

IPR2024-00806
IPR2024-00807


*Apple Inc. v.
Resonant Systems, Inc.*

U.S. Patent No. 9,941,830
U.S. Patent No. 8,860,337

Patent Owner's Demonstratives

Challenged Claims

'830 Patent:

 US09941830B2	
(12) United States Patent Elenga et al.	(10) Patent No.: US 9,941,830 B2 (45) Date of Patent: Apr. 10, 2018
(54) LINEAR VIBRATION MODULES AND LINEAR-RESONANT VIBRATION MODULES	(58) Field of Classification Search CPC H02P 25/032; H02K 7/1876; D06D 1/166 See application file for complete search history.
(71) Applicant: Resonant Systems, Inc., Seattle, WA (US)	(56) References Cited U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS
(72) Inventors: Robin Elenga, Seattle, WA (US); Brian Marc Popin, Oakland, CA (US); Glen Tomplins, Woodinville, WA (US)	1,120,414 A 12/1914 Schofield et al. 3,728,654 A 4/1975 Tada 4,540,335 A 10/1988 Wang 4,692,999 A 9/1987 Francis 5,017,619 A 5/1991 Pott et al. 5,187,398 A 2/1993 Stuart et al. 5,231,336 A 7/1993 van Nuenen (Continued)
(73) Assignee: Resonant Systems, Inc., Seattle, WA (US)	FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS EP 1 376 833 A1 1/2004
(*) Notice: Subject to any disclaimer, the term of this patent is extended or adjusted under 35 U.S.C. 154(b) by 0 days.	Primary Examiner —Karen Masih (74) Attorney, Agent, or Firm —Olympic Patent Works P.L.L.C.
(21) Appl. No.: 15/181,249	(57) ABSTRACT
(22) Filed: Jun. 13, 2016	The current application is directed to various types of linear vibrational modules, including linear-resonant vibration modules that can be incorporated in a wide variety of appliances, devices, and systems to provide vibrational forces. The vibrational forces are produced by linear oscil- lation of a weight or member, in turn produced by rapidly alternating the polarity of one or more driving electromag- nets. Feedback control is used to maintain the vibrational frequency of linear-resonant vibration module at or near the resonant frequency for the linear-resonant vibration module. Both linear vibration modules and linear-resonant vibration modules can be designed to produce vibrational amplitude/ frequency combinations throughout a large region of ampli- tude/frequency space.
(65) Prior Publication Data US 2016/0301346 A1 Oct. 13, 2016	
Related U.S. Application Data	
(63) Continuation of application No. 14/469,210, filed on Aug. 26, 2014, now Pat. No. 9,369,081, which is a continuation of application No. 13/545,607, filed on Jan. 6, 2012, now Pat. No. 8,860,337, which is a continuation-in-part of application No. 12/782,697, filed on May 18, 2010, now Pat. No. 8,093,767.	
(60) Provisional application No. 61/179,109, filed on May 18, 2009.	
(51) Int. Cl. H02K 33/00 (2006.01) H02P 25/02 (2016.01) H02K 33/16 (2006.01)	
(52) U.S. Cl. CPC H02P 25/032 (2016.02); H02K 33/16 (2013.01)	
20 Claims, 20 Drawing Sheets	
	


1. A vibration module comprising:
a housing;
a moveable component;
a power supply;
user-input features;
a driving component that drives the moveable component
to oscillate within the housing; and
a control component that controls supply of power from
the power supply to the driving component to cause the
moveable component to oscillate at a frequency and an
amplitude specified by one or more stored values.

14. The vibration module of claim 1 further including flux
paths comprising a paramagnetic material that is shaped and
positioned to reduce the reluctance of one or more magnetic
circuits within the vibration module.

