

# EXHIBIT 1

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

**Case No. 1:10cv023580-Civ-UU**

MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

---

APPLE INC.,

Counterclaim Plaintiff,

v.

MOTOROLA, INC. and  
MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC.,

Counterclaim Defendants.

---

**APPLE’S SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES TO MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC. AND  
MOTOROLA, INC.’S FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES (NO. 2)**

Pursuant to Rules 26 and 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Defendant and Counterclaim-Plaintiff Apple Inc. (“Apple”) objects and responds to the interrogatories served by Plaintiff and Counterclaim-Defendants Motorola Mobility, Inc. (“Motorola Mobility”) and Motorola, Inc. (“Motorola”) (collectively, the “Plaintiffs”) as follows:

**GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

Apple reiterates and incorporates by reference its objections to Plaintiffs’ First Set of Interrogatories, as if specifically stated herein.

## **FURTHER OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES**

### **INTERROGATORY NO. 2**

For each Mobility Asserted Patent, describe the complete basis for your contention that the patent is not valid or enforceable, including for each patent an identification of all material or information that you contend constitutes Prior Art and a description, on a claim-by-claim, element-by-element basis of why you contend the Prior Art renders the Mobility Asserted Patent invalid.

### **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 2**

In addition to its General Objections, Apple objects to this interrogatory as vague and ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Apple further objects to this interrogatory to the extent that it seeks information that is (a) protected by the attorney-client privilege or work product doctrine; (b) confidential, proprietary, or trade secret; (c) subject to Apple's legal or contractual obligation of nondisclosure or confidentiality to a third party; and/or (d) public or readily available to Counterclaim-Defendants. Apple further objects to the extent this interrogatory calls for a legal conclusion. Apple also objects to this contention interrogatory as premature because the Court has not yet set the deadlines for serving invalidity and unenforceability contentions. Apple expressly reserves the right to amend, supplement, and/or correct its response to this interrogatory as additional information becomes available to Apple during the course of its discovery and investigation, in response to any claim construction by the Court, or in response to Counterclaim-Defendants' infringement contentions (or any supplement thereto) or Counter-Defendants' response to Apple's interrogatories (or any supplement thereto).

Subject to its General and Specific Objections, Apple responds as follows: Apple will provide its invalidity and unenforceability contentions pursuant to any deadlines the Court may set for the exchange of such contentions and will supplement those contentions as appropriate.

Apple will provide its expert reports regarding invalidity and unenforceability pursuant to any deadlines the Court may set for the exchange of such reports and will supplement those reports as appropriate and necessary and as permitted by the Court.

## **SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 2**

Subject to its General and Specific objections above, Apple further responds as follows: Apple hereby provides its Invalidity Contentions with respect to the claims identified by Defendants Motorola, Inc. and Motorola Mobility, Inc. (“Motorola”).

Apple received Motorola’s Infringement Contentions on May 18, 2011. Apple objects to Motorola’s Infringement Contentions as vague and ambiguous, and no position that Apple takes about the disclosure of the prior art in these Invalidity Contentions should be viewed as an admission that any portion of the accused products practices any portion of the asserted claims. These Invalidity Contentions are based on claim constructions implied by Motorola’s infringement allegations, as set forth in its Infringement Contentions, and/or claim constructions that may be adopted by the Court in this matter. Nothing in these Invalidity Contentions should be understood or deemed to be an express or implied admission or contention with respect to the proper construction of any terms contained within the asserted claims. Apple will offer its proposed claim constructions in accordance with the Court’s Scheduling Order and the agreement of the parties. Apple further reserves its right to amend or supplement these contentions in light of the Court’s claim construction order(s) in this case or other proceedings involving the patents-in-suit.

