

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.
Petitioner

v.

HBCU Messaging US LP,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2026-00105
Patent 11,991,600

**PETITIONER'S AUTHORIZED REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. HBCU IMPROPERLY SEEKS DENIAL BASED ON CONSTRUCTIONS OF TERMS NOT RECITED IN THE '600 PATENT1

II. APPLE’S PETITION IS CONSISTENT WITH ITS CLAIM CONSTRUCTION POSITIONS IN COURT1

 A. “Bearer”1

 B. “Cellular Core Network”3

III. THE DIRECTOR’S RECENT DE-REFERRALS OF APPLE’S RELATED PETITIONS DO NOT WARRANT DENIAL HERE4

LIST OF EXHIBITS

APPLE-1001	U.S. Patent No. 11,991,600 (“the ’600 Patent”)
APPLE-1002	File History of U.S. Patent No. 11,991,600
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	U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0173308 (“Dorenbosch”)
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	RESERVED
APPLE-1011	U.S. Patent No. 6,940,844 (“Purkayastha”)
APPLE-1012	U.S. Patent No. 7,702,342 (“Duan”)
APPLE-1013	RESERVED
APPLE-1014	U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0286984 (“Bonner”)
APPLE-1015 – APPLE-1019	RESERVED
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 (“Qi”)
APPLE-1026	RFC 3261 – SIP: Session Initiation Protocol. Available at http://www.faqs.org/rfcs/rfc3261.html . June 2002.

APPLE-1027 – APPLE-1031 RESERVED

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

APPLE-1033 – APPLE-1036 RESERVED

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

APPLE-1038 – APPLE-1041 RESERVED

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

APPLE-1043 – APPLE-1044 RESERVED

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 RESERVED

APPLE-1050 U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0233737 (“Lin”)

APPLE-1051 U.S. Pub. No. 2008/0176538 (“Terrill”)

APPLE-1052 U.S. Patent No. 9,036,620 (“Procopio”)

APPLE-1053 U.S. Patent. No. 9,467,530 (“Belimpasakis”)

APPLE-1054 U.S. Patent No. 7,069,008 (“Hill”)

APPLE-1055 U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0125547 (“Ahonen”)

APPLE-1056 U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0002407 (“Shaheen”)

APPLE-1057 RESERVED

APPLE-1058 WO 01/41477 (“Lee”)

APPLE-1059 – APPLE-1060 RESERVED

APPLE-1061	U.S. Pub. No. 2007/0290787 (“Fiatal”)
APPLE-1062	RESERVED
APPLE-1063	U.S. Pub. No. 2009/0325609 (“Rosen”)
APPLE-1064	U.S. Patent No. 7,117,445 (“Berger”)
APPLE-1065	RFC 3680: A Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) Event Package for Registrations (March 2004)
APPLE-1066	IMS Share Technote, available at https://www.sharetechnote.com/html/Handbook_IMS_SIP_Header_Expire.html
APPLE-1067	U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0036857 (“Hwang”)
APPLE-1068	U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0006793 (“Kun-Szabo”)
APPLE-1069	U.S. Patent No. 6,678,524 (“Hansson”)
APPLE-1070	U.S. Pub. No. 2007/0004461 (“Bathina”)
APPLE-1071	U.S. Pub. No. 2008/0307487 (“Choyi”)
APPLE-1072	U.S. Pub. No. 2008/0310425 (“Nath”)
APPLE-1073	U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0005875 (“Ko”)
APPLE-1074	U.S. Pub. No. 2008/0263137 (“Pattison”)
APPLE-1075	U.S. Pub. No. 2014/0258423 (“Schaedler”)
APPLE-1076	U.S. Pub. No. 2008/0311888 (“Ku”)
APPLE-1077	U.S. Pub. No. 2008/0192770 (“Burrows”)
APPLE-1078	U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0264213 (“Thompson”)
APPLE-1079 – APPLE-1083	RESERVED
APPLE-1084	U.S. Pub. No. 2009/0280779 (“Torres”)
APPLE-1085	U.S. Pub. No. 2009/0220091 (“Howard”)
APPLE-1086	U.S. Pub. No. 2008/0039081 (“Ma”)

APPLE-1087 U.S. Pub. No. 2008/0045214 (“Wen”)

APPLE-1088 U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0185003 (“Laitinen”)

APPLE-1089 – APPLE-1099 RESERVED

APPLE-1100 Complaint, *HBCU Messaging US LP v. Apple, Inc. et al.*, 1-24-cv-01199 (WDTX) (Oct. 7, 2024)

APPLE-1101 Infringement Charts of the ’600 Patent

APPLE-1102 Stipulation dated November 26, 2025

APPLE-1103 *Apple Inc. v. HBCU Messaging US LP*, IPR2025-01486, Paper 12 (PTAB Jan 9, 2026)