IPR2024-00806, Ex. 1001

Challenged Claims

'337 Patent:

(12) United States Patent		(10) Patent No.: US 8,860,337 B2
Elenga et al.		(45) Date of Patent: Oct. 14, 2014
 US008860337B2		
(54) LINEAR VIBRATION MODULES AND LINEAR-RESONANT VIBRATION MODULES	4,549,535 A 10/1985 Wing	
	4,602,599 A 9/1987 Frandsen	
	5,017,819 A 5/1991 Pott et al.	
(75) Inventors: Robin Elenga, Seattle, WA (US); Brian Marc Pepin, Oakland, CA (US); Glen Tompkins, Woodinville, WA (US)	5,187,908 A 2/1993 Stuart et al.	
	5,231,336 A 7/1993 van Natten	
	5,231,337 A 7/1993 van Natten	
	5,424,592 A 6/1995 Blum et al.	
	5,896,076 A 4/1999 van Natten	
(73) Assignee: Resonant Systems, Inc., Seattle, WA (US)	5,955,799 A 9/1999 Amey et al.	310/36
	5,973,422 A 10/1999 Clumme	
	6,323,568 B1 11/2001 Zaher	310/17
	6,326,706 B1 12/2001 Zhang	
(*) Notice: Subject to any disclaimer, the term of this patent is extended or adjusted under 35 U.S.C. 154(b) by 322 days.	7,449,803 B2 11/2008 Sakyan	
	7,474,018 B2 1/2009 Shimizu et al.	
	7,768,160 B1 8/2010 Sakyan	
	7,768,168 B2 8/2010 Aschhoff et al.	
	7,771,348 B2 8/2010 Madsen et al.	
(21) Appl. No.: 13/345,607	(Continued)	
(22) Filed: Jan. 6, 2012	FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS	
(65) Prior Publication Data	EP 1 376 833 A1 1/2004	
US 2012/0133308 A1 May 31, 2012	Primary Examiner — Karen Masih	
Related U.S. Application Data	(74) Attorney, Agent, or Firm — Olympic Patent Works, PLLC.	
(63) Continuation-in-part of application No. 12/782,697, filed on May 18, 2010, now Pat. No. 8,093,767.		
(60) Provisional application No. 61/179,109, filed on May 18, 2009.	(57) ABSTRACT	
(51) Int. Cl. H02K 33/00 (2006.01)	The current application is directed to various types of linear vibrational modules, including linear-resonant vibration modules, that can be incorporated in a wide variety of appliances, devices, and systems to provide vibrational forces. The vibrational forces are produced by linear oscillation of a weight or member, in turn produced by rapidly alternating the polarity of one or more driving electromagnets. Feedback control is used to maintain the vibrational frequency of linear-resonant vibration module at or near the resonant frequency for the linear-resonant vibration module. Both linear vibration modules and linear-resonant vibration modules can be designed to produce vibrational amplitude/frequency combinations through a large region of amplitude/frequency space.	
(52) U.S. CL. CPC H02K 33/16 (2006.01)		
(58) Field of Classification Search USPC 318/128, 318/129, 318/114		
USPC 318/128, 129, 114; 310/19, 36, 254, 17, 340/407.1		
See application file for complete search history.		
(56) References Cited		
U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS		
1,120,414 A 12/1914 Schofield et al.		
3,728,654 A 4/1973 Tada		
5 Claims, 20 Drawing Sheets		
		

IPR2024-00807, Ex. 1001

2. A linear vibration module comprising:
 - a housing;
 - a moveable component;
 - a power supply;
 - user-input features;
 - a driving component that drives the moveable component in each of two opposite directions within the housing; and
 - a control component that controls supply of power from the power supply to the driving component to cause the moveable component to oscillate at a frequency and an amplitude specified by user input received from the user-input features,wherein the control component drives simultaneous oscillation of the moveable component at two or more frequencies to generate complex vibration modes.
3. The linear vibration module of claim 2 wherein the complex vibration modes include:
 - a primary oscillation frequency modulated by a modulating oscillation frequency;
 - a beat frequency; and
 - an aperiodic oscillation waveform.

