

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

In re U.S. Patent No. 7,516,192

Trial Number: IPR2013-00468

Filed: July 14, 2006

Issued: April 7, 2009

Inventors: Stephen J. Brown

Assignee: Robert Bosch Healthcare Systems,
Inc.

Title: NETWORKED SYSTEM FOR INTERACTIVE
COMMUNICATION AND REMOTE MONITORING OF
INDIVIDUALS

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD,
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 313 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. OVERVIEW OF THE '192 PATENT	1
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	8
A. “Script Program”	10
B. “Data Merge Program”	12
IV. OVERVIEW OF THE ASSERTED REFERENCES	16
A. Wright.....	17
B. Goodman	21
C. Wahlquist.....	24
V. GROUND 1 OF THE PETITION SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(B)(2)	28
VI. NO <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW SHOULD BE INITIATED BECAUSE THE PRIOR ART DOES NOT INVALIDATE ANY CLAIM.....	30
A. Overview Of Reasons for Denying <i>Inter Partes</i> Review	30
B. The Prior Art Does Not Teach a “Data Merge Program Configured to Generate a Customized Script Program by Customizing a Generic Script Program.”	32
1. Wright Does Not Teach the Claimed Data Merge Program.....	32
2. Goodman Does Not Teach the Claimed Data Merge Program.....	34
3. Wahlquist Does Not Teach the Claimed Data Merge Program.....	36
C. The Prior Art Does Not Teach “the Customized Script Program...Includes (i) a Display Command...and (ii) an Input Command.”	42
1. Wright Does Not Teach the Claimed Script Program Including a Display Command and an Input Command	43

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

	Page
2. Goodman Does Not Teach the Claimed Script Program Including a Display Command and an Input Command	44
3. Wahlquist Does Not Teach the Claimed Script Program Including a Display Command and an Input Command	45
D. Additional Reasons No Review Should Be Instituted for Ground 1	46
E. Additional Reasons No Review Should Be Instituted for Ground 2	48
1. Goodman and Wright Do Not Teach a Database for Storing the Generic Script Program	49
2. A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Not Have Combined Goodman and Wright in the Manner Asserted	50
F. Additional Reasons No Review Should Be Instituted for Ground 3	52
1. Wahlquist Is Not Directed to Communication Systems for Remote Monitoring of Individuals	53
2. A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Not Have Combined Goodman and Wahlquist in the Manner Asserted	57
VII. CONCLUSION	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Accent Packaging, Inc. v. Leggett & Platt, Inc.</i> , 707 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	15
<i>Am. Seating Co. v. Freedman Seating Co.</i> , 450 F. Supp. 2d 765 (W.D. Mich. 2006)	39
<i>Heart Failure Techs., LLC v. Cardiokinetix, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00183, 2013 Pat. App. LEXIS 5602 (PTAB July 31, 2013).....	48
<i>In re Klein</i> , 647 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	31, 53, 59
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	31
<i>Largan Precision Co., Ltd. v. Fujifilm, Corp.</i> , 2012 Pat. App. LEXIS 2916 (BPAI 2012)	52
<i>Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casualty Ins. Co.</i> , CBM2012-00003, 2012 Pat. App. LEXIS 7236 (PTAB Oct. 25, 2012).....	30, 48
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (<i>en banc</i>)	9
<i>In re Robertson</i> , 169 F.3d 743 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	35
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 102	28
35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	<i>passim</i>
35 U.S.C. § 314	1

...

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

Page(s)

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)	8
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)	28, 29, 46
M.P.E.P. § 2112.	35
M.P.E.P. § 2141.01(a).....	31, 54
Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary, pp. 422-423 (Ex. 1009)	11
Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary, p. 296 (Ex. 2003).....	13

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.