

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APPLE INC.  
Petitioner

v.

HBCU Messaging US LP,  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2025-01488  
Patent No. 11,653,182

---

**PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR DIRECTOR REVIEW OF  
THE DECISION DENYING INSTITUTION**

**LIST OF EXHIBITS**

|            |  |
|------------|--|
| APPLE-1001 | U.S. Patent No. 11,653,182 (“the ’182 Patent”)   |
| APPLE-1002 | File History of U.S. Patent No. 11,653,182   |
| APPLE-1003 | Expert Declaration of Dr. Patrick Traynor, Ph.D.   |
| APPLE-1004 | U.S. Pub. No. 2007/0254681 (“Horvath”)   |
| APPLE-1005 | U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0203956 (“Tsampalis”)   |
| APPLE-1006 | RESERVED   |
| APPLE-1007 | Chatterjee et al., “Instant Messaging and Presence Technologies for College Campuses.” IEEE Network, May/June 2005. (“Chatterjee”) |
| APPLE-1008 | U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0243978 (“Son”)   |
| APPLE-1009 | UK Pub. No. 2432482 (“Beaumont”)   |
| APPLE-1010 | U.S. Patent No. 9,408,077 (“David”)  |
| APPLE-1011 | U.S. Patent No. 6,940,844 (“Purkayastha”)  |
| APPLE-1012 | U.S. Patent No. 7,702,342 (“Duan”)   |
| APPLE-1013 | U.S. Patent No. 8,819,145 (“Gailloux”)   |
| APPLE-1014 | U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0286984 (“Bonner”)  |
| APPLE-1015 | U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0197142 (“Major”)   |
| APPLE-1016 | U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0037762 (“Gurbani”)   |
| APPLE-1017 | U.S. Patent No. 9,167,401 (“Helferich”)  |
| APPLE-1018 | U.S. Patent No. 6,430,604 (“Ogle”)   |
| APPLE-1019 | International Pub. No. WO 2006/029331 (“Henderson”)  |
| APPLE-1020 | U.S. Patent No. 7,236,472 (“Lazaridis”)  |

APPLE-1021 – APPLE-1024 RESERVED

APPLE-1025 Qi et al., 2004, July. “Multimedia Messaging Service.” Available at [https://www.zte.com.cn/global/about/magazine/zte-communications/2004/1/en\\_68/162264.html](https://www.zte.com.cn/global/about/magazine/zte-communications/2004/1/en_68/162264.html) (“Qi”)

APPLE-1026 RFC 3261 – SIP: Session Initiation Protocol. Available at <http://www.faqs.org/rfcs/rfc3261.html>. June 2002.

APPLE-1027 RESERVED

APPLE-1028 “How do I sign in to Messenger?” Yahoo! Messenger 6.0. 2004. Available at <https://web.archive.org/web/20040528072514/http://help.yahoo.com/help/us/messenger/win/signin/signin-03.html>

APPLE-1029 – APPLE-1031 RESERVED

APPLE-1032 U.S. Pub. No. 2008/0261577 (claiming priority to Provisional App. No. 60/913,187) (“Celik”)

APPLE-1033 U.S. Provisional App. No. 60/913,187

APPLE-1034 – APPLE-1035 RESERVED

APPLE-1036 International Pub. No. WO 2007/052264 (“Agiv”)

APPLE-1037 T-Mobile webpage <https://www.t-mobile.com/home-internet/the-signal/internet-help/the-complete-wifi-history>

APPLE-1038 – APPLE1041 RESERVED

APPLE-1042 U.S. Pub. No. US 2008/0153459 (“Kansal”)

APPLE-1043 RFC 2778 – A Model for Presence and Instant Messaging. Available at <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/rfc2778>. February 2000.

APPLE-1044 RFC 3856 – A Presence Event Package for the Session Initiation Protocol (SIP). Available at <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/rfc3856>. August 2004.

