

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

HTC CORPORATION; HTC AMERICA, INC.; SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS
CO., LTD.; and SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.
Petitioner

v.

E-WATCH, INC. and E-WATCH CORPORATION
Patent Owner

CASE IPR2014-00987¹
Patent No. 7,365,871 B2

PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

¹ Case IPR2015-00541 has been joined with this proceeding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. RESPONSE TO PATENT OWNER'S ARGUMENTS	1
A. All limitations in Claim 12 are taught or suggested by Wilska and Yamagishi-114.....	1
1. Wilska teaches or suggests the Non-Audio Digital Image Signal Transmission Limitation, as recited in claim 12	2
2. The plain language of claim 12 and the '871 Patent specification supports a BRI of claim 12 that encompasses transmission of images via fax.....	4
3. PO's contention on Multimedia Messaging Service (MMS) with respect to Wilska.....	7
B. All limitations in Claims 1 and 6 are taught or suggested by Wilska and Yamagishi-114	7
1. PO's Visual Image Transmission Limitation has no basis in the plain language of claims 1 and 6	8
2. PO's Visual Image Transmission Limitation also lacks basis in the specification of '871 Patent	10
3. PO has taken conflicting infringement positions in litigation	12
4. The specification of the '871 Patent identifies fax transmissions as the "subject invention"	13
5. Wilska's device is capable of transmitting reproducible images	13
C. PO's stated reasons against the combination of Wilska and Yamagishi-114 are without merit.....	14
1. Arguments made during a reexamination proceeding of a U.S. counterpart to Wilska are not relevant to Wilska's principle of operation	16

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
2. Having two processors is not the essential principle of operation of Wilska.....	18
3. Yamagishi-114 is capable of being combined with Wilska	19
4. The display limitation recited in claims 2 and 12 is obvious over Wilska and Yamagishi-114.....	20
5. PO's assertions of patentability of claim 12 based on alleged lack of stated motivations to combine are misguided.....	22
D. Claims 1-8 and 12-15 are challenged as being obvious under 35 USC 103(a) over the combination of Wilska and Yamagishi-114	22
III. CONCLUSION.....	23

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Federal Cases	
<i>Baldwin Graphic Sys., Inc. v. Siebert, Inc.</i> , 512 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	13
<i>Catalina Mktg. Int'l, Inc. v. Coolsavings.com, Inc.</i> , 289 F.3d 801 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	8
<i>EPOS Techs. Ltd. v. Pegasus Techs. Ltd.</i> , 766 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	6
<i>In re Katz Interactive Call Processing Patent Litig.</i> , 639 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	16
<i>In re Keller</i> , 642 F.2d 413 (C.C.P.A. 1981)	20
<i>In re Mouttet</i> , 686 F.3d 1322	17, 19
<i>In re Umbarger</i> , 407 F.2d 425 (C.C.P.A. 1969)	17

EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit #	Brief Description
1001	U.S. Patent No. 7,365,871 B2 to David A. Monroe ("the '871 Patent")
1002	U.K. Patent Application GB 2,289,555 A to Wilska <i>et al.</i> ("Wilska")
1003	Certified Translation of the Japanese Patent Publication No. H06-176114 to Yamagishi ("Yamagishi-114"), Certification of English Translation and the Original Japanese Document
1004	U.S. Patent No. 5,550,754 B2 to McNelley <i>et al.</i> ("McNelley")
1005	European Patent Application Publication No. 0594992 A1 to Yamagishi ("Yamagishi-992")
1006	Declaration of Kenneth Parulski Including Attachments A-D
1007	Selected Portions of the '871 Patent Prosecution File History
1008	Rebuttal Declaration of Kenneth Parulski in Support of Petitioner's Reply to Patent Owner's Response of February 20, 2015 ("2015 Parulski Decl.")
1009	Select Sections of eWatch Preliminary Contentions in Lawsuits Filed in the Eastern District of Texas Against Petitioner HTC
1010	Select Sections of eWatch Preliminary Contentions in Lawsuits Filed in the Eastern District of Texas Against Petitioner Samsung
1011	Samsung Galaxy S5 User Manual
1012	Select Sections of AT&T Wireless Picture/Video Messaging

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.