With respect to each asserted claim and based on its investigation to date, Apple hereby: (a) identifies in Appendices A-F materials that define the scope and content of the prior art, including each currently known item of prior art that either anticipates or renders obvious any

asserted claim; (b) provides in Exhibits A1-A11, B1-B14, C1-C11, D1-D12, E1-E11, and F1-F13 exemplar prior art references (or a combination of several of the same) that anticipate each asserted claim or render it obvious; (c) submits charts, also in Exhibits A1-A11, B1-B14, C1-C11, D1-D12, E1-E11, and F1-F13, identifying where each element of each asserted claim is disclosed, described, or taught in the exemplar prior art references; and (d) identifies below the grounds for invalidating asserted claims based on indefiniteness, lack of enablement, or insufficient written description under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112.

Apple reserves the right to amend these Invalidity Contentions. The information herein and the accompanying documents that Apple produces are provisional and subject to further revision as follows: Apple expressly reserves the right to amend these disclosures and the associated document production should Motorola provide any information that it failed to provide in its Infringement Contentions or should Motorola amend its Infringement Contentions in any way. Further, because discovery is still in the early stages, including discovery directed to third parties, and because Apple has not yet completed its search for and analysis of relevant prior art, Apple reserves the right to amend and/or supplement the information provided herein, including identifying and relying upon additional references, should Apple's further search and its analysis yield additional information or references. Apple reserves the right to revise its ultimate contentions concerning the invalidity of the asserted claims, which may change depending upon the Court's construction of the asserted claims, any findings as to the priority date of the asserted claims, and/or positions that Motorola or its expert witness(es) may take concerning the level of ordinary skill in the art, claim construction, infringement, and/or invalidity issues.

Apple has provided detailed invalidity charts with respect to numerous references for each of the patents-in-suit. Additionally, Apple reserves the right to cite to any of the art identified in the attached appendices or exhibits in support of its invalidity arguments. Apple specifically reserves the right to rely on art cited in the file histories of the patents-in-suit, either alone or in combination with other art, and notes that Motorola is aware of both the scope and content of that art. Apple reserves the right to supplement its invalidity charts to include any of the art identified herein, either alone or in combination with other art.

Prior art not included in this disclosure, whether known or not known to Apple, may become relevant. In particular, Apple is currently unaware of the extent, if any, to which Motorola will contend that limitations of the asserted claims are not disclosed in the prior art identified by Apple. To the extent that such an issue arises, Apple reserves the right to identify additional teachings in the same references or in other references that anticipate or would have made the addition of the allegedly missing limitation to the disclosed device or method obvious.

Apple's claim charts attached to the Invalidity Contentions cite to particular teaching and disclosures of the prior art as applied to the features of the asserted claims. However, a person having ordinary skill in the art generally may view an item of prior art in the context of other publications, literature, products and understanding. As such, the cited portions are only examples, and Apple reserves the right to rely on uncited portions of the prior art references and on other publications and expert testimony as aids in understanding and interpreting the cited portions, as providing context thereto, and as additional evidence that a claim limitation is known or disclosed. Apple further reserves the right to rely on uncited portions of the prior art references, other publications, and testimony to establish bases for combinations of certain cited references that render the asserted claims obvious.

The references identified herein and in the exhibits attached to the Invalidity Contentions may disclose the elements of the asserted claims explicitly and/or inherently, and/or they may be relied upon to show the state of the art in the relevant time frame. Suggested obviousness combinations are provided in the alternative to Apple's anticipation contentions and are not to be construed to suggest that any reference included in the combinations is not by itself anticipatory or that any particular limitation is missing from a particular reference. Further, any art that is asserted to be anticipatory of any particular claim would also render that claim obvious.

Apple further reserves the right to contend that the asserted claims are invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) in the event Apple obtains evidence through discovery that the inventor named in the asserted patents did not invent the subject matter claimed therein.