Claim Construction

“driving component...” ('830 and '337 patents)

Board’s construction of “driving component”

Function:

drives the moveable component to oscillate within the housing

Corresponding structure:

a coil of conductive wire 420” (Figures 4A–4G); “coil 514” (Figures 5A–5B); “coil 626” (Figure 6); “electromagnet” (Figures 10-11); “additional coils 1202 and 1204” (Figure 12); “coils 1302 and 1304” (Figure 13); “driving coils 1412 and 1414” (Figure 14); “coil 1510” (Figures 15–17); “stator coils” (Figures 24A-25)

Board adopted Petitioner’s proposed construction.
Patent Owner does not believe this term
requires construction to resolve either IPR.

IPR2024-00806, ID 12–13, Pet. 6–7, POR 7

IPR2024-00807, ID 12, Pet. 5–6, POR 7

“control component...” (’830 and ’337 patents)

District Court construction of “control component”

Function (’830 and ’337 patents):

controlling supply of power from the power supply to the driving component to cause the moveable component to oscillate at a frequency and an amplitude specified by specified by one or more stored values

Corresponding structure (’830 patent):

a microcontroller, a processor, a microprocessor, or a CPU that performs the algorithm shown in Steps 706 through 716 in Figure 7A, with reference to all steps shown in Figure 7B other than Step 734 and all steps shown in Figure 7C, or the algorithm described in the corresponding text, See, e.g., 7:20–7:34, 7:42–7:52, 7:60–8:40, and equivalents thereof.

Corresponding structure (’337 patent):

a microcontroller, a processor, a microprocessor, or a CPU that performs the algorithm shown in Steps 706 through 716 in Figure 7A, with reference to the steps shown in Figures 7B and 7C, or the algorithm described in the corresponding text, See, e.g. 7:10–7:24, 7:32–8:30 and/or equivalents thereof.

IPR2024-00806, ID 13

IPR2024-00807, ID 13

“control component...” (’830 and ’337 patents)

Board’s construction of “control component” (both patents)

“As elaborated below, our reading of the [’830/’337] patent is in accord with the District Court’s construction, and we adopt it for purposes of this Decision.”

“In summary, the corresponding structure of the ‘control component’ under a means plus function interpretation that relies upon a microprocessor (and memory) as corresponding structure further requires algorithmic structure at least for 1) operating a timer or its equivalent to **flip the polarity of a control value** periodically corresponding to a user-selected frequency and **input the control value to an H-bridge switch circuit to change the direction of the current** through the coil as supplied by the power supply, and 2) **computing an output value** corresponding to a user-selected amplitude of oscillation **and outputting the value to the claimed power supply** so that the power supply outputs an appropriate current amplitude to a coil.”

IPR2024-00806, ID 13, 20

IPR2024-00807, ID 13, 20

“control component...” (’830 and ’337 patents)

Petition’s construction of “control component” (both patents)



This Petition treats “control component” in [challenged claims] as including one of the switches shown in Figures 5A-6 and described at [5:52-6:5, 6:9-16], and the processor (also referred to as microprocessor, microcontroller, or CPU) that **performs the algorithm shown in Figures 7A-7C** and described at [6:52-8:40].

Reply does not argue for a construction different from that in the Board’s institution decision

IPR2024-00806, Pet. 4–5, POR 8–9, Reply 8–9

IPR2024-00807, Pet. 4, POR 8–10, Reply 16–17

“control component...” ('830 and '337 patents)



IPR2024-00806, Ex. 1001, Figs. 7A, 7C, POR 8, 20, Sur-reply 3–4

IPR2024-00807, Ex. 1001, Figs. 7A, 7C, POR 8–9, 27, Sur-reply 3–4

“control component...” (’830 and ’337 patents)

Board’s construction of “control component” (both patents)

“As elaborated below, our reading of the [’830/’337] patent is in accord with the District Court’s construction, and we adopt it for purposes of this Decision.”

