

Paper No. \_\_\_\_\_

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 PRELIMINARY RESPONSE  
PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 313 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

*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**

I. INTRODUCTION .....1

II. BACKGROUND .....1

III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....2

    A. Coded Number .....3

    B. Transmission .....5

    C. The Number and Content of Transmissions Falling within the  
        Claim Scope .....5

IV. STANDARD FOR INSTITUTING *INTER PARTES* REVIEW .....6

V. GROUNDS 1, 2, 3, AND 4 SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE  
THEY PRESENT THE SAME ART AND ARGUMENT  
PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED BY THE OFFICE.....7

    A. The Art Relied on Was Considered During Prosecution .....8

        1. Kennedy was considered during prosecution of the ’717  
            patent .....8

        2. Gaukel was considered during prosecution of the ’717  
            patent .....9

    B. The Petitioners Make No Attempt to Overcome the  
        Presumption of Administrative Correctness .....9

    C. Petitioners Add Nothing More than What Is Already in the  
        Record with Respect to Kennedy and Gaukel.....12

VI. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE IT FAILS TO  
DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS .....13

    A. Kennedy Fails to Disclose Material Elements Present in All  
        Independent Claims .....15

Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response  
*Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,648,717

1.	“a <i>programmable interface</i> for establishing a communication link with at least one monitored technical device” (element (b)) .....	17
2.	“and a processing module for <i>authenticating</i> one or more wireless transmissions sent from a programming transmitter and received by the programmable communicator device <i>by determining if at least one transmission contains a coded number</i> ” (element (d)).....	20
3.	“wherein the programmable communicator device is configured to use a memory to store at least one telephone number or IP address included within at least one of the transmissions as one or more stored telephone numbers or IP addresses if the processing module authenticates the at least one of the transmissions including the at least one telephone number or IP address and the coded number by determining that the at least one of the transmissions includes the coded number” (element (e)).....	25
4.	Kennedy does not disclose all of the elements of claim 24.....	28
5.	Kennedy does not disclose all of the elements of claim 29.....	29
B.	Kennedy Fails to Disclose Material Elements Present in Dependent Claims 4, 5, 12, and 26 .....	30
1.	A programmable communicator device according to claim 1 wherein the programmable communicator device is configured to process wireless transmissions compliant with Bluetooth wireless air interface standards. (Claim 4).....	30
2.	A programmable communicator device according to claim 1 further configured to request that an at least one monitored technical device send data through the programmable interface for processing by the programmable communicator device in response to programming instructions received in an incoming wireless packet switched data message. (Claim 5).....	32

Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response  
*Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,648,717

3.	A programmable communicator device according to claim 1 further configured to request that an at least one monitored technical device send data through the programmable interface for receipt by the programmable communicator device in response to programming instructions received in an incoming wireless packet switched data message. (Claim 12).....	33
4.	A programmable communicator device according to claim 25 further configured to request that an at least one monitored technical device send data through the programmable interface for receipt by the programmable communicator device in response to programming instructions received in an incoming short message service (SMS) data message, a GPRS message, or any wireless packet switched data message. (Claim 26).....	34
C.	Petitioners’ Obviousness Analysis Is Inadequate .....	34
1.	The Petitioners failed to articulate the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art.....	35
2.	The Petitioners have not provided an adequate rationale to combine the references .....	37
3.	There is no support for the proposed combination of Kennedy with the AAPA .....	40
4.	The Petitioners provide no support for their Ground 1 or “alternative” Ground 4 obviousness arguments .....	40
5.	The Petitioners provide no analysis for their Ground 2 obviousness argument.....	42
6.	The Petitioners provide no analysis for their Ground 3 obviousness argument.....	43
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	44

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>CAE Screenplates, Inc. v. Heinrich Fiedler GmbH &amp; Co. KG</i> , 224 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	4
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	35
<i>Heart Failure Technologies, LLC v. CardioKinetix</i> .....	37
IPR2013-00183, (PTAB July 31, 2013)	
<i>Integrated Global Concepts, Inc. v. Advanced Messaging Technologies, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01027, (PTAB December 22, 2014) .....	12
<i>Johns Manville Corp. v. Knauf Insulation, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01402, (PTAB October 21, 2015).....	14, 35, 36, 37
<i>Karim v. Jobson</i> , Interference No. 105,376, Paper 99, p. 10 (B.P.A.I. Feb. 28, 2007) .....	10
<i>Kinetic Technologies, Inc. v. Skyworks Solutions, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00529, (PTAB September 23, 2014).....	38, 39, 40, 43
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	35
<i>Luminara Worldwide, LLC v. Shenzhen Liown Electronics Co. LTD</i> , IPR2015-01183, (PTAB November 5, 2015).....	36, 37, 38, 39
<i>Parsons v. United States</i> , 670 F.2d 164 (Ct. Cl. 1982).....	9
<i>In re Portola Packaging, Inc.</i> , 110 F.3d 786 (Fed. Cir. 1997) .....	10

# 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.