The Invalidity Contentions are further subject to revision and amendment pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26(e) and Orders of record in this matter and to the extent appropriate in light of further investigation and discovery regarding the defenses, including but not limited to Motorola's disclosure of its claim construction positions, the Court's construction of the claims at issue, and/or positions that Motorola or its expert witness(es) may take concerning claim interpretation, infringement, and/or invalidity issues. To the extent the contentions reflect constructions of claim elements consistent with or implicit in Motorola's Infringement Contentions, no inference is intended nor should any be drawn that Apple agrees with Motorola's constructions, and Apple expressly reserves the right to contest such claim constructions. Apple offers these contentions in response to Motorola's Infringement Contentions and without prejudice to any position they may ultimately take as to any claim construction issues.

## **INVALIDITY CONTENTIONS**

### **I. Invalidity Arguments**

Subject to Apple's reservation of rights, Apple identifies in the attached appendices each item of prior art that anticipates and/or renders obvious one or more of the asserted claims of the patents-in-suit. The patents/applications, publications, and systems identified are also relevant for their showing of the state of the art and reasons and motivations for making improvements, additions, and combinations.

Discovery is ongoing, and Apple's prior art investigation and third party discovery are therefore not yet complete. Apple reserves the right to present additional items of prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), (b), (e), and/or (g), and/or § 103 located during the course of discovery or further investigation. For example, Apple has or expects to issue subpoenas to third parties believed to have knowledge, documentation, and/or corroborating evidence concerning some of the prior art listed in this and the following sections and/or additional prior art. These third parties include without limitation the authors, inventors, or assignees of the references listed in these disclosures. In addition, Apple reserves the right to assert invalidity under 35 U.S.C. § 102(c), (d) or (f) to the extent that discovery or further investigation yield information forming the basis for such invalidity.

Apple believes that no showing of a specific motivation is required to combine the references as disclosed these contentions, including in the charts attached hereto. There was a reason to make each combination, each combination of art would have produced no unexpected results, and each combination at most would simply represent a known alternative to one of ordinary skill in the art. *See KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 414-18 (2007) (rejecting the Federal Circuit's "rigid" application of the teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine test, instead espousing an "expansive and flexible" approach). Indeed, the Supreme



Court held that a person of ordinary skill in the art is “a person of ordinary creativity, not an automaton” and “in many cases a person of ordinary skill in the art will be able to fit the teachings of multiple patents together like a pieces of a puzzle.” *Id.* at 420-21.

Nevertheless, in addition to the information contained elsewhere in these contentions and in particular in the Exhibits, Apple identifies additional motivations and reasons to combine the cited art. Multiple teachings, suggestions, and/or reasons to modify any of the references and/or to combine any two or more of the references come from many sources, including the prior art (specific and as a whole), common knowledge, common sense, predictability, expectations, industry trends, design incentives or need, market demand or pressure, market forces, that something is obvious to try, the nature of the problem faced, and/or knowledge possessed by one of ordinary skill. In addition, it would have been obvious to try combining the prior art references identified because there were only a finite number of predictable solutions and/or because known work in one field or endeavor prompted variations based on predictable design incentives and/or market forces either in the same field or a different one. The combination of prior art references identified in these contentions would have been obvious because the combination represents the known potential options with a reasonable expectation of success. Additionally, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to create combinations identified in these contentions using: known methods to yield predictable results; known techniques in the same way; a simple substitution of one known, equivalent element for another to obtain predictable results; and/or teaching, suggestion, or motivation in the prior art generally. Also, market forces in the industry, and the desire to improve features and performance, would motivate the addition of features to systems as they become available, become smaller, become

less expensive, become more commonly used, provide better performance, reduce costs, size or weight, or predictably achieve other clearly desirable results.

Apple reserves the right to provide contentions regarding secondary consideration issues relating to obviousness or non-obviousness at a later date, as this is an issue on which Motorola bears the initial burdens of production and proof.

