

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

Applicant:	Foster	Universal Remote Control, Inc.
Case No.:	IPR2014-01112	v.
Filing Date:	March 31, 2003	Universal Electronics, Inc.
Patent No.:	RE39,059	Trial Paralegal: Cathy Underwood
Title:	COMPUTER PROGRAMMABLE REMOTE CONTROL	Attorney Doc.: 059489.143500

**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 8th day of October 2014.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BACKGROUND OF THE '059 PATENT	3
III.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	5
IV.	THE PETITION DOES NOT MEET THE STATUTORY	11
A.	The Petition Does Not Establish that Lexicon and AMX Are Prior Art to the '059 Patent Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).....	12
B.	There Is No Reasonable Likelihood that Claims 13 – 17, 19 – 26, or 30 are Obvious in View of Lexicon and Ciarcia (Ground 1)	15
1.	The Petition's Obviousness Analysis under Ground 1 Does Not Apply the Requisite <i>Graham</i> Factors at least Because the Petition Does Not Identify Any Differences Between the Claim Limitations and the Alleged Prior Art.....	15
2.	The Petition Fails to Identify Why One Having Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Be Motivated to Combine Lexicon and Ciarcia	18
3.	Lexicon and Ciarcia Do Not Teach or Suggest Various Limitations of Claims 13 – 17, 19 – 26, and 30	23
a.	The Petition Does Not Establish That Lexicon and Ciarcia Teach or Suggest a Soft Key Object that Comprises a Tagname for a Command that Is to Be Issued When the Soft Key Is Activated	24
b.	The Petition Fails to Establish that Lexicon and Ciarcia Teach or Suggest Limitations (a) Through (e) of Claims 13 and 23, Amongst Others, Performed by a General Purpose Computer	27
d.	The Petition Does Not Establish that Lexicon and Ciarcia Teach or Suggest a General Purpose Computer that Facilitates Editing of the Screen Object, as Recited in Claim 22	30
C.	There Is No Reasonable Likelihood that Claims 13 – 17, 19 – 26, or 30 Are Obvious in View of AMX and the Admitted Prior Art (Ground 2).....	31

1.	AMX and the Admitted Prior Art Do Not Teach a Remote Control Development Program that Allows a User to Display and/or Edit a Screen Object Having a Soft Key Object Where the Soft Key Object Includes a Tagname for a Command to Be Issued When the Soft Key Is Activated.....	31
2.	The Petition Also Does Not Identify Where AMX Allegedly Discloses the Ability to Edit a Soft Key Object that Comprises a Location for Displaying the Representation of the Soft Key	36
3.	AMX and the Admitted Prior Art Do Not Teach a Remote Control Development Program that Causes a General Purpose Computer to Provide Users with an Ability to Edit Screen Objects and Perform Limitations (a) through (e) as Recited in Claims 13 and 23, or to Perform the Limitations Recited in the Dependent Claims	38
V.	CONCLUSION.....	41

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Federal Cases

<i>Applied Med. Res. Corp. v. U.S. Surgical Corp.</i> , 448 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	10
<i>Bruckelmyer v. Ground Heaters, Inc.</i> , 445 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	13, 14
<i>CAE Screenplates Inc. v. Heinrich Fiedler GmbH</i> , 224 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	10
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	15, 16, 18
<i>In re ICON Health & Fitness</i> , 496 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	22
<i>In ResQNet.com, Inc. v. Lansa, Inc.</i> , 594 F.3d 860 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	14
<i>In re Klopfenstein</i> , 380 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	13, 14
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	15
<i>Kyocera Wireless Corp. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 545 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	13
<i>Mahurkar v. C.R. Bard, Inc.</i> , 79 F.3d 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	13
<i>McGinley v. Franklin Sports, Inc.</i> , 262 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	21
<i>In re Peterson</i> , 315 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	22
<i>Ricoh Co., Ltd. v. Quanta Computer Inc.</i> , 550 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	22
<i>In re Robertson</i> , 169 F.3d 743 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	12

Teva Pharms. USA, Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.,
552 U.S. 941 (2007).....22

Therasense, Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson & Co.,
560 F. Supp. 2d 835 (N.D. Cal. 2008).....13

P.T.A.B. Decisions

3D-Matrix, Ltd. v. Menicon Co.,
IPR2014-00398, Paper No. 11 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 1, 2014).....12

eBay, Inc. v. Paid, Inc.,
CBM2014-00125, Paper 15 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 30, 2014).....16

Eizo Corp. v. Barco N.V.,
IPR2014-00358, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. July 23, 2014).....15, 16

Fidelity Nat’l Info. Servs., Inc. v. DataTreasury Corp.,
IPR2014-00489, Paper No. 9 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 13, 2014).....33, 37

Moses Lake Indus., Inc. v. Enthone, Inc.,
IPR2014-00243, Paper 6 (P.T.A.B. June 18, 2014).....16

Moses Lake Indus., Inc. v. Enthone, Inc.,
IPR2014-00246, Paper 6 (P.T.A.B. June 18, 2014).....16

Synopsis v. Mentor Graphics Corp.,
IPR2012-00042, Paper No. 16 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 22, 2013).....12

Travelocity.com L.P. v. Cronos Techs., LLC,
CBM2014-00082, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 15, 2014).....33, 37

Federal Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102.....15

35 U.S.C. § 102(a).....12

35 U.S.C. § 102(a) – (b).....14

35 U.S.C. § 102(b).....12

35 U.S.C. § 103(a).....1

35 U.S.C. § 313.....1

35 U.S.C. § 314(a).....11

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.