“In summary, the corresponding structure of the ‘control component’ under a means plus function interpretation that relies upon a microprocessor (and memory) as corresponding structure further requires algorithmic structure at least for 1) operating a timer or its equivalent to **flip the polarity of a control value** periodically corresponding to a user-selected frequency and **input the control value to an H-bridge switch circuit to change the direction of the current** through the coil as supplied by the power supply, and 2) **computing an output value** corresponding to a user-selected amplitude of oscillation **and outputting the value to the claimed power supply** so that the power supply outputs an appropriate current amplitude to a coil.”

IPR2024-00806, ID 13, 20

IPR2024-00807, ID 13, 20

IPR2024-00806 '830 Patent Grounds 1A-1F

IPR2024-00806, Grounds 1A-1F

- The grounds are all based upon constructions for “control component” that neither Petitioner nor Patent Owner have advanced in this proceeding.
- The Institution Decision was based upon Grounds 2A-2C. With respect to Grounds 1A-1F, the Board stated “those grounds are based on assumed “plain and ordinary meaning” interpretations of the claims that we do not adopt. . . . Therefore, we do not consider those grounds of Petitioner’s challenge”
- The Reply does not address Grounds 1A-1F at all.
- These Grounds should be rejected.

IPR2024-00806, Pet. 16–19, ID 21, Sur-Reply 2

IPR2024-00806 '830 Patent Grounds 2A-2C


IPR2024-00806, Grounds 2A–2C

- Grounds 2A–C are purportedly based upon Apple’s construction of “control component.”
- But Petition failed to provide a full step-by-step mapping that included steps 708 and 762 the context of the full algorithm

IPR2024-00806, Sur-Reply 3–5

IPR2024-00806, Grounds 2A–2C

Reply adds a new argument, based upon Gregorio drive signal 504:



IPR2024-00806, Reply 6–7, Sur-Reply 6

IPR2024-00806, Grounds 2A–2C



“35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3) [requires] IPR petitions to identify ‘with particularity ... the evidence that supports the grounds for the challenge to each claim’”

Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc., 815 F.3d 1356, 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2016)

“We see no error in the Board’s rejection of Ariosa’s reliance, in its Reply submissions, on previously unidentified portions of a prior-art reference to make a meaningfully distinct contention.”

Ariosa Diagnostics v. Verinata Health, Inc., 805 F.3d 1359, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2015)

“[Petitioner] waited until its reply to present what in substance is an argument that it would have been obvious to a relevant artisan to modify [prior art]. This argument was a ‘meaningfully distinct contention’ We thus see no abuse of discretion in the Board’s decision not to consider the new argument.”

Yita LLC v. MacNeil IP LLC, 69 F.4th 1356, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2023)

IPR2024-00806, Sur-Reply 6–7


Even if this untimely theory were considered, drive signal 504 is a single signal. Nowhere does Gregario teach separately outputting d and p signals at separate steps of the algorithm as required by the means-plus-function corresponding structures proposed by Apple's or the Board's constructions.

IPR2024-00806, Sur-Reply 7

IPR2024-00806 '830 Patent Claim 14

IPR2024-00806, Claim 14

Claim 14 theories (grounds 1B, 1E, 2B) are based upon using aluminum as the “magnetic substance” of Wakuda’s casing:



The vibration generating means 1 shown in FIG. 1 comprises a cylindrical-shaped casing 2 made of a magnetic substance as a support, and covers 3, 3 made of a non-magnetic substance and being mountable on both ends of the

IPR2024-00806, Pet. 32, Ex. 1005, 4:34–36, Fig. 1B, POR 22

IPR2024-00806, Claim 14

Claim 14 theories (grounds 1B, 1E, 2B) are based upon using aluminum as the “magnetic substance” of Wakuda’s casing:

- “Several reasons would have motivated a POSITA to implement the casing of Gregorio-Wakuda’s LRA using a paramagnetic material (e.g., aluminum).”
- “Further, well-known paramagnetic materials (e.g., aluminum) were lighter than other popular magnetic materials like iron and steel, making it a superior choice”
- “Moreover, paramagnetic materials (e.g., aluminum) were well-known to be naturally resistant to rust and corrosion”
- “Additionally, paramagnetic materials (e.g., aluminum) were excellent conductors of electricity and heat”