APPLE-1045 Trillian Pro v1.0 webpage (“Trillian”)

|                         |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| APPLE-1046              | U.S. Pub. No. 2007/0054627 (“Wormald”)  |
| APPLE-1047              | U.S. Pub. No. 2008/0120427 (“Ramanathan”)   |
| APPLE-1048              | U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0062345 (“Guedalia”)   |
| APPLE-1049              | U.S. Patent No. 7,472,163 (“Ben-Yoseph”)  |
| APPLE-1050              | U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0233737 (“Lin”)  |
| APPLE-1051 – APPLE-1099 | RESERVED  |
| APPLE-1100              | Complaint, <i>HBCU Messaging US LP v. Apple, Inc. et al.</i> , 1-24-cv-01199 (WDTX) (Oct. 7, 2024)  |
| APPLE-1101              | Infringement Charts of the ’182 Patent  |
| APPLE-1102              | Declaration of June Ann Munford   |
| APPLE-1103              | U.S. Pub. No. 2007/0299930 (“Wendelrup”)  |
| APPLE-1104              | Stipulation dated October 31, 2025  |
| APPLE-1105              | MPEP Chapter 900: Prior Art, Classification, and Search (Rev. 08.2017) (January 2018), <i>available at</i><br><a href="https://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/mpep/old/e9r08-2017/mpep-0900.pdf">https://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/mpep/old/e9r08-2017/mpep-0900.pdf</a> |
| APPLE-1106              | Apple’s Opening Claim Construction Brief, <i>HBCU Messaging US LP v. Apple, Inc. et al.</i> , 1-24-cv-01199 (WDTX) (Sept. 22, 2025)   |
| APPLE-1107              | HBCU’s Opening Claim Construction Brief, <i>HBCU Messaging US LP v. Apple, Inc. et al.</i> , 1-24-cv-01199 (WDTX) (Sept. 22, 2025)  |
| APPLE-1108              | Apple’s Responsive Claim Construction Brief, <i>HBCU Messaging US LP v. Apple, Inc. et al.</i> , 1-24-cv-01199 (WDTX) (Oct. 24, 2025)   |

- APPLE-1109 HBCU’s Responsive Claim Construction Brief, *HBCU Messaging US LP v. Apple, Inc. et al.*, 1-24-cv-01199 (WDTX) (Oct. 24, 2025)
- APPLE-1110 Continuity Data for U.S. Application Serial No. 12/452,883
- APPLE-1111 Continuity Data for U.S. Application Serial No. 16/714,113
- APPLE-1112 – APPLE-1114 RESERVED
- APPLE-1115 Summons in a Civil Action and Certification of Service of Summons and Complaint, *HBCU Messaging US LP v. Apple, Inc. et al.*, 1-24-cv-01199 (WDTX) (Nov. 5, 2024)
- APPLE-1116 German Federal Court of Justice Decision, *Apple Retail Germany GmbH v. Rembrandt Messaging Technologies, LP*, concerning EP 2 177 072 (Dec. 15, 2020) (Certified English Translation)
- APPLE-1117 Claim Construction Order, *HBCU Messaging US LP v. Apple, Inc. et al.*, 1-24-cv-01199 (WDTX) (Jan. 26, 2026)
- APPLE-1118 *Markman* Hearing Transcript, *HBCU Messaging US LP v. Apple, Inc. et al.*, 1-24-cv-01199 (WDTX) (Jan. 23, 2026)

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

|      |  |    |
|------|--|----|
| I.   | INTRODUCTION .....   | 1  |
| II.  | THE DECISION ERRED IN FOLLOWING HBCU’S<br>MISREPRESENTATIONS AND DENYING INSTITUTION UNDER<br>REVVO BECAUSE APPLE’S PETITION IS NOT INCONSISTENT<br>WITH ITS CLAIM CONSTRUCTION POSITIONS IN COURT ..... | 2  |
|      | A. “BEARER” .....  | 2  |
|      | B. “WHEREIN ... WHEN” .....  | 7  |
| III. | CONCLUSION.....  | 10 |

## I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner (Apple Inc. or “Apple”) requests Director Review of the February 18, 2026 Decision denying institution of the present proceeding (IPR2025-01488). *See* Paper 15. The Notice of institution denial indicated that “[a]lthough previously referred, this case is now discretionarily denied in view of *Revvo Techs., Inc. v. Cerebrum Sensor Techs., Inc.*, IPR2025-00632, Paper 20 (Director Nov. 3, 2026) (precedential).” *Id.*, n. 1.

The Decision followed Patent Owner’s (HBCU Messaging US LP or “HBCU”) unfounded contentions of inconsistent claim construction positions between the Petition and parallel litigation on the ’182 Patent. Indeed, only twelve days prior to the Decision, HBCU filed a Sur-Reply (Paper 14) that blatantly mischaracterized the claim construction record in the parallel litigation and offered false statements concerning the same. This led the Director to rely on inaccurate information in resolving whether to terminate. Consequently, the Decision denying institution was based on erroneous findings of material fact or law, and/or amounted to an abuse of discretion, because Apple’s Petition was not inconsistent with its claim construction positions in Court.

