

By: Andy H. Chan, Reg. No. 56,893
Pepper Hamilton LLP
333 Twin Dolphin Drive
Suite 400
Redwood City, CA 94065
(650) 802-3602 (telephone)
(650) 802-3650 (facsimile)
chana@pepperlaw.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., AND APPLE INC.,
Petitioner
v.

IXI IP, LLC
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2015-01444
Patent 7,039,033

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page(s)
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. ALLEGED GROUNDS OF INVALIDITY	2
III. TECHNICAL OVERVIEW OF THE '033 PATENT	3
IV. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	7
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	8
A. “identifies whether the service is available at a particular time”	9
VI. THERE IS NO REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE RENDERED OBVIOUS BY THE ALLEGED COMBINATIONS	11
A. Overview Of The Asserted Art	11
1. Marchand	11
2. Nurmann.....	16
3. Vilander.....	17
4. RFC 2543	18
5. Larsson	18
6. JINI Specification	19
B. There Is No Reasonable Likelihood That Claims 1, 4, 7, And 14 Are Rendered Obvious By Marchand, Nurmann, And Vilander	22
1. Marchand, alone or in combination with Nurmann and Vilander, fails to disclose that a first wireless device “having a software component to access information from the Internet . . . in response to a first short-range radio signal” as recited in independent claim 1	22
2. Marchand, alone or in combination with Nurmann and Vilander, fails to disclose the “service repository software component” as recited in independent claim 1	24

a.	Marchand fails to disclose the claimed “service repository software component” either explicitly or inherently	25
b.	Petitioner’s obviousness argument regarding claimed “service repository software component” is defective	30
3.	Marchand, alone or in combination with Nurmann and Vilander, fails to disclose dependent claims 4, 7 and 14.....	34
4.	The Petition fails to demonstrate any motivation to modify Marchand in view of Nurmann and Vilander to arrive at the claimed invention.....	36
C.	There Is No Reasonable Likelihood That Claim 5 Is Rendered Obvious By Marchand, Nurmann, Vilander, and RFC 2543.....	38
1.	The Petition fails to demonstrate any motivation to modify Marchand in view of Nurmann, Vilander, and RFC 2543 to arrive at the claimed invention.....	38
D.	There Is No Reasonable Likelihood That Claims 6 and 23 Are Rendered Obvious By Marchand, Nurmann, Vilander and Larsson	39
1.	Marchand, alone or in combination with Nurmann, Vilander and Larsson, further fails to disclose the claimed “security software component to control access between the cellular network and the first wireless device” in claim 6	40
2.	The Petition fails to demonstrate any motivation to modify Marchand in view of Nurmann, Vilander, and Larsson to arrive at the claimed invention.....	42
E.	There Is No Reasonable Likelihood That Claims 12, 15, 22, 34, 39, 40, 42, And 46 Are Rendered Obvious By Marchand, Nurmann, Vilander, and JINI Spec.	43
1.	Marchand, alone or in combination with Nurmann Vilander, and JINI Spec, fails to disclose that the processor operative with the software component to “enumerate a list of services available from the handheld device and the terminal” and “search the list of services”	

	as recited in independent claim 34 and similarly in independent claim 42	43
2.	Marchand, alone or in combination with Nurmann Vilander, and JINI Spec, fails to disclose “wherein the software component includes a plug and play software component to identify the terminal in a short distance wireless network and obtain the application software component for the terminal” as recited in claims 12 and 40.....	45
3.	The Petition fails to demonstrate any motivation to modify Marchand in view of Nurmann, Vilander, and JINI spec. to arrive at the claimed invention	47
F.	There Is No Reasonable Likelihood That Claims 25 and 28 Are Rendered Obvious By Marchand, Larsson, and JINI Spec.....	48
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	49

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>ATD Corp. v. Lydall, Inc.</i> , 159 F.3d 534, 48 USPQ2d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	32
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC</i> , 778 F.3d 1271 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	8
<i>In re Fritch</i> , 972 F.2d 1260 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	32
<i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	passim
<i>In re Hedges</i> , 783 F.2d 1038 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	41
<i>In re Ratti</i> , 270 F.2d 810 (CCPA 1959)	passim
<i>InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGO Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	39, 42, 48
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	passim
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , Case IPR2012-00026 (PTAB, Feb. 19, 2014)	26
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , No. 2014-1542, -1543 (Fed. Cir. Jun. 16, 2015)	9
<i>Scaltech, Inc. v. Retec/Tetra, LLC</i> , 178 F.3d 1378 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	26

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.