IPR2024-00806, Pet. 33–34

IPR2024-00806, Claim 14



Prof. Keith Goossen
Patent Owner's Expert

139. As this figure is drawn, showing strong bending of the magnetic field lines into the casing, it is clearly represented as ferromagnetic, as discussed above. A paramagnetic material would not so strongly bend the lines. Furthermore Wakuda states that the casing forms the magnetic circuit, and thus must bend and guide the magnetic field lines¹¹⁶:

140. Thus replacing the casing with a paramagnetic material would result in the device not working, according to Wakuda's design.

IPR2024-00806, POR 26–27, Ex. 2009, ¶¶ 139–140

IPR2024-00806, Claim 14



Prof. Keith Goossen
Patent Owner's Expert

143. As this explains, a permeability substantially greater than 1 (i.e., in the thousands) is needed to confine the flux, like what is illustrated in McLyman Figure 1-11 or Wakuda Figure 1B. To understand where the properties of aluminum place it in this discussion from McLyman, we can determine its permeability. In the CGS units used in McLyman, the permeability can be written in terms of susceptibility κ^{121} :

$$\frac{B}{H} = 1 + 4\pi\kappa$$

IPR2024-00806, POR 28, Ex. 2009, ¶ 143

IPR2024-00806, Claim 14



Prof. Keith Goossen
Patent Owner's Expert

144. The CGS susceptibility of solid aluminum is 16.5×10^{-6} , making the permeability $1 + 4\pi\kappa$ approximately 1.000022,¹²² and making it one of the “non-magnetic materials” with “permeabilities of the same order” as 1.0, according to McLyman.¹²³ Importantly, the magnetization due to paramagnetism in aluminum will only alter the magnetic B field by around 0.002% of the value that field would have in a vacuum. A POSITA would recognize that such a weak effect would not alter the magnetic flux lines from McLyman Figure 1-10 to be concentrated as in McLyman Figure 1-11, and it would not produce the magnetic flux paths confined to the magnetic material as shown in Wakuda Figure 1B.

145. A POSITA seeking to apply the teachings of Wakuda Figure 1B would not be motivated to use a paramagnetic material such as aluminum in place of the magnetic material taught by Wakuda. Accordingly, the combination of Gregario with Wakuda does not render

IPR2024-00806, POR 28–29, Ex. 2009, ¶¶ 134–145

IPR2024-00806, Claim 14

Apple's own evidence:

webphysics.kupl.edu/vebscience/physics_archive/magneticmaterials.html

20 cantos

13 Mar 2002 - 21 Apr 2001

Go FEB 23 MAY 2001 2002 2003 About this chapter

Phys 251

 "What is Physics Good For?"

Extra credit is available at the end of this page. Please see the instructions.

Magnetic Materials

For the next several weeks, we will be studying magnetic fields, and the forces that charged particles and currents feel as a result of these fields. However, we don't have enough time to cover magnetic materials in any detail. This is too bad for at least two reasons:

- Magnetic materials are an important technology that impacts our daily lives.
- Your instructor's research is in this area, and he is particularly fond of it.

This page will provide a VERY BRIEF introduction to the main types of magnetic materials.

First, a technical point. All materials are magnetic in the sense that they are affected in some way. However, the extent to which they are affected varies widely. There are three basic types of magnetic materials:

1. **Diamagnetism:** Materials such as copper, lead, quartz, water, and most organic materials are diamagnetic. These materials are very weakly affected by magnetic fields. If the magnetic field is not uniform, they feel a force away from the field. Diamagnetism results from the effects of magnetic fields on the motion of electrons. Thus, all materials are diamagnetic. However, the other forms of magnetism are usually ignored unless it is the only magnetism present.
2. **Paramagnetism:** Materials such as sodium, oxygen, iron oxide (FeO or Fe_2O_3), and platinum are paramagnetic. They are affected somewhat more strongly than diamagnetic materials, they become polarized parallel to a magnetic field. Thus, in a nonuniform magnetic field, they feel a force towards the higher field region. Paramagnetism results from the magnetic forces on unpaired electrons. You may recall from a chemistry course that electrons move around atoms in "orbitals" and that a maximum of two electrons can go into each orbital. Electrons that are alone in an orbital are said to be unpaired.
3. **Ferromagnetism:** Materials such as iron, nickel, gadolinium, iron oxide (Fe_2O_3), Manganese Bismuth (MnBi), and Cobalt are ferromagnetic. These materials are very strongly affected by magnetic fields. They become polarized in the direction of the magnetic field, thus, they are strongly attracted to the field. Furthermore, they retain their polarization after the field is removed. These materials produce magnetic fields of their own. Since these fields are strong, ferromagnetic materials are capable of attracting each other. Ferromagnetism results from the interactions among the electron spins. Ferromagnets are magnetically polarized even if there is no magnetic field applied to them from the outside.

It should be no surprise that most applications of magnetic materials call for ferromagnetic materials. These are the ones that interact most strongly with magnetic fields. Within this category there are several important subcategories. These have to do with how easily the magnetic polarization (magnetization) of the material can be changed. In general, the more difficult it is to magnetize a material, the more that material will retain its magnetization. This property is known as "magnetic hardness."

For instance, in a (magnetically) **hard** material the magnetization is very difficult to change. However, the magnetized material will retain almost all of its magnetization once the magnetizing field is removed. Then, the material can be used in this condition. Hard materials are ideal for use as "permanent magnets." Permanent magnets are used in many ways, the most familiar is probably the "fridge" magnet, which is often used to hold shopping lists and children's art to the refrigerator door. Permanent magnets are also used in magnetic catches (e.g., to keep the fridge door closed), in electric motors (there's another one in the fridge), in electric generators (which power the fridge), in anti-lock brakes, in electric guitar pick-ups, and in thousands of other common and unusual devices.

Ferromagnets that are very easily magnetized, but which give up most of their magnetization when removed from the magnetic field are known as **soft** magnetic materials. These materials are used in magnetic field sensors (to read the data on magnetic tape and disks, or in antilock brakes), and in magnetic shielding. They are also used in electric transformers, which we will learn about when we study

Liquid oxygen between the poles of a horseshoe magnet.

U. Illinois-Urbana



First, a technical point. All materials are magnetic in the sense that they are affected in some way. However, the extent to which they are affected varies widely. There are

Diamagnetism results from the the effects of magnetic fields on all of the electrons. Thus, all materials are diamagnetic. However, the other forms of magnetism are usually ignored unless it is the only magnetism present.

no surprise that most applications of magnetic materials call for ferromagnetic materials. These materials interact most strongly with magnetic fields. Within this category there are several important

IPR2024-00806, Ex. 1032, POR 22

IPR2024-00806, Claim 14

Apple's own evidence:

The screenshot shows the website of the University of Minnesota Institute for Rock Magnetism. The page is titled '2. Classes of Magnetic Materials'. The text explains the origin of magnetism and classifies materials into five groups: 1. Diamagnetism, 2. Paramagnetism, 3. Ferromagnetism, 4. Ferrimagnetism, and 5. Antiferromagnetism. A sidebar on the right contains a 'Hitchhiker's Guide to Magnetism' PDF document. The main text states: 'The magnetic behavior of materials can be classified into the following five major groups: 1. Diamagnetism 2. Paramagnetism 3. Ferromagnetism 4. Ferrimagnetism 5. Antiferromagnetism'. Below this, it says: 'Materials in the first two groups are those that exhibit no collective magnetic interactions and are not magnetically ordered. Materials in the last three groups exhibit long-range magnetic order below a certain critical temperature. Ferromagnetic and ferrimagnetic materials are usually what we consider as being magnetic (ie., behaving like iron). The remaining three are so weakly magnetic that they are usually thought of as "nonmagnetic".'