**A. U.S. Patent No. 5,710,987 (“the ’987 patent”)**

**1. Anticipation and Obviousness**

Appendix A contains a listing of the prior art references that anticipate and/or render obvious one or more asserted claims of the ’987 patent. Attached as Exhibits A1 - A11 are charts identifying where specifically in each respective item of prior art, or specific prior art combinations, each element of the asserted claims is found. Each anticipatory prior art reference disclosed, either alone or in combination with other prior art, renders the asserted claims invalid as obvious. In particular, each anticipatory prior art reference may be combined with (1) information known to persons skilled in the art at the time of the alleged invention, (2) any of the other anticipatory prior art references, and/or (3) any of the additional prior art identified in Appendix A. To the extent Motorola contends that any of the anticipatory prior art fails to disclose one or more limitations of the asserted claims, Apple reserves the right to identify other prior art that would supply any such limitation(s) which, when combined with the contested anticipatory prior art, would render the claimed subject matter obvious.

**B. U.S. Patent No. 5,754,119 (“the ’119 patent”)**

**1. Anticipation and Obviousness**

Appendix B contains a listing of the prior art references that anticipate and/or render obvious one or more asserted claims of the ’119 patent. Attached as Exhibits B1 - B14 are charts identifying where specifically in each respective item of prior art, or specific prior art

combinations, each element of the asserted claims is found. Each anticipatory prior art reference disclosed, either alone or in combination with other prior art, renders the asserted claims invalid as obvious. In particular, each anticipatory prior art reference may be combined with (1) information known to persons skilled in the art at the time of the alleged invention, (2) any of the other anticipatory prior art references, and/or (3) any of the additional prior art identified in Appendix B. To the extent Motorola contends that any of the anticipatory prior art fails to disclose one or more limitations of the asserted claims, Apple reserves the right to identify other prior art that would supply any such limitation(s) which, when combined with the contested anticipatory prior art, would render the claimed subject matter obvious.

## **2. Invalidity under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

All asserted claims of the '119 patent are invalid under 35 U.S.C. Section 101, at least because they involve no transformation of matter and do not require the use of a particular machine.

### **C. U.S. Patent No. 5,958,006 (“the ’006 patent”)**

#### **1. Anticipation and Obviousness**

Appendix C contains a listing of the prior art references that anticipate and/or render obvious one or more asserted claims of the '006 patent. Attached as Exhibits C1 - C11 are charts identifying where specifically in each respective item of prior art, or specific prior art combinations, each element of the asserted claims is found. Each anticipatory prior art reference disclosed, either alone or in combination with other prior art, renders the asserted claims invalid as obvious. In particular, each anticipatory prior art reference may be combined with (1) information known to persons skilled in the art at the time of the alleged invention, (2) any of the other anticipatory prior art references, and/or (3) any of the additional prior art identified in Appendix C. To the extent Motorola contends that any of the anticipatory prior art fails to

disclose one or more limitations of the asserted claims, Apple reserves the right to identify other prior art that would supply any such limitation(s) which, when combined with the contested anticipatory prior art, would render the claimed subject matter obvious.

## **2. Invalidity under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Asserted claim 12 of the '006 patent is invalid under 35 U.S.C. Section 101, at least because it involves no transformation of matter and do not require the use of a particular machine.

### **D. U.S. Patent No. 6,008,737 (“the ’737 patent”)**

#### **1. Anticipation and Obviousness**

##### **a. Printed Publications**

Appendix D contains a listing of the prior art references that anticipate and/or render obvious one or more asserted claims of the '737 patent. Attached as Exhibits D1 - D12 are charts identifying where specifically in each respective item of prior art, or specific prior art combinations, each element of the asserted claims is found. Each anticipatory prior art reference disclosed, either alone or in combination with other prior art, renders the asserted claims invalid as obvious. In particular, each anticipatory prior art reference may be combined with (1) information known to persons skilled in the art at the time of the alleged invention, (2) any of the other anticipatory prior art references, and/or (3) any of the additional prior art identified in Appendix D. To the extent Motorola contends that any of the anticipatory prior art fails to disclose one or more limitations of the asserted claims, Apple reserves the right to identify other prior art that would supply any such limitation(s) which, when combined with the contested anticipatory prior art, would render the claimed subject matter obvious.

