

Filed on behalf of: Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. and
Samsung Electronics America, Inc.

By:
Steven L. Park (stevenpark@paulhastings.com)
Naveen Modi (naveenmodi@paulhastings.com)
Elizabeth L. Brann (elizabethbrann@paulhastings.com)
Paul Hastings LLP

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD. and
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.
Petitioner

v.

E-WATCH, INC.
Patent Owner

Patent No. 7,643,168

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,643,168**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. GROUNDS FOR STANDING PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.1042

III. OVERVIEW OF THE '168 PATENT2

IV. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.1043

 A. Claims for Which Inter Partes Review Is Requested.....3

 B. The Prior Art and Specific Ground for Unpatentability3

 C. Claim Construction.....3

 D. How the Construed Claims Are Unpatentable6

 E. Supporting Evidence6

V. DETAILED EXPLANATION OF GROUNDS FOR UNPATENTABILITY6

 A. The '168 Patent Is Not Entitled to the Priority Date of the '073 Application7

 1. The '168 Patent Did Not Properly Claim Priority to the '073 Application7

 2. The '073 Application Was Intentionally Abandoned Before the Filing Date of the '871 Parent Patent.....10

 B. The '818 Publication Anticipates the '168 Patent Claims18

 1. Independent Claim 1 and Its Dependent Claims19

 2. Independent Claim 22 and Its Dependent Claims38

 3. Independent Claim 24 and Its Dependent Claims42

 4. Independent Claim 2646

 5. Independent Claim 27 and Its Dependent Claims48

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review – Patent No. 7,643,168

6. Independent Claim 29 and Its Dependent Claims53

VI. MANDATORY NOTICES PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.857

VII. PAYMENT OF FEES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.1560

VIII. CONCLUSION.....60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>In re Application of G</i> , 11 USPQ2d 1378 (Comm’r, 1989).....	22
<i>Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc. v. Alpine Elecs. of Am., Inc.</i> , 609 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	14
<i>Lawman Armor Corp. v. Simon</i> , 2005 U.S. Dist. Lexis 10843 (E.D. Mich., March 29, 2005).....	22
<i>In re Maldague</i> , 10 USPQ2d 1477 (Comm’r 1988).....	22
IPR2014-00439, Paper No. 16 (Aug. 4, 2014)	7
<i>Medtronic Corevalue, LLC v. Edwards Lifesciences Corp.</i> , 741 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	14, 17
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 102(b)	8, 13
35 U.S.C. § 120.....	14, 15
35 U.S.C. § 133.....	20
35 U.S.C. § 154(a)(2).....	14
Other Authorities	
37 C.F.R. § 1.68	13
37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b).	<i>passim</i>
37 C.F.R. § 1.137(c).....	21
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(1).....	73
37 C.F.R. § 42.15(a).....	77

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review – Patent No. 7,643,168

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a).....5
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)8
37 C.F.R. § 42.300(b)8

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.