

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APPLE INC.,  
Petitioner

v.

MOBILE TELECOMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES, LLC  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2014-01033  
Patent 5,894,506

---

**PATENT OWNER MOBILE TELECOMMUNICATIONS  
TECHNOLOGIES, LLC'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

***Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"***  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. BACKGROUND .....	1
III. PROPER CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	2
1. “a first file,” “a second file ... corresponding to the first file,” and “a third file ... corresponding to the first file” .....	4
2. “the message code” .....	6
3. “relaying the message code” .....	7
4. “a message terminal” and “a designated other message terminal” .....	9
5. “a file of canned messages and message codes ... and a file of canned multiple response options and response codes” .....	11
6. “the response code” .....	12
7. “transmitting the message code ... and the response code” and “compiling the assigned message code and the response codes” .....	13
IV. REFERENCES RELIED UPON BY PETITIONER .....	15
A. <i>Cannon</i> .....	15
B. <i>LaPorta</i> .....	23
C. <i>Will</i> .....	28
V. GROUND 1 – CLAIMS 8-9 ARE NOT ANTICIPATED BY <i>CANNON</i> . .....	33
A. <i>Cannon</i> does not disclose relaying the message code .....	33
B. <i>Cannon</i> and <i>LaPorta</i> are not prior art. ....	38
VI. GROUND 2 – CLAIMS 10, 19, AND 21 ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER <i>CANNON</i> IN VIEW OF <i>LAPORTA</i> . .....	41
A. <i>Cannon</i> and <i>LaPorta</i> do not disclose relaying message codes or separate files for messages and responses. ....	41

1.	Claim 10 is not obvious over <i>Cannon</i> in view of <i>LaPorta</i> .....	41
2.	Claims 19 and 21 are not obvious over <i>Cannon</i> in view of <i>LaPorta</i> .....	44
i.	Neither <i>Cannon</i> Nor <i>LaPorta</i> Teaches or Suggests Elements 19(a) or 21(a) of Independent Claims 19 and 21.....	45
ii.	Neither <i>Cannon</i> Nor <i>LaPorta</i> Teaches or Suggests Elements 19(e) or 21(e) of Independent Claims 19 and 21.....	48
B.	<i>Cannon</i> and <i>LaPorta</i> are not prior art.....	53
VII.	GROUND 3 – CLAIMS 11-12 ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER <i>CANNON</i> IN VIEW OF <i>WILL</i> .....	53
A.	<i>Cannon</i> and <i>Will</i> do not disclose relaying a message code.....	53
B.	<i>Cannon</i> is not prior art.....	56
VIII.	GROUND 4 – CLAIMS 13-14 ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER <i>CANNON</i> IN VIEW OF <i>WILL</i> AND <i>LAPORTA</i> .....	56
A.	<i>Cannon</i> , <i>Will</i> , and <i>LaPorta</i> do not disclose relaying a message code.....	56
B.	<i>Cannon</i> and <i>LaPorta</i> are not prior art.....	57
IX.	CONCLUSION.....	57

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

### CASES

<i>Advanced Display Sys. Inc. v. Kent State Univ.</i> , 212 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	33
<i>Facebook, Inc. v. Evolutionary Intelligence, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00093, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 28, 2014) .....	3
<i>In re Royka</i> , 490 F.2d 981 (CCPA 1974) .....	41, 44
<i>In re Zletz</i> , 13 USPQ2d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 1989) .....	3
<i>Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	33, 35
<i>Xerox Corp. v. 3Com Corp.</i> , 458 F.3d 1310 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	33

### OTHER AUTHORITIES

35 United States Code § 102 .....	1
35 United States Code § 103 .....	1
35 United States Code § 312(c) .....	2
37 Code of Federal Regulations § 42.100(b) .....	3
37 Code of Federal Regulations § 42.104(b)(3) .....	2
Manual of Patent Examining Procedure § 715.07 .....	38

## **PATENT OWNER EXHIBIT LIST**

2000. April 2014 Deposition of Mr. Gregory Pinter in *Mobile Telecommunications Technologies, LLC v. Sprint Nextel Corporation*, Civil Action No. 2:12-cv-832-JRG-RSP, U.S.D.C. for the Eastern District of Texas
2001. Sheth Memo dated February 17, 1995
2002. Huller Memo dated February 23, 1995
2003. 1995 Functional Requirements dated March 13, 1995
2004. The WSJ article dated September 19, 1995
2005. USA Today article dated September 19, 1995

# 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.