This Request demonstrates that Apple’s positions were not inconsistent and that *Revvo* should not have applied. Accordingly, Apple’s Request for Director Review should be granted, the Decision denying institution should be vacated, and the

Petition should be re-referred for consideration on the merits and instituted.

**II. THE DECISION ERRED IN FOLLOWING HBCU'S MISREPRESENTATIONS AND DENYING INSTITUTION UNDER *REVVO* BECAUSE APPLE'S PETITION IS NOT INCONSISTENT WITH ITS CLAIM CONSTRUCTION POSITIONS IN COURT**

Two claim terms from the '182 Patent were the subject of construction in the parallel litigation: (1) "bearer" and (2) "wherein...when". *See* APPLE-1117. Contrary to HBCU's contentions, Apple's claim construction positions for each of these terms in Court is not inconsistent with their treatment in the Petition. The record thus fails to support denial under *Revvo*. The Decision's finding otherwise was clear error based on an incomplete and inaccurate record of the District Court proceeding left by HBCU in its Sur-Reply.

**A. "bearer"**

Apple's treatment of "bearer" in the Petition is consistent with its Court construction.<sup>1</sup> While unacknowledged in HBCU's Sur-Reply, the Petition's identification of "SMS" and "IM" (instant messaging) directly aligns precisely with the '182 Patent's explanation that a bearer can be an "SMS bearer" and that instant messaging

---

<sup>1</sup> The only claims of the '182 Patent that recite "bearer" are dependent claims 14, 15, 29, and 30. *None of these claims are asserted in Court.* "Bearer" is therefore not a disputed term with respect to any claim at issue in the '182 Patent in Court.

(e.g., “Mobile Instant Messaging (MIM)” protocols are used for messaging in embodiments of the alleged invention. Pet., 73-75; APPLE-1001, 3:28-35, 2:21-27, 3:20-24. Indeed, Apple’s District Court claim construction briefing cited this same portion of the specification to illustrate how its proposed construction of “bearer” as “a communication channel or protocol” encompasses each of the examples disclosed in the specification, including SMS bearers. See APPLE-1108, 9 (“The SMS bearer may be ...” (quoting related U.S. Patent No. 8,918,127 at 2:61-3:2)).

Also notable, HBCU’s District Court claim construction proposal explicitly identified SMS bearers like that addressed in the Petition. For instance, HBCU identified “SS7” and “GSM SS7” as example “bearers” in its construction, and the ’182 Patent explains that these are types of “SMS bearers.” See APPLE-1107, 1 (HBCU construing “bearer” as “[a] protocol running on a channel for transmitting data including *SS7*, *GSM SS7*, HSDPA, WCDMA, CDMA2000, GPRS, Bluetooth, Wifi, WiMax, or any other WPAN, WLAN, or WWAN wireless data transfer protocol.”); APPLE-1001, 3:28-29, 2:2-7. Apple’s Petition thus addresses “bearer” in a manner consistent with the District Court claim construction proposals of both parties, and the absence of dispute over this term’s meaning rendered unnecessary a formal claim construction for this term in the Petition. *Wellman, Inc. v. Eastman Chem. Co.*, 642 F.3d 1355, 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2011) (“claim terms need only be construed to the extent necessary to resolve the controversy”) (cited in Pet., 3).

HBCU also mischaracterized events in Court by falsely alleging that the parties have an ongoing dispute over “bearer” that may require the Court to re-construe the term at a later stage of the proceeding. Sur-Reply, 1 (“[The Court’s] current ‘plain and ordinary’ ruling will likely need to be revisited later, on a fuller record, because the parties disagree about what that ordinary meaning is.”), 3 (“[B]oth the Court and Parties currently understand that both these terms may require further construction later”). HBCU omits that, immediately after the *Markman* hearing, “[t]he parties propose[d] the Court construe [bearer] to have its ‘plain and ordinary meaning.’” EX2024 (emphasis added); *see also* EX2025. Acknowledging the joint proposal, *the Court then ordered that “bearer” be given its plain and ordinary meaning*, specifically noting that this construction was “*final*.” APPLE-1117 (emphasis added). Now resolved as consistent with the Petition, “bearer” is not relevant to institution of this IPR.