APPLE-1104 RESERVED

APPLE-1105 MPEP Chapter 900: Prior Art, Classification, and Search (Rev. 08.2017) (January 2018), *available at* <https://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/mpep/old/e9r08-2017/mpep-0900.pdf>

APPLE-1106 Apple’s Opening Claim Construction Brief, *HBCU Messaging US LP v. Apple, Inc. et al.*, 1-24-cv-01199 (WDTX) (Sept. 22, 2025)

APPLE-1107 HBCU’s Opening Claim Construction Brief, *HBCU Messaging US LP v. Apple, Inc. et al.*, 1-24-cv-01199 (WDTX) (Sept. 22, 2025)

APPLE-1108 Apple’s Responsive Claim Construction Brief, *HBCU Messaging US LP v. Apple, Inc. et al.*, 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 Claim Construction Order, *HBCU Messaging US LP v. Apple, Inc. et al.*, 1-24-cv-01199 (WDTX) (Sept. 22, 2025)
- 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-1116-1118 RESERVED
- APPLE-1119 Email from Mr. Brian Nash re Claim Constructions in *HBCU Messaging US LP v. Apple, Inc. et al.*, 1-24-cv-01199 (WDTX) (Jan. 23, 2026)
- APPLE-1120 Claim Construction Order, *HBCU Messaging US LP v. Apple, Inc. et al.*, 1-24-cv-01199 (WDTX) (Jan. 28, 2026)
- APPLE-1121 *Apple Inc. v. HBCU Messaging US LP*, IPR2025-01486, Paper 12 (PTAB Jan. 9, 2026)
- APPLE-1122 *Markman* Hearing Transcript, *HBCU Messaging US LP v. Apple, Inc. et al.*, 1-24-cv-01199 (WDTX) (Jan. 23, 2026)
- APPLE-1123 HBCU Messaging US LP’s Identification of Claim Terms Requiring Construction, *HBCU Messaging US LP v. Apple, Inc. et al.*, 1-24-cv-01199 (WDTX) (Aug. 1, 2025)
- APPLE-1124 HBCU Messaging US LP’s Supplemental Proposed Constructions, *HBCU Messaging US LP v. Apple, Inc. et al.*, 1-24-cv-01199 (WDTX) (Aug. 28, 2025)
- APPLE-1125 Notice of Decisions on Institution, *Apple Inc. v. HBCU Messaging US LP*, IPR2025-01488, Paper 15 (Feb. 18, 2026)

- APPLE-1126 Order Denying Patent Owner's Request for Director Review of the Decision Granting Institution, *Samsung Elecs. Co. Ltd. v. Wilus Institute of Standards and Tech. Inc.*, IPR2025-01069, Paper 20 (Feb. 4, 2026)
- APPLE-1127 Patent Owner's Request for Director Review of Institution Decision, *Samsung Elecs. Co. Ltd. v. Wilus Institute of Standards and Tech. Inc.*, IPR2025-01069, Paper 18 (Dec. 24, 2025)
- APPLE-1128 Decision Granting Institution of *Inter Partes* Review, *Samsung Elecs. Co. Ltd. v. Wilus Institute of Standards and Tech. Inc.*, IPR2025-01069, Paper 16 (Dec. 10, 2025)

I. HBCU IMPROPERLY SEEKS DENIAL BASED ON CONSTRUCTIONS OF TERMS NOT RECITED IN THE '600 PATENT

As an initial matter, much of HBCU's POPR argument relates to claim terms ("wherein...when") not even recited by claims of the '600 Patent. *See* APPLE-1120, 2 (construing "wherein...when" only for the '182 and '127 Patents). For example, the POPR prominently quotes a portion of the *Markman* hearing transcript containing questioning from the Court over Apple's claim construction position at the PTAB. POPR 1, 9 (citing EX2024). But HBCU omits that the construction referenced in the Court's question pertained to the "wherein...when" terms, which are *not recited in the '600 Patent*. HBCU masked this context by submitting only a short excerpt of the transcript, which does not identify the terms at issue. *Compare* EX2024 (HBCU's excerpt) *with* EX1122 (full transcript), 19, 24-25 (addressing "wherein/when clauses"). Likewise, HBCU's reference to Exhibits 2025 and 2026, and its related contention that "the Court and Parties currently understand that at least one set of terms may require further construction later," pertains only to the "wherein...when" terms. POPR, 10. There is no basis to deny the present Petition based on these arguments. HBCU's misleading assertion should not be condoned.

