

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

IRON DOME LLC

Petitioner

v.

E-WATCH, INC.

Patent Owner

Case: IPR2014-00439

Patent No. 7,365,871

**Title: Apparatus For Capturing, Converting And Transmitting A Visual
Image Signal Via A Digital Transmission System**

**PATENT OWNER E-WATCH INC'S RESPONSE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. §42.120**

E-Watch, Inc.
Petitioner – Iron Dome LLC
Patent Owner – E-Watch, Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS IN DISPUTE 1

II. INTRODUCTION..... 1

A. Statement Of Relief Requested 1

B. Summary Of Patent Owner’s Argument..... 1

III. CONTEXT OF INVENTIVE DISCLOSURE OF REFERENCES RELIED UPON BY PETITIONER..... 3

A. Primary Reference - U.S. Patent No. 6,122,526 (“the Parulski reference”)..... 3

B. Secondary Reference - U.S. Patent No. 5,893,037 (“the Reelee reference”)..... 4

IV. SWEARING BEHIND THE PARULSKI REFERENCE 5

A. Priority Date For The Parulski Reference..... 5

B. Inventor 1.131 Declaration (“The Monroe Declaration”) 6

C. The Inventor Exercised Reasonable Diligence to Reduce To Practice The Invention Claimed In The ‘871 Patent. 7

D. Independent Corroboration Regarding Conception And Diligence. 8

E. The ‘871 Patent Claims Are Entitled To An Invention Date Before The Parulski Reference. 8

V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION..... 9

- A. “Selectively Displaying” 10
- B. “Selectively Transmitting” 13
- C. “Selected Digitized Framed Image” 14

- VI. PATENT OWNER’S RESPONSE TO PETITIONER’S CLAIM ANALYSIS AND OBVIOUSNESS ASSERTIONS..... 14**
 - A. The Relied Upon References Do Not Teach Or Suggest All Limitations Of The Challenged Claims 14
 - 1. The References Do Not Teach Or Suggest the Selectively Displaying/Transmitting Limitation As Recited In Claims 1, 6, 9, and 12.. 14
 - 2. The References Do Not Teach Or Suggest the User Interface Enabling Limitation As Recited In Claims 1 and 6..... 17
 - 3. The References Do Not Teach Or Suggest the Prior To Capture Limitation As Recited In Claims 2, 9, and 12 19
 - 4. The References Do Not Teach Or Suggest the Non-Audio Signal Transmission/Reception Limitation As Recited In Claims 5, 9, 12, and 14 21
 - 5. The References Do Not Teach Or Suggest the Digital Signaling Limitation As Recited In Claims 9 and 12..... 25
 - 6. The References Do Not Teach Or Suggest the Digitized Audio Signal Limitation As Recited In Claims 1, 9, and 1228
 - 7. The References Do Not Teach Or Suggest the Plural Memory Module Limitation As Recited In Claims 4, 10, and 13..... 30
 - 8. The References Do Not Teach Or Suggest the Integrated Electronic Camera Limitation As Recited In Claims 1 and 6..... 32
 - B. Expert Testimony Regarding Teaching and Combining Parulski and Reelee as Suggested by Petitioner 35
 - 1. The Parulski and Reelee References Have Non-Enabling Disclosures That Would Preclude A Skilled Person From Attempting to Combine 35
 - 2. The Parulski and Reelee References Being Directed To Solving Different

Problems Would Inhibit Motivation To Combine 35

3. The Reele Reference Teaches An Inoperable Combined Camera-Phone
Unit..... 36

VII. CONCLUSION 37

EXHIBIT LIST**Previously Filed – Patent Owner**

- [EXH. 2001] As-filed 1.131 Affidavit from U.S. patent application serial no. 10/336,470 (“Swear Behind Affidavit”) (part 1)
- [EXH. 2002] As-filed 1.131 Affidavit from U.S. patent application serial no. 10/336,470 (“Swear Behind Affidavit”) (part 2)
- [EXH. 2003] Office Action indicating sufficiency of the Swear Behind Affidavit.
- [EXH. 2004] U.S. patent no. 5,666,159 (“Parulski ‘159 Patent”)
- [EXH. 2005] U.S. patent no. 5,943,603 (“Parulski ‘603 Patent”)
- [EXH. 2006] Artifact sheet from U.S. patent application serial no. 10/336,470 (“Artifact Sheet”)
- [EXH. 2007] Unscanned artifacts from Swear Behind Affidavit (“Unscanned Artifacts”)

Currently Filed – Patent Owner

- [EXH. 2014] Declaration of David A. Monroe
- [EXH. 2015] Declaration of Winston Ninh
- [EXH. 2016] Declaration of Stephen Baker
- [EXH. 2017] Declaration of Glen Davis
- [EXH. 2018] Declaration of Michael Forman
- [EXH. 2019] Declaration of Donald Kayser
- [EXH. 2020] Declaration of Michael Kight

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.