##### **b. Prior Code Signing and Certificate-Related Art**

In its infringement contentions, for the first time, Motorola identified Apple's enterprise application distribution and certificate signing as allegedly infringing. On information and belief,

prior to the filing of the '737 patent, there existed published code signing and certificate-related references and systems that were made, used, offered for sale, and sold and that are prior art to the '737 patent under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(a), 102(b), 102(g)(2) and/or § 103 alone or in combination with the other prior art references disclosed in these contentions. Due to the short time period between the receipt of Motorola's infringement contentions and the deadline for serving its invalidity contentions, Apple has not completed its identification, gathering and analysis of this art. Apple reserves the right to identify additional prior art related to Motorola's infringement contentions. If such prior art or systems are located, Apple will make them available at that time and will provide charts showing how they anticipate or render obvious the asserted claim.

**c. Prior Art License Management Systems**

On information on belief, prior to the filing of the '737 patent, two companies named GLOBEtrouter and Highland Digital had designed, made, used, offered for sale, and sold the FLEXlm license management system. This system is prior art to the '737 patent under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(a), 102(b), 102(g)(2) and/or § 103 alone or in combination with the other prior art references disclosed in these contentions.

On information and belief, Elan Computer Group designed, made, used, offered for sale, and sold ELM (the Elan License Manager) prior to the filing of the '737 patent. On information and belief, Apollo Computer designed, made, used, offered for sale, and sold the Network License Server prior to the filing of the '737 patent. On information and belief, Viman, which later merged with Wyatt River Systems, designed, made, used, offered for sale, and sold a license management system prior to the filing of the '737 patent. These license management systems are prior art to the '737 patent under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(a), 102(b), 102(g)(2) and/or § 103 alone or in combination with the other prior art references disclosed in these contentions.

Documents relating to and persons familiar with the design of the above systems are being sought. If Apple locates the systems or documents disclosing them, it will make them available at that time and will provide charts showing how they anticipate or render obvious the asserted claim.

**E. U.S. Patent No. 6,101,531 (“the ’531 patent”)**

**1. Anticipation and Obviousness**

Appendix E contains a listing of the prior art references that anticipate and/or render obvious one or more asserted claims of the ’531 patent. Attached as Exhibits E1 - E11 are charts identifying where specifically in each respective item of prior art, or specific prior art combinations, each element of the asserted claims is found. Each anticipatory prior art reference disclosed, either alone or in combination with other prior art, renders the asserted claims invalid as obvious. In particular, each anticipatory prior art reference may be combined with (1) information known to persons skilled in the art at the time of the alleged invention, (2) any of the other anticipatory prior art references, and/or (3) any of the additional prior art identified in Appendix E. To the extent Motorola contends that any of the anticipatory prior art fails to disclose one or more limitations of the asserted claims, Apple reserves the right to identify other prior art that would supply any such limitation(s) which, when combined with the contested anticipatory prior art, would render the claimed subject matter obvious.

**2. Invalidity under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

One or more claims of the ’531 patent fail to satisfy one or more of the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 as follows:

The asserted claims are invalid for indefiniteness, lack of written description, and/or enablement because the patent fails to provide a consistent teaching as to the meaning of “virtual

session,” and one of ordinary skill in the art would not understand what is meant by a virtual session, nor how to determine whether information is sent in a virtual session.

### **3. Invalidity under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

All asserted claims of the '531 patent are invalid under 35 U.S.C. Section 101, at least because they involve no transformation of matter and do not require the use of a particular machine.

