UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Microsoft Corporation, and Nokia Inc.,

Petitioners

v.

Global Touch Solutions, LLC,

Patent Owner

IPR2015-01151

Patent 8,288,952

PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction....1

II. Mandatory Notices....3

A. Rule 42.8(b)(1) - Real Party-In-Interest....3

B. Rule 42.8(b)(2) - Related Matters....3

1. This Petition Is Not Redundant of Apple's IPR Petition on the '952 Patent....5

C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel and Service Information....5

III. Payment of Fees....6

IV. Requirements for *Inter Partes* Review....6

A. Rule 42.104(a) - Grounds for Standing....6

B. Rule 42.104 (b) - Challenge and Relief Requested....6

C. Rule 42.104(b)(5) – Evidence Relied Upon....7

V. Factual Background....8

A. Summary of the '952 Patent....8

B. Prosecution History of the '952 patent....10

VI. Broadest Reasonable Construction....11

A. "the touch sensor functions" (claim 1, from which claims 2-4, 14, 16, 17, 19, and 22-24 ultimately depend) and "the touch sensing functions" (claim 26, from which claims 27 and 38-40 ultimately depend)....11

B. "a product" (claims 4, 14, and 16); "the electronic user interface module" (claim 16); "the product user interface" (claim 26, from which claims 27 and 38-40 ultimately depend)....13

VII. Claims 1-4, 14, 16, 17, 19, 22-24, 26, 27, and 38-40 of the '952 Patent are Unpatentable as Obvious over Jahagirdar Combined with Schultz....14

A. The Law of Obviousness....14

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

B. Level of Ordinary Skill In The Art 16

C. Overview of the Prior art 17

1. Scope and Content of U.S. Pat. No. 6,125,286 ("Jahagirdar") (Exhibit 1004) 17

2. Scope and content of the Touch Sensor References 21

VIII. Independent Claim 1 would have been obvious over Jahagirdar in combination with Schultz 24

A. Jahagirdar taught the limitations of claim 1's preamble 24

B. Jahagirdar combined with Schultz renders obvious "using an electronic module comprising an electronic circuit including a microchip and a touch sensor. . . said microchip . . . implementing the touch sensor functions" 26

C. Jahagirdar taught "activating a visible indication . . . [to provide] information . . . on at least one [of]: a state or condition of the product, location of the user interface, a battery power level indication." 34

IX. Jahagirdar disclosed all of the limitations of claim 2, rendering claim 2 obvious.....36

X. Jahagirdar disclosed all of the limitations of claim 3, rendering claim 3 obvious.....36

XI. Jahagirdar disclosed all of the limitations of claim 4, rendering claim 4 obvious.....37

XII. Jahagirdar disclosed all of the limitations of claim 14, rendering claim 14 obvious.....38

XIII. Jahagirdar disclosed all of the limitations of claim 16, rendering claim 16 obvious.....39

XIV. Jahagirdar disclosed all of the limitations of claim 17, rendering claim 17 obvious.....40

XV. Jahagirdar disclosed all of the limitations of claim 19, rendering claim 19 obvious.....41

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

XVI. Jahagirdar disclosed all of the limitations of claim 22, rendering claim 22 obvious....42

XVII. Jahagirdar disclosed all of the limitations of claim 23, rendering claim 23 obvious....43

XVIII. Jahagirdar disclosed all of the limitations of claim 24, rendering claim 24 obvious....44

XIX. Independent Claim 26 would have been obvious over Jahagirdar in combination with Schultz....44

A. Jahagirdar taught the limitations of claim 1's preamble....44

B. Jahagirdar combined with Schultz renders obvious "said module comprising . . . a microchip and a touch sensor . . . said microchip . . .implementing the touch sensing functions"....46

C. Jahagirdar taught that the microchip "activate[s] a visible indication . . . [to provide] information . . . on at least one… [of]: a state or condition of the product, a location of the user interface, a battery power level indication."....54

XX. Jahagirdar disclosed all of the limitations of claim 27, rendering claim 27 obvious....55

XXI. Jahagirdar disclosed all of the limitations of claim 38, rendering claim 38 obvious....56

XXII. Jahagirdar disclosed all of the limitations of claim 39, rendering claim 39 obvious....56

XXIII. Jahagirdar disclosed all of the limitations of claim 40, rendering claim 40 obvious....57

XXIV. The Challenged Claims are also invalid under a construction of "the touch sensor functions" and "the touch sensing function" to mean "functions controlled by the touch sensor"....57

XXV. The Challenged Claims Would Have Been Obvious Under the Construction of "Energy Consuming Load" Advanced by Apple....59

XXVI. Conclusion....60

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases **Page(s)**

Daiicchi Sankyo Co. v. Apotex, Inc.,
501 F.3d 1254 (Fed. Cir. 2007) 16

Global Touch Solutions, LLC v. Apple Inc.,
No. 2:14-cv-00390 (E.D. Va. filed Aug. 1, 2014) 4

Global Touch Solutions, LLC v. Microsoft Corp.,
No. 2:15-cv-00017 (E.D. Va. filed Aug. 1, 2014) 1, 4

Global Touch Solutions, LLC v. Motorola Mobility, LLC,
No. 2:14-cv-00391 (E.D. Va. filed Aug. 1, 2014) 4

Global Touch Solutions, LLC v. Vizio, Inc.,
No. 2:14-cv-00347 (E.D. Va. filed July 9, 2014) 4

Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kan. City,
383 U.S. 1 (1966) 14, 15

KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007) 3, 14, 15, 16, 30, 33, 49, 53

Transocean Offshore Deepwater Drilling, Inc. v. Maersk Drilling USA, Inc.,
699 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 15

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) 7, 21

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) 7, 17

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) 3, 7

35 U.S.C. § 311 1

35 U.S.C. § 312 1

35 U.S.C. § 313 1

35 U.S.C. § 314 1

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.