

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

Applicant:	Darbee	Universal Remote Control, Inc.
Case No.:	IPR2014-01106	v.
Filing Date:	April 8, 1993	Universal Electronics, Inc.
Patent No.:	5,255,313	Trial Paralegal: Cathy Underwood
Title:	UNIVERSAL REMOTE CONTROL SYSTEM	Attorney Doc.: 059489.144100

**PRELIMINARY RESPONSE OF PATENT OWNER  
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

**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 this correspondence is being electronically filed with the USPTO on this 8<sup>th</sup> day of October 2014.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	3
A.	“input means . . . for inputting commands into the remote control” (Claims 1, 2, and 20) .....	4
B.	“infrared signal output means for supplying an infrared signal to a controlled device” (Claims 1, 2, and 20).....	6
C.	“data coupling means for periodically coupling said computer to said remote control for receiving from said computer memory said code data for creating appropriate IR lamp driver instructions . . . said data coupling means for coupling said remote control to said computer, directly, through a telephone line, through a modem and a telephone line, or through decoding means and a television set to receive a television signal picked up by the television set” (Claim 1).....	7
D.	“data coupling means including terminal means comprising a receiving port coupled to said CPU for enabling code data for creating appropriate IR lamp driver instructions . . . to be supplied from outside said remote control through said receiving port of said terminal means directly to said CPU for direct entry to said memory means” (Claim 2).....	14
E.	“coupling means for coupling said terminal means to a computer, directly, through a telephone line, through a modem and a telephone line, or through decoding means and a television set” (Claim 2) .....	16
F.	“data coupling means for periodically coupling said computer to said remote control for receiving from said computer memory and inputting into said memory means of said remote control said code data for creating appropriate IR lamp driver instructions” (Claim 20).....	20
III.	THE PETITION DOES NOT MEET THE STATUTORY REQUIREMENT OF 35 U.S.C. § 314(a) .....	24
A.	The Petition Fails to Establish that CS-232 Is Prior Art to the ’313 Patent Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) .....	26
B.	Even If the CS-232 Manual Is a “Printed Publication,” It Is Not Prior Art to the ’313 Patent .....	28

C.	The Petition Fails to Identify Why One Having Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Have Been Motivated to Combine Wozniak with Either CS-232 or Hastreiter (Ground 1).....	45
D.	The Petition Fails to Identify Why One Having Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Have Been Motivated to Combine Ciarcia and Hastreiter (Ground 2) .....	49
IV.	CONCLUSION.....	50

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### **Federal Cases**

<i>Bruckelmyer v. Ground Heaters, Inc.</i> , 445 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	27, 28
<i>Gen. Elec. Co. v. U.S.</i> , 572 F.2d 745 (Ct. Cl. 1978) .....	5
<i>In ResQNet.com, Inc. v. Lansa, Inc.</i> , 594 F.3d 860 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	28
<i>In re Klopfenstein</i> , 380 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	27, 28
<i>Kyocera Wireless Corp. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 545 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	27
<i>Therasense, Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson &amp; Co.</i> , 560 F. Supp. 2d 835 (N.D. Cal. 2008) .....	26

### **Federal Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 102 .....	28
35 U.S.C. § 102(a) – (b) (2010) .....	28, 29
35 U.S.C. § 102(a) and (b) .....	26
35 U.S.C. § 102(b) .....	26, 27, 28
35 U.S.C. § 103(a) .....	2
35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 6 .....	<i>passim</i>
35 U.S.C. § 313 .....	1, 24
35 U.S.C. § 314(A) .....	24, 25

### **Regulations**

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) .....	3
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4) .....	2

37 C.F.R. § 42.107 ..... 1  
37 C.F.R. § 42.107(b) ..... 1

# 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.