

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

**In re Patent of:** Arling et al.

**Patent No.:** 7,126,468

**Filed:** September 19, 2003

**Issued:** October 24, 2006

**Assignee:** Universal Electronics Inc.

**Title:** SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR  
MONITORING REMOTE CONTROL  
TRANSMISSIONS

**Petition for *Inter Partes* Review under  
35 U.S.C. §§ 311–319 and 37 C.F.R.  
§ 42.100 et seq.**

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

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,126,468**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**EXHIBIT LIST .....v**

**I. MANDATORY NOTICES .....1**

**A. Real Party-In-Interest .....1**

**B. Related Matters.....1**

**C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel .....2**

**D. Service Information.....3**

**II. PAYMENT OF FEES .....3**

**III. REQUIREMENTS FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW.....4**

**A. Grounds For Standing .....4**

**B. Identification of Challenge.....4**

**1. Claims for which *inter partes* review is requested .....5**

**2. The specific art and statutory grounds on which the challenge is based .....5**

**3. How the challenged claims are to be construed.....7**

**4. How the construed claims are unpatentable under the statutory grounds identified in 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(2) .....7**

**5. Supporting evidence relied upon to support the challenge .....8**

**IV. SUMMARY OF THE '468 PATENT .....8**

**A. Earliest Priority Date of the '468 Patent .....8**

**B. Summary of the Prosecution History of the '468 Patent .....9**

**V. DETAILED CLAIM CONSTRUCTION..... 10**

**A. Construction of Terms ..... 10**

**B. Claims 2, 29, 46 phrase "state table" ..... 10**

**VI. THERE IS A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT AT LEAST ONE CLAIM OF THE '468 PATENT IS UNPATENTABLE ..... 11**

**A. Claims 1, 2, 11, 27, 28, 29, 33, 35, 45, 46 and 49 Are Unpatentable Over the '414 Patent..... 11**

B.	Claims 1, 2, 27, 29, 33, 35, 46 and 49 Are Unpatentable Over the '819 Publication. ....	12
C.	Claim 11 Is Unpatentable Over the '819 Publication in View of CORE 13	13
D.	Claims 28 and 45 Are Unpatentable Over the '819 Publication in View of the '587 Patent. ....	13
E.	Claims 1, 2, 11, 27, 28, 29, 33, 35, 45, 46 and 49 Are Unpatentable Over Niles.....	14
F.	Claim 11 Is Unpatentable Over Niles in view of CORE .....	14
VII.	DETAILED EXPLANATION OF HOW THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE.....	15
A.	Description of the Prior Art.....	15
1.	U.S. Patent No. 5,235,414 to Cohen, Exhibit 1005.....	15
2.	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0045819, Exhibit 1003 .....	16
3.	"IntelliControl Reference Manual" Version. 8.1, April 2002 by Niles Audio Corporation, Exhibit 1004.....	17
4.	Ron Karr, et al., <i>CORE Reference Manual</i> ; CL9, ©1987, Exhibit 1006 .....	18
5.	U.S. Patent No. 6,545,587 to Hatakeyama, et al., Exhibit 100719	
B.	Detailed Grounds for Unpatentability Arguments .....	19
1.	Ground 1: Claims 1, 2, 11, 27, 28, 29, 33, 35, 45, 46 and 49 are anticipated by the '414 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 102, and if not anticipated, are rendered obvious by the '414 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 103.....	19
2.	Ground 2: Claims 1, 2, 27, 29, 33, 35, 46 and 49 are anticipated by the '819 publication under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and if not anticipated, are rendered obvious by the '819 publication under 35 U.S.C. § 103.....	34
3.	Ground 3: Claim 11 is rendered obvious by the '819 publication in view of CORE under 35 U.S.C. § 103.....	44
4.	Ground 4: Claims 28 and 45 are rendered obvious by the '819 publication in view of the '587 patent under U.S.C. § 103.....	45

- 5. **Ground 5: Claims 1, 2, 11, 27, 28, 29, 33, 35, 45, 46 and 49 are anticipated by Niles under 35 U.S.C. § 102, and if not anticipated, are rendered obvious by Niles under 35 U.S.C. § 103. 46**
- 6. **Ground 6: Claim 11 is rendered obvious by Niles in view of CORE under U.S.C. § 103..... 58**

**VIII. CONCLUSION ..... 60**

**EXHIBIT LIST**

1001. U.S. Patent No. 7,126,468 (filed Sep. 19, 2003) to Arling *et al.*
1002. Prosecution history of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/665,650, which matured into the '468 Patent.
1003. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0045819 (filed Mar. 12, 2001; published Nov. 29, 2001) to Harris *et al.*
1004. "IntelliControl Reference Manual" Version. 8.1, April 2002 by Niles Audio Corporation.
1005. U.S. Patent No. 5,235,414 (filed May 21, 1990; issued Aug. 10, 1993) to Cohen.
1006. Ron Karr, *et al.*, *CORE Reference Manual*; CL9, ©1987 ("CORE").
1007. U.S. Patent No. 6,545,587 (filed Jan 13, 1999; issued Apr. 8, 2003) to Hatakeyama, *et al.*
1008. Declaration of James T. Geier In Support of the Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,126,468.
1009. Complaint for Patent Infringement in *Universal Electronics, Inc. v. Universal Remote Control, Inc.*, Civil Action No. SACV 13-00984, dated June 28, 2013.
1010. U.S. Patent No. 7,005,979 (filed Jun. 25, 2003; issued Feb. 28, 2006) to Haughwout *et al.*

# 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.