

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC,

Petitioner,

v.

PROXENSE, LLC

Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 8,352,730

IPR Case No. 2024-01486

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	- 1 -
II.	Discretionary Denial is warranted under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	- 1 -
III.	Conclusion	- 2 -

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 313 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.107, Patent Owner Proxense, LLC (“Patent Owner” or “Proxense”) submits the following Preliminary Response to the Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent No. 8,352,730 B2 (“the 730 Patent”) filed by Apple Inc. (“Petitioner” or “Apple”).

II. DISCRETIONARY DENIAL IS WARRANTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 314(a)

Apple filed a Petition for *inter partes* review of claims 1-17 of the 730 patent (Paper 1) and a Motion for Joinder (“Motion”) (Paper 3) to join Microsoft’s instituted proceeding in IPR2024-00775 (“Microsoft IPR”) and a Notice Ranking Petitions (“Notice”) (Paper 4). Apple acknowledges that it previously filed a petition, which was granted, for *inter partes* review of claims 1-6 and 8-17 of the 730 Patent in IPR2024-01333 (“1333 IPR”) - which was joined with IPR2024-00232 (“232 IPR”). Furthermore, “Petitioner ranks the 1333 IPR first.” Paper 4, at 1. Per its ranking, Petitioner states that “[s]hould the Board decide to institute only a single petition and grant only a single motion for joinder against the ’730 patent, Petitioner requests that the Board institute Petitioner’s petition in the 1333 IPR and grant its motion to join the Google IPR.” *Id.*, at 4. The Board should exercise its discretion under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a) to deny Petitioner’s request for institution with respect to Apple’s second petition.

“[O]ne petition should be sufficient to challenge the claims of a patent in most situations.” Patent Trial and Appeal Board Consolidated Trial Practice Guide, November 2019, at 59. While Apple’s previous petition in the 1333 IPR relied on different prior art combinations, Apple has not made any showing that the prior art combinations could not have been presented in a single Petition. Furthermore, Apple has not claimed it was unaware of the different prior art combinations at the time of the filing of the 1333 IPR. Nor could Apple make such a showing as IPR2024-00775 to which apple attempts to joined was filed four months prior to its present Petition.

Furthermore, though this Petition challenges dependent claim 7 of the 730 Patent, which was not challenged in the 1333 IPR, Patent Owner has not asserted claim 7 against Apple in the current co-pending litigation. *See* Apple Exhibit 1036, at 38. Thus, the only difference between the petitions is a challenge to a dependent claim not at issue.

Additionally, there is no dispute about the priority date regarding either combination of references. Patent Owner has not denied that either combination references constitute prior art.

Finally, Patent Owner notes that Microsoft's petition and accompanying motion to join the 1333 IPR in IPR2024-01326 were denied. *See Microsoft Corp. v. Proxense LLC*, IPR2024-01326, Paper 8. Apple has presented no reason why it should receive different treatment than Microsoft. While Apple may have initially been an "understudy" in the 1333 IPR, Apple is now the sole Petitioner in the 1333 IPR.

Apple ranked the 1333 IPR first, which was instituted, and offers no credible reasons why multiple proceedings are necessary. Accordingly, the Board should exercise its discretion under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a) and deny Apple's second petition.

III. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Apple's second petition for *inter partes* review of the 730 Patent should be denied.

Dated: January 27, 2025

Respectfully submitted by,

/s/ David L. Hecht

David L. Hecht (Reg. No. 61,618)

dhecht@hechtpartners.com

HECHT PARTNERS LLP

125 Park Avenue, 25th Floor

New York, NY 10017

P: (212) 851-6821

CERTIFICATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.24

Under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 42.24, the undersigned hereby certifies that the word count for the forgoing Patent Owner Response (excluding the table of contents, table of authorities, certificate of service, certificate of word count, or listing of exhibits) total 539 words, which is less than the 14,000 words allowed under 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(b)(1).

Dated: January 27, 2025

/s/ David L. Hecht

David L. Hecht (Reg. No. 61,618)

dhecht@hechtpartners.com

HECHT PARTNERS LLP

125 Park Avenue, 25th Floor

New York, NY 10017

P: (212) 851-6821

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e)

The undersigned certifies service pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e) on the petitioner by emailing a copy of this Patent Owner Preliminary Response and supporting materials at the correspondence address of record for the Petitioner listed below:

PHILIP W. WOO (USPTO Reg. No. 39,880)
DUANE MORRIS LLP,
260 Homer Avenue #202
Palo Alto, CA 94301
P: (650) 847-4145
F: (650) 644-0150
PWWoo@duanemorris.com

MONTÉ T. SQUIRE (USPTO Reg. No. 80,123)
DUANE MORRIS LLP
1201 North Market Street, Suite 501,
Wilmington, DE 19801
P: (302) 657-4918
F: (302) 397-2543
MTSquire@duanemorris.com

D. STUART BARTOW (USPTO Reg. No. 56,505)
DUANE MORRIS LLP
1201 North Market Street, Suite 501,
Wilmington, DE 19801
P: (650) 847-4158
F: (650) 618-8505
DSBartow@duanemorris.com

PAUL BELNAP (USPTO Reg. No. 73,106)
DUANE MORRIS LLP
901 New York Ave. NW, Suite 700 East,
Washington, D.C. 20001
P: (202) 776-7879
F: (202) 776-7801
PHBelnap@duanemorris.com

Dated: January 27, 2025

/s/ David L. Hecht
David L. Hecht (Reg. No. 61,618)
dhecht@hechtpartners.com
HECHT PARTNERS LLP
125 Park Avenue, 25th Floor
New York, NY 10017
P: (212) 851-6821