discloses a Control Device that “Completes the Execution of the Fault Inspection Program Before the Game is Started”.....	58
B.	Ground 2: Claims 1–9 Are Patentable Over <i>Morrow</i> ’952 and <i>Morrow</i> ’771	61
1.	Neither <i>Morrow</i> ’952 or <i>Morrow</i> ’771 Disclose the Claimed Fault Inspection Program	61

2. *Morrow '952* Discloses “a Boot Program,” But It
is Not the File Allocation Reader 64

3. *Morrow '952's* “Boot Program” Loads the
Operating System and Is Only Run After the File
Allocation Reader Completes Its Task. 66

C. Grounds 3–6: Claims 2, 7–8 Is Further Patentable Over
Yamaguchi and Claim 8 is Further Patentable Over
Proudler..... 67

D. Grounds 7–8: Claim 10 Is Further Patentable Over
Cheston 68

VIII. CONCLUSION..... 68

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Apotex Inc. v. Wyeth LLC</i> , IPR2014-00115, Paper 94 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 20, 2015)	46
<i>Arctic Cat Inc. v. Polaris Indus., Inc.</i> , 795 F. App'x 827 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	49
<i>Becton Dickinson & Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Group, LP</i> , 616 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	24
<i>C.R. Bard, Inc. v. U.S. Surgical Corp.</i> , 388 F.3d 858 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	28
<i>In re Chu</i> , 66 F.3d 292 (Fed. Cir. 1995)	57
<i>Comcast Cable Commc'ns, LLC v. Promptu Sys. Corp.</i> , 838 F.App'x 551 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	25
<i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	51, 55
<i>Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	24
<i>MBO Labs., Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson & Co.</i> , 474 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	26
<i>Nike, Inc. v. Adidas AG</i> , 812 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2016))	56
<i>In re Nuvasive</i> , 842 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	57
<i>Personal Web Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	50, 58
<i>Plas-Pak Indus., Inc. v. Sulzer Mixpac AG</i> , 600 F. App'x 755 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	52, 53, 55
<i>Procter & Gamble Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc.</i> , 566 F.3d 989 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	46

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.