

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Applicant:	Arling et al.)	Universal Remote Control, Inc.
)	
Case No.:	IPR2014-01084)	v.
)	
Filing Date:	09/19/2003)	Universal Electronics, Inc.
)	
Patent No.:	7,126,468)	Trial Paralegal: Amy Kattula
)	
Title:	System and Method for)	Attny Doc.: 059489.143800
	Monitoring Remote)	
	Control Transmissions)	

PRELIMINARY RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(b)

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

Certificate of Filing: I hereby certify that his correspondence is being electronically filed with the USPTO on this 14th day of October, 2014.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pages
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	3
III. THE PETITION DOES NOT MEET THE STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS OF 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).....	8
A. Ground 1: Cohen Does Not Anticipate Or Render Obvious Claims 1, 2, 11, 27, 28, 29, 33, 35, 45, 46, And/Or 49	11
1. Cohen Does Not Anticipate Claims 1, 2, 11, 27, 28, 29, 33, 35, 45, 46, And/Or 49 Of The ‘468 Patent	11
i. Claim 1	11
ii. Claim 2.....	15
iii. Claim 11.....	15
iv. Claim 27.....	15
v. Claim 28.....	17
vi. Claim 29.....	17
vii. Claim 33.....	18
viii. Claim 35.....	19
ix. Claim 45.....	20
x. Claim 46.....	20
xi. Claim 49.....	21
2. Cohen Does Not Render Obvious Claims 1, 2, 11, 27, 28, 29, 33, 35, 45, 46, And/Or 49 Of The ‘468 Patent	22
B. Ground 2: Harris Does Not Anticipate Or Render Obvious Claims 1, 2, 27, 29, 33, 35, 46, And/Or 49	24
1. Harris Does Not Anticipate Claims 1, 2, 27, 29, 33, 35, 46, And/Or 49 Of The ‘468 Patent	24
i. Claim 1	24
ii. Claim 2.....	27
iii. Claim 27.....	27
iv. Claim 29.....	29
v. Claim 33.....	29

vi.	Claim 35.....	29
vii.	Claim 46.....	31
viii.	Claim 49.....	31
2.	Harris Does Not Render Obvious Claims 1, 2, 27, 29, 33, 35, 46, And/Or 49 Of The ‘468 Patent	31
C.	Ground 3: Harris In View Of CORE Does Not Render Obvious Claim 11	32
1.	CORE Does Not Qualify As A Printed Publication Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).....	32
2.	Harris In View Of Core Does Not Render Obvious Claim 11.....	35
D.	Ground 4: Harris In View Of Hatakeyama Does Not Render Obvious Claims 28 And/Or 45.....	36
E.	Ground 5: Niles Does Not Anticipate Or Render Obvious Claims 1, 2, 11, 27, 28, 29, 33, 35, 45, 46, And/Or 49	39
1.	Niles Does Not Qualify As A Printed Publication Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).....	39
2.	Niles Does Not Anticipate Claims 1, 2, 11, 27, 28, 29, 33, 35, 45, 46, And/Or 49 Of The ‘468 Patent	41
i.	Claim 1.....	41
ii.	Claim 2.....	45
iii.	Claim 11.....	46
iv.	Claim 27.....	46
v.	Claim 28.....	48
vi.	Claim 29.....	48
vii.	Claim 33.....	49
viii.	Claim 35.....	49
ix.	Claim 45.....	51
x.	Claim 46.....	51
xi.	Claim 49.....	52
3.	Niles Does Not Render Obvious Claims 1, 2, 11, 27, 28, 29, 33, 35, 45, 46, And/Or 49 Of The ‘468 Patent	52

F.	Ground 6: Niles In View Of CORE Does Not Render Obvious Claim 11	53
1.	Neither Niles Nor CORE Qualify As A Printed Publication Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).....	53
2.	Niles In View Of CORE Does Not Render Obvious Claim 11	53
IV.	CONCLUSION.....	54

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Federal Cases	
<i>In re Am. Acad. Of Sci. Tech. Ctr.</i> , 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	3
<i>Bruckelmyer v. Ground Heaters, Inc.</i> , 445 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	33, 34, 40, 41
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	22, 31, 32, 52
<i>In ResQNet.com, Inc. v. Lansa, Inc.</i> , 594 F.3d 860 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	34, 40
<i>In re Klopfenstein</i> , 380 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	33, 34, 39, 41
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	22
<i>Kyocera Wireless Corp. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 545 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	33, 39
<i>Mahurkar v. C.R. Bard, Inc.</i> , 79 F.3d 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	32, 39
<i>In re Robertson</i> , 169 F.3d 743 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	43, 46, 49
<i>Therasense, Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson & Co.</i> , 560 F. Supp. 2d 835 (N.D. Cal. 2008).....	32, 39
P.T.A.B. Cases	
<i>3D-Matrix, Ltd. v. Menicon Co.</i> , Case IPR2014-00398, Paper No. 11 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 1, 2014).....	43, 44, 46, 49
<i>Dominion Dealer Solutions, LLC v. AutoAlert, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00222, Paper No. 12 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 12, 2013).....	36, 37, 54
<i>eBay, Inc. v. Paid, Inc.</i> , CBM2014-00125, Paper 15 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 30, 2014).....	23
<i>Eizo Corp. v. Barco N.V.</i> , IPR2014-00358, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. July 23, 2014).....	22, 23

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.