The magnetic behavior of materials can be classified into the following five major groups:

1. Diamagnetism
2. Paramagnetism
3. Ferromagnetism
4. Ferrimagnetism
5. Antiferromagnetism

certain critical temperature. Ferromagnetic and ferrimagnetic materials are usually what we consider as being magnetic (ie., behaving like iron). The remaining three are so weakly magnetic that they are usually thought of as "nonmagnetic".

IPR2024-00806, Ex. 1037, POR 22–23

IPR2024-00806, Claim 14

Apple's own evidence:



US008134437B2

(12) **United States Patent**
Brooks

(10) **Patent No.:** US 8,134,437 B2
(45) **Date of Patent:** Mar. 13, 2012

(54) **EDDY CURRENT INDUCTIVE DRIVE ELECTROMECHANICAL LINEAR ACTUATOR AND SWITCHING ARRANGEMENT**

(75) **Inventor:** Elliot Brooks, Foothill Ranch, CA (US)

(73) **Assignee:** PowerPath Technologies LLC, San Juan Capistrano, CA (US)

(*) **Notice:** Subject to any disclaimer, the term of this patent is extended or adjusted under 35 U.S.C. 154(b) by 142 days.

(21) **Appl. No.:** 11/920,785

(22) **PCT Filed:** May 20, 2006

(86) **PCT No.:** PCT/US2006/019779
§ 371 (c)(1), (2), (4) **Date:** Mar. 2, 2009

(87) **PCT Pub. No.:** WO2006/127628
PCT Pub. Date: Nov. 30, 2006

(65) **Prior Publication Data**
US 2009/0212889 A1 Aug. 27, 2009

(51) **Int. Cl.** H01F 7/08 (2006.01)

(52) **U.S. Cl.** 335/222; 335/100; 335/147; 335/224; 335/226

(58) **Field of Classification Search** 335/100, 335/147, 150, 222, 226, 245
See application file for complete search history.

(56) **References Cited**
U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS
1,384,769 A 7/1921 MacLaren
1,711,285 A 4/1929 Petersen
1,953,542 A 4/1934 Pridhan

1,993,946 A 3/1935 RB
1,996,599 A 4/1935 TB
2,180,661 A 11/1939 BA
2,488,443 A 11/1949 SA
3,001,115 A 9/1961 GA
3,162,796 A 12/1964 SA
3,176,170 A 3/1965 FA
3,417,268 A 12/1968 LA
3,505,544 A 4/1970 HA
3,585,458 A 6/1971 YA
3,599,020 A 8/1971 HA
3,619,673 A 11/1971 HA

(Continued)

FOREIGN PATENT
EP 0 364 308 (Continued)


OTHER PUBL
Zieve, Low Voltage Electromagnet
Oct. 21, 1986. (Continued)

Primary Examiner — Ramon B.
(74) Attorney, Agent, or Firm —

(57) **ABSTR**

The present invention is directed to an electromagnetic linear actuator. A current induced by a fixed drive eddy current focusing fields are currents using Lorentz forces to the armature includes a shorted field. This can be supplied by a current is applied, a force is perpendicular to the magnetic field suited for electrical switching applications, circuit ground fault interrupter applications.

28 Claims, 20 Dr



In applications where it is desired to ensure actuation times are as low as possible, the piston 92 is made of material having a suitably high ratio that is also non-magnetic, non-ferrous and, if desired, can be paramagnetic. Aluminum, copper and magnesium and alloys thereof are examples of suitable materials meeting these requirements. Actuation time is advantageously optimized because a piston 92 made of a such a non-magnetic, non-ferrous material is not susceptible to any potentially acceleration reducing self-induction or solenoid effect, as would likely be the case if it were ferromagnetic.

IPR2024-00806, Ex. 1031, POR 23–24

IPR2024-00807 '337 Patent Grounds 1 and 2


IPR2024-00807, Grounds 1 and 2

- Ground 1 based upon constructions for “control component” that neither Petitioner nor Patent Owner have advanced in this proceeding.
- Neither Petition nor Reply attempted to show all steps of Board’s “control component” construction satisfied.
- Ground 1 should be rejected.