#### **F. U.S. Patent No. 6,377,161 (“the '161 patent”)**

##### **1. Anticipation and Obviousness**

Appendix F contains a listing of the prior art references that anticipate and/or render obvious one or more asserted claims of the '161 patent. Attached as Exhibits F1 - F13 are charts identifying where specifically in each respective item of prior art, or specific prior art combinations, each element of the asserted claims is found. Each anticipatory prior art reference disclosed, either alone or in combination with other prior art, renders the asserted claims invalid as obvious. In particular, each anticipatory prior art reference may be combined with (1) information known to persons skilled in the art at the time of the alleged invention, (2) any of the other anticipatory prior art references, and/or (3) any of the additional prior art identified in Appendix F. To the extent Motorola contends that any of the anticipatory prior art fails to disclose one or more limitations of the asserted claims, Apple reserves the right to identify other prior art that would supply any such limitation(s) which, when combined with the contested anticipatory prior art, would render the claimed subject matter obvious.

##### **2. Invalidity under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Asserted claims 1, 2, 3, 5, and 9 of the '161 are invalid under 35 U.S.C. Section 101, at least because they involve no transformation of matter and do not require the use of a particular machine.

Dated: June 20, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Christine Saunders Haskett

Robert D. Fram (CA Bar No. 126750)

rfram@cov.com

Christine Saunders Haskett (CA Bar No. 188053)

chaskett@cov.com

Samuel F. Ernst (CA Bar No. 223963)

sernst@cov.com

Winslow B. Taub (CA Bar No. 233456)

wtaub@cov.com

COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

One Front Street

San Francisco, CA 94111-5356

Telephone: (415) 591-6000

Facsimile: (415) 591-6091

Robert T. Haslam (CA Bar No. 71134)

rhaslam@cov.com

COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

333 Twin Dolphin Drive, Suite 700

Redwood Shores, CA 94065-1418

Telephone: (650) 632-4700

Facsimile: (650) 632-4800

Christopher R. J. Pace

Edward Soto

WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP

1395 Brickell Avenue, Suite 1200

Miami, FL 33131

Telephone: (305) 577-3100

Facsimile: (305) 374-7159

Matthew D. Powers

[matthew.powers@weil.com](mailto:matthew.powers@weil.com)

Steven S. Cherenksy

Jill J. Ho

[jill.ho@weil.com](mailto:jill.ho@weil.com)

WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP

201 Redwood Shores Parkway

Redwood Shores, CA 94065

Telephone: (650) 802-3000

Facsimile: (650) 802-3100



Mark G. Davis

[mark.davis@weil.com](mailto:mark.davis@weil.com)

WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP

1300 Eye Street, N.W., Suite 900

Washington, DC 20005

Telephone: (202) 682-7000

Facsimile: (202) 857-0940

*Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaim Plaintiff,  
Apple Inc.*

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I declare that I am employed with the law firm of Covington & Burling LLP, One Front Street, San Francisco, California 94111. I am not a party to the within cause, and I am over the age of eighteen years. I further declare that on June 20, 2011, I caused to be served, on all counsel of record, a copy of :

### APPLE'S SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES TO MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC. AND MOTOROLA, INC.'S FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES (NO. 2)

☐ **BY U.S. MAIL** by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, addressed as follows, for collection and mailing in accordance with the firm's ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with the practice for collection and processing of mail, and know that in the ordinary course of business practice that the document(s) described above will be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the same date as sworn to below.

☒ **BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE** by electronically mailing a true and correct copy through the electronic mail system to the email address(es) set forth in the service list below.

☐ **BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY** by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with overnight delivery fees provided for, addressed as follows, for collection by Federal Express in accordance with ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with the practice for collection and processing of correspondence for overnight delivery and know that in the ordinary course of business practice the document(s) described above will be deposited by an employee or agent in a box or other facility regularly maintained by Federal Express for collection on the same day that the document(s) are deposited.

☐ **BY PERSONAL SERVICE** by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope to be delivered by messenger to the offices of the addressee(s) (and left with an employee or person in charge of addressee's office), as stated below, during ordinary business hours.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on June 20, 2011, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ Christine Saunders Haskett  
Christine Saunders Haskett