

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	1
A. The '290 Patent	1
B. Person Of Ordinary Skill In The Art.....	3
II. ARGUMENT	3
A. “code sequence”	3
B. “which is/are timed in relation to”	9
C. “time slots”	13
D. “RF synchronizing beacons”	16
E. “[RF bursts at] intervals determined by a code sequence”	18
F. “controlled by said oscillator” / “controlled by said server unit oscillator”	20
G. “a local oscillator”	22
H. “a server microcomputer”	25
I. “adapted to operate within a short range of [said server unit]”	28
III. CONCLUSION	30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Aspex Eyewear, Inc. v. Marchon Eyewear, Inc.</i> , 672 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	3, 28
<i>Edwards Lifesciences LLC v. Cook Inc.</i> , 582 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	27
<i>Irdeto Access, Inc. v. Echostar Satellite Corp.</i> , 383 F.3d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	passim
<i>K-2 Corp. v. Salomon S.A.</i> , 191 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	25
<i>MyMail, Ltd. v. Am. Online., Inc.</i> , 476 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	passim
<i>Nystrom v. Trex Co., Inc.</i> , 424 F.3d 1136 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	26, 27, 28
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	24
<i>Primos, Inc. v. Hunter’s Specialties, Inc.</i> , 451 F.3d 841 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	21
<i>Retractable Tech., Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson and Co.</i> , 653 F.3d 1296 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	24
<i>Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.</i> , 90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	17

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

DSS' infringement read tries to wedge a square peg into a round hole. Because of this, DSS has to take strained readings of fundamental terms in the patent. For example, DSS takes the term "code sequence" (the purported point of novelty) and uses its construction to literally read out the words "code" and "sequence" such that the term has no meaning. DSS cannot do this. In conjunction with other terms, DSS wants to hide from the facts and tells the Court to ignore the accepted meaning in the art that is reiterated in the specification (*e.g.*, the term "a local oscillator"). DSS cannot do this either. These sorts of errors, and others, pervade DSS' constructions, and the Court should reject DSS' constructions as detailed below.

A. The '290 Patent

At the outset, it is important to understand the problem the '290 patent sought to solve and how its claims solve the problem.¹ The goal of the '290 patent was to substantially reduce power consumption and interfering signals between a server microcomputer and a plurality of peripherals. '290 patent, Abstract, 1:57-61. This goal was purportedly achieved by generating "code sequences" which control the operation of transmitters in a low duty cycle pulsed mode of operation. *See, e.g., id.* at 1:57-61, 2:35-39. While the specification is clear on this point, the lone inventor also has averred that the "code sequences" that control the operations of the transmitters was the key novel concept disclosed in the patent. Ex. A, Declaration of Inventor

¹ The '290 patent was filed as a continuation in part of U.S. Patent Application No. 08/611,695, which was filed on March 6, 1996, and issued as U.S. Patent No. 5,699,357. The specifications of the '290 and '357 patents are similar, except that the '290 patent provides the additional disclosure that the peripheral units can operate "within short range of the server unit, *e.g.*, 20 meters." '290 patent at Abstract.

Philip P. Carvey Regarding U.S. Patent No. 6,128,290 (“Carvey Decl.”), ¶¶5-6. This is important because DSS ignores the purported invention in proffering its constructions.

The only “server microcomputer” disclosed in the ’290 patent is “characterized as a personal digital assistant (PDA).” ’290 patent, 2:66-3:1. Like conventional PDAs, the server microcomputer “is powered by a battery 12 and may be carried on the person of a user, *e.g.*, in his hand or on a belt hook.” *Id.* at 3:3-3:5. The peripheral units, referred to as “personal electronic accessories or PEAs,” include body-mounted accessories such as displays “mounted on a headband or eyeglasses” and “physiological sensors.” *Id.* at 1:67-2:18.

The server microcomputer and peripherals are linked in close physical proximity, *e.g.*, within twenty meters, to establish a common time base or synchronization. ’290 patent, 1:50-55. The claimed inventions all require “low duty” cycle operation. *Id.* at claims 1, 5, 6 and 9. This low duty cycle operation ensures that the units’ transmitters are only active for relatively short durations of time, which “substantially reduces power consumption and facilitates the rejection of interfering signals.” *Id.* at 1:59-61. Critical to low duty cycle operation is the use of “code sequences” or “sparse codes,” which “control the operation of the several transmitters in a low duty cycle pulsed mode of operation.” *Id.* at 1:57-59. The ’290 patent teaches that a code sequence is a series of values, where each value in the series represents a time slot within a frame interval when a unit’s transmitter is energized or a time slot when a unit’s transmitter is depowered. In the Preferred Embodiment (the only disclosed embodiment), “the codes are mostly zeros with three scattered ones representing the locations of the slots in which RF bursts are to be transmitted or received.” *Id.* at 7:27-29.

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.