HBCU’s gamesmanship is prominent. Its Motion for Discretionary Denial never identified Apple’s or HBCU’s specific claim construction that supposedly created tension between the Court and PTAB. Apple nonetheless provided this information in its Opposition briefing to inform the Director of Apple’s constructions and to explain why formal constructions were unnecessary in the Petition under *Wellman*. Opp., 19-20 (citing APPLE-1106, -1107, -1108, -1109 (claim construction briefing)). HBCU then raised further allegations of inconsistencies in the POPR,

contrary to the Director’s instruction that “[t]he petitioner and the patent owner *should not* present discretionary considerations in the petition or the Patent Owner Preliminary Response (POPR), respectively.” Interim Director Discretionary Process Webpage, <https://www.uspto.gov/patents/ptab/interim-director-discretionary-process> (emphasis added); POPR, 27.

Still, the claim construction briefing that Apple submitted with its Opposition reveals that Apple’s focus in Court was offering an alternative construction for “bearer” consistent with plain meaning, to counter HBCU’s attempts to construe bearer in a manner that was likely to both lead to confusion and improperly exclude disclosed embodiments. APPLE-1107, 13 (“HBCU Messaging’s construction is [] unnecessarily verbose. There is no good reason to present jurors with 12 examples of messaging protocols.”), 4 (HBCU’s “construction of ‘bearer’ inexplicably replaces [] one simple word with 31 more complicated words”). But throughout its briefing in the IPR, HBCU ignores that HBCU—not Apple—identified “bearer” as a term requiring construction in Court. *See* EX1107. Indeed, but for HBCU’s actions, Apple explained to the Court that a construction should not have been necessary for this term:

[O]n this term [bearer], Apple did provide a construction to the extent it was helpful to the Court. *But this was not a term that we had thought needed construction. ... [I]t’s been our*

*position that one of skill in the art would understand this, have a plain and ordinary meaning to it.* It's a bearer.

APPLE-1118, 46-47 (emphasis added); *see also id.*, 43 (“We also think that it is consistent with the plain meaning.”). Thus, Apple’s Court construction has always been consistent with its PTAB construction. HBCU conveniently ignored these facts in the Sur-Reply.

The Sur-Reply also fails to acknowledge that Apple’s proposed Court construction was *broad*er than HBCU’s. Both parties agreed in Court that a “bearer” encompasses communication or messaging “protocols,” which include the SMS and IM protocols Apple mapped in the Petition. APPLE-1106, 12-13; APPLE-1118, 37:14-39:19, 43:6-14. The parties’ dispute in Court centered over whether the full scope of “bearer” further encompassed “channels” apart from the protocols used for messaging over channels. *Id.* Apple contended that “bearer” encompassed both protocols and channels; HBCU sought to limit “bearer” to protocols only. *Id.*; *see also* APPLE-1117.

HBCU’s allegations of gamesmanship are plainly unfounded in this context, especially as Apple never proposed that “bearer” should be construed narrowly in Court in any way that would have excluded Apple’s prior art mappings in the Petition. The Petition instead mapped prior art SMS and IM protocols to the claimed

“bearer” in a manner that not only aligned with Apple’s proposed Court construction, but that also satisfied HBCU’s narrower construction. These facts implicate none of the concerns over inconsistencies, inefficiencies, or unfairness expressed in *Revvo*. *See Revvo* at 4 (“The Board’s claim construction rules are designed to ensure that the Board correctly construes claim terms and to minimize inconsistency in claim construction between forums. ... To that end, the rules discourage petitioners from seeking broader constructions at the Board to support a patentability challenge while seeking narrower constructions in litigation to avoid infringement liability.”).

**B. “wherein ... when”**

HBCU’s arguments over the “wherein ... when” terms are similarly deficient.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> “wherein ... when” is a shorthand for four limitations recited in claims of the ’127 and ’182 patents identified in the parties’ claim construction briefing in Court. *See, e.g.*, APPLE-1105, 6 (Apple’s opening claim construction brief); APPLE-1116, 2-4 (*Markman* Order addressing “wherein...when” for ’127 and ’182 patents). No claims asserted from the other five patents in Court includes a “wherein ... when” limitation subject to the Court’s construction. Apple’s challenges to the asserted claims in related petitions on those five patents are therefore not impacted by “wherein...when” constructions. *See* IPR2025-01493, IPR2026-00104, IPR2026-00105, IPR2026-00107, and IPR2026-00109.

Because the Petition’s prior art combination addresses the conditional relationships articulated in Apple’s proposed construction in Court, there is no divergence between Apple’s treatment of “wherein ... when” at the PTAB and Apple’s construction in Court. *See* APPLE-1106, 6-10; APPLE-1118, 23:20-24; Pet., 82-83.