II. APPLE'S PETITION IS CONSISTENT WITH ITS CLAIM CONSTRUCTION POSITIONS IN COURT

A. "Bearer"

Apple's treatment of "bearer" in the Petition is consistent with its construction in Court. While unacknowledged in the POPR, the Petition spends a full 1.5 pages

addressing the scope of “bearer” in the ’600 Patent, and through this discussion, the Petition identifies several example communication channels or protocols constituting “bearers” that *directly correspond to those Apple identified in Court*. Compare Pet., 33-35 (explaining that “bearer” encompasses SMS, Bluetooth, WiFi, WiMax and similar communication channels or protocols) with APPLE-1105, 12-13 (Apple’s opening claim construction brief identifying the same). HBCU’s narrower construction identified several of these same protocols. APPLE-1124, 1. Apple’s Petition grounds are thus consistent with both parties’ constructions in Court. Any contention by HBCU otherwise would be new, late and unfounded. See Pet., 33-34 (mapping prior art’s “Wi-Fi” and “GPRS, EV-DO or UMTS” protocols as “packet-switched bearers”); APPLE-1106, 12-13; APPLE-1107, 7-8.

HBCU’s arguments omit additional relevant context. For example, the POPR ignores that HBCU—not Apple—identified “bearer” as a term requiring construction in the first place. See APPLE-1123–1124. Yet, the parties have never disputed that “bearer” encompasses the protocols identified in Apple’s IPR Petition; the dispute instead centered on whether those protocols needed to be listed explicitly, and whether HBCU improperly excluded channels from its construction. APPLE-1106–1109. Through its claim construction briefing, Apple highlighted the flaws in HBCU’s confusing, overly narrow construction in a manner consistent with the plain and ordinary meaning advanced in the Petition, which recognizes inclusion of the

protocols without binding the term to particular protocols or channels. APPLE-1106, 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”).

Perhaps most notably, and contrary to the POPR’s insinuations, there is *no* ongoing dispute over “bearer” in Court. POPR, 10-11. HBCU again omits that, immediately after the *Markman* hearing, “[t]he parties propose[d] the Court construe [bearer] to have its ‘plain and ordinary meaning.’” EX2025, 1. Acknowledging the joint proposal, the Court ordered that “bearer” be given its plain and ordinary meaning, holding that this construction was “final.” APPLE-1120. Now resolved as consistent with the Petition, “bearer” is not relevant to institution of this IPR.

B. “Cellular Core Network”

Similarly, Apple’s treatment of “cellular core network” in the Petition is consistent with its construction in Court. Again, HBCU—not Apple—identified “cellular core network” as a term requiring construction in the first place. *See* APPLE-1123–1124; APPLE-1106, 13; APPLE-. Similarly also, Apple’s claim construction briefing highlighted the flaws in HBCU’s overly narrow construction in a manner consistent with the plain and ordinary meaning advanced in the Petition, including citing to a technical dictionary that reflects the plain and ordinary meaning of the

term. APPLE-1106, 13 (“Apple does, however, object to HBCU Messaging’s baseless importation of numerous limitations that complicate rather than elucidate the term’s meaning”), 4, 15 (citing Newton’s Telecom Dictionary). And Apple’s Petition cites additional evidence (APPLE-1072) showing that its application of prior art is consistent with this plain meaning. Pet. 55. More importantly, Apple hereby officially withdraws its challenge to claims 5 and 16 to moot this issue and thereby simplify the case.

III. THE DIRECTOR’S RECENT DE-REFERRALS OF APPLE’S RELATED PETITIONS DO NOT WARRANT DENIAL HERE

The Director recently de-referred Apple’s Petitions challenging a related set of HBCU patents in IPR2025-01486 and -01488 in view of *Revvo*. APPLE-1125. But there, HBCU mischaracterized Apple’s position and the Court’s ruling on the “bearer” term, just as it did in this case. And, the only other term argued by HBCU that appears in both the de-referred cases (“wherein...when”) is exclusive to the claims of the patents implicated by those cases. ***Five of Apple’s seven related petitions are not impacted by the construction of those terms.*** As noted by the initial referral, other discretionary factors strongly favor referral of the Petitions 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 10. Petitioner therefore asks the Director to refer this and all of Apple’s related Petitions.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 27, 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 February 27, 2026, a complete and entire copy of this Petitioner's Authorized Reply to Patent Owner's Preliminary Response and exhibits were provided by email to the Patent Owner by serving the correspondence email address of record as follows:

Timothy Devlin
Neil Benchell
DEVLIN LAW FIRM LLC
1526 Gilpin Avenue
Wilmington, DE 19806
tdevlin@devlinlawfirm.com
nbenchell@devlinlawfirm.com
dflitparas@devlinlawfirm.com

Attorneys for Patent Owner

/Esther Goldschlager/

Esther Goldschlager
Fish & Richardson P.C.
60 South Sixth Street, Suite 3200
Minneapolis, MN 55402
goldschlager@fr.com