IPR2024-00807, Pet. 17–19, Sur-Reply 4–5

IPR2024-00807, Grounds 1 and 2

In Reply, Petitioner identifies Wakuda “Drive Signal S1” as **both** the directional output d (to H bridge) and the output p (to power supply):



IPR2024-00807, Reply 3, 8–9, Sur-Reply 4–5, 8–10

FIG. 4




FIG. 4 shows a waveform of a drive signal $S1$. In the embodiment, while the drive signal $S1$ is given to the coil 5 as a rectangular wave, the drive signal $S1$ may have a waveform such as a triangular wave or the like. In FIG. 4, a middle point of the drive signal $S1$ is indicated by “0”, and

IPR2024-00807, Ex. 1005, 6:63–67, Fig. 4, Reply 6–7, Sur-Reply 5

Even assuming these drive signal S1 embodiment could control both the H-bridge and power supply, Wakuda does not teach separately outputting d and p signals at separate steps of the “control component” algorithm as required by Apple’s or the Board’s constructions.

IPR2024-00807, POR 19–22, Sur-Reply 5–6

IPR2024-00807 '337 Patent Grounds 3A–B, 4A–B

IPR2024-00807, Grounds 3A–B and 4A–B

- Grounds 3A–B based upon constructions for “control component” that neither Petitioner nor Patent Owner have advanced in this proceeding.
- Neither Petition nor Reply attempted to show all steps of Board’s “control component” construction satisfied.
- Grounds 3A–B should be rejected.

IPR2024-00807, Pet. 62–64, Sur-Reply 7–8

IPR2024-00807, Grounds 3A–B and 4A–B

- Grounds 4A–B are purportedly based upon Apple’s construction of “control component.”
- But Petition failed to provide any step-by-step mapping of Gregorio combination at all:


Given the similarity between Gregorio-Ramsay-Wakuda-Rossi-Aldrich’s system (§IV.E.1.(b)) and Wakuda-Ramsay-Rossi-Aldrich’s system (§IV.B.3.(b)), the analysis of Ground 2 ([1f], [2f]-[2g], [4f]) based on Rossi, Aldrich, and supporting evidence similarly applies for Gregorio-Ramsay-Wakuda-Rossi-Aldrich. APPLE-1003, [289]-[321], [324]-[327], [329].

- Grounds 4A–B should be rejected.

IPR2024-00807, Pet. 75–80, Sur-Reply 7–8

IPR2024-00807, Grounds 3A–B and 4A–B

Reply adds a new argument, based upon Gregorio drive signal 504:



IPR2024-00807, Reply 15, Sur-Reply 10

IPR2024-00807, Grounds 3A–B and 4A–B



“35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3) [requires] IPR petitions to identify ‘with particularity ... the evidence that supports the grounds for the challenge to each claim’”

Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc., 815 F.3d 1356, 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2016)

“We see no error in the Board’s rejection of Ariosa’s reliance, in its Reply submissions, on previously unidentified portions of a prior-art reference to make a meaningfully distinct contention.”

Ariosa Diagnostics v. Verinata Health, Inc., 805 F.3d 1359, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2015)

“[Petitioner] waited until its reply to present what in substance is an argument that it would have been obvious to a relevant artisan to modify [prior art]. This argument was a ‘meaningfully distinct contention’ We thus see no abuse of discretion in the Board’s decision not to consider the new argument.”

Yita LLC v. MacNeil IP LLC, 69 F.4th 1356, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2023)

IPR2024-00807, Sur-Reply 9–10

Even if this untimely theory were considered, drive signal 504 is a single signal. Nowhere does Gregario teach separately outputting d and p signals at separate steps of the algorithm as required by the means-plus-function corresponding structures proposed by Apple's or the Board's constructions.

IPR2024-00807, Sur-Reply 10

