

Patent Owner's Supplemental Brief
Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,648,717

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ENFORA, INC., NOVATEL WIRELESS SOLUTIONS, INC., and
NOVATEL WIRELESS, INC.

Petitioners

v.

M2M SOLUTIONS LLC

Patent Owner

Case IPR2015-01670

Patent No. 8,648,717 B2

PATENT OWNER'S SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page(s)
I. LEGAL STANDARD	1
II. THE CLAIM LANGUAGE ITSELF DISCLOSES STRUCTURE	2
III. CONCLUSION.....	5

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>AllVoice Computing PLC v. Nuance Commc'ns., Inc.</i> , 504 F.3d 1236(Fed. Cir. 2007)	4
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Motorola, Inc.</i> , 757 F.3d 1286 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
<i>Blackboard, Inc. v. Desire2Learn, Inc.</i> , 574 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	1, 4
<i>Finisar Corp. v. DirecTV Grp., Inc.</i> , 523 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	2
<i>Lighting World, Inc. v. Birchwood Lighting, Inc.</i> , 382 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	2
<i>Typhoon Touch Techs., Inc. v. Dell, Inc.</i> , 659 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	5
<i>Williamson v. Citrix Online, LLC</i> , 792 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2015) (en banc)	1

Patent Owner, M2M Solutions Inc. (“M2M”) respectfully submits this supplemental brief pursuant to the Board’s Order, Conduct of the Proceedings, 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.5, 42.20. Paper 9. Consistent with the District Court’s decision in a related proceeding (Ex. 2005),¹ the processing module limitation should not be interpreted as a means-plus-function limitation.

I. LEGAL STANDARD

When a claim term lacks the word “means” it is presumed that § 112(6) does not apply. *Williamson v. Citrix Online, LLC*, 792 F.3d 1339, 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2015) (en banc). However, “the presumption can be overcome and § 112, para. 6 will apply if the challenger demonstrates that the claim term fails to ‘recite sufficiently definite structure’ or else recites ‘function without reciting sufficient structure for performing that function.’” *Id.*

For software-implemented claim terms, the relevant supporting structure is an algorithm. *Apple, Inc. v. Motorola, Inc.*, 757 F.3d 1286, 1298-99 (Fed. Cir. 2014). An algorithm provides at least “some explanation of how . . . [the claim term] performs the claimed function,” and offers a description of a “means for achieving that end.” *Blackboard, Inc. v. Desire2Learn, Inc.*, 574 F.3d 1371,

¹ For completeness, M2M submits pertinent portions of the brief and declarations before the District Court as Exs. 2006-2008.

1384-85 (Fed. Cir. 2009). The Federal Circuit's liberal standard "permits a patentee to express . . . [an] algorithm in *any understandable terms* including as a mathematical formula, in prose, or as a flow chart, or in any other manner that provides sufficient structure." *Finisar Corp. v. DirecTV Grp., Inc.*, 523 F.3d 1323, 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2008) (emphasis added) (citation omitted). Ex. 2005 at 6.

In determining whether a claim term recites sufficient structure to avoid the application of Section 112(6), initial focus is placed on the claim term itself. *Lighting World, Inc. v. Birchwood Lighting, Inc.*, 382 F.3d 1354, 1359-60 (Fed. Cir. 2004). Next, the analysis turns to the surrounding claim language of the "entire claim limitation" in which the claim term appears to ascertain whether it "connotes 'sufficiently definite structure' to a person of ordinary skill in the art." *Apple*, 757 F.3d at 1296. If the surrounding language of the full claim limitation provides a "structural definition" for the disputed claim term, or a "sufficient description of its operation," then statutorily adequate structure for that claim term has been disclosed. *Id.* at 1299-1300. This analytical approach applies with full force "[e]ven if a patentee elects to use a 'generic' claim term, such as a 'nonce word or a verbal construct.'" *Id.* at 1299.

II. THE CLAIM LANGUAGE ITSELF DISCLOSES STRUCTURE

The recited function for the "processing module" of independent Claims 1, 24 and 29 is authenticating a received incoming transmission. Ex. 1001 at 12:39-

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.