In the Sur-Reply, HBCU argues that “nothing absolves Petitioner from its failure to seek claim construction here or to at least make the Board and Director aware of its differing positions.” Sur-Reply, 1. Not so. HBCU disregards critical facts.

First, because the Petition applied art consistent with Apple’s proposed construction in Court (and therefore also consistent with HBCU’s broader position), there was no need to formally construe “wherein...when” in the Petition under *Wellman*. *See* Pet., 3.

Second, the contention that Apple “fail[ed] ... to at least make the Board and the Director aware of its differing positions” is false. As discussed above, Apple’s Opposition brief (Paper 8)—*i.e.*, Apple’s first opportunity for briefing following release of *Revvo*—expressly acknowledged that “the parties identified several terms for construction in district court” and cited each party’s claim construction briefing. Opp., 19- 20 (citing APPLE-1106, -1107, -1108, -1109). By contrast, HBCU elected *not* to submit the parties’ specific claim construction proposals from Court with its Motion for Discretionary Denial. Apple thus went beyond what was necessary to respond to HBCU’s arguments to inform the Director of its positions in Court and

to explain why formal constructions were unnecessary in the Petition under *Wellman*. Opp., 19-20. This is exactly what *Revvo* calls for. *See Revvo*, 3-4 (“Although the Board’s trial rules do not necessarily prohibit petitioners from taking inconsistent claim construction positions before the Board and a district court, when a petitioner takes alternative positions before the Board and a district court, that petitioner should, at a minimum, explain why alternative positions are warranted.”) (internal quotations omitted).

Third, HBCU’s criticisms are not applicable in view of more recent developments in Court. For example, Apple agreed before the Decision denying institution to maintain plain and ordinary meaning for “wherein...when” in Court, not inconsistent with the Petition. *See* EX2024. Although HBCU notes that the parties expressed disagreement over the plain and ordinary meaning in an email to the Court following the *Markman* hearing, it is still the case that the Court proceeded to “order plain and ordinary meaning for the ‘wherein...when’ terms at this stage.” EX2025; APPLE-1117.

For avoidance of doubt, however, and in an effort to moot the parties’ earlier dispute, unless the Court requests further clarification from the parties or if HBCU itself seeks further construction, ***Apple certifies that it will apply the plain and ordinary meaning of the “wherein...when” terms in the district court litigation***, consistent with the Court’s recent Order. Apple’s treatment of “wherein...when” in this

IPR has been and will remain consistent with the Court's construction if IPR is instituted.

### III. CONCLUSION

As noted by the initial referral, other discretionary factors strongly favor referral of the Petition for the reasons addressed in Apple's Opposition briefing, such that the PTAB remains the best forum to adjudicate patentability of HBCU's patents. *See* Paper 12.

Accordingly, and for each of the reasons addressed herein, Apple respectfully requests that Apple's request for Director Review be granted, that the Director's decision denying institution be vacated, and the Petition be referred and instituted on the merits.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 10, 2026

/W. Karl Renner/  
W. Karl Renner, Reg. No. 41,265  
David Holt, Reg. No. 65,161  
Nicholas Stephens, Reg. No. 74,320  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
60 South Sixth Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
T: 202-783-5070  
F: 877-769-7945

*Attorneys for Petitioner*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Pursuant to 37 CFR § 42.6(e)(4), the undersigned certifies that on March 10, 2026, a complete and entire copy of this Petitioner's Authorized Reply to Patent Owner's Preliminary Response and Exhibit APPLE-1118 were provided by email to the Patent Owner by serving the correspondence email address of record as follows:

Timothy Devlin, Reg. No. 41,706  
Neil Benchell (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
DEVLIN LAW FIRM LLC  
1526 Gilpin Avenue  
Wilmington, DE 19806  
Phone: (302) 449-9010  
Fax: (302) 353-4251  
[tdevlin@devlinlawfirm.com](mailto:tdevlin@devlinlawfirm.com)  
[nbenchell@devlinlawfirm.com](mailto:nbenchell@devlinlawfirm.com)  
[dflitparas@devlinlawfirm.com](mailto:dflitparas@devlinlawfirm.com)

/Crena Pacheco/

---

Crena Pacheco  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
60 South Sixth Street, Suite 3200  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
[pacheco@fr.com](mailto:pacheco@fr.com)