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 IPR2015-01672
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

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

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. BACKGROUND ..... 1

III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ..... 2

A. Coded Number ..... 2

B. Transmission ..... 4

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 ..... 7

1. Whitley was considered during prosecution of the '717 patent ..... 8

2. Ardalan was considered during prosecution of the '717 patent ..... 8

B. The Petitioners Make No Attempt to Overcome the Presumption of Administrative Correctness ..... 8

C. Petitioners Add Nothing More than What Is Already in the Record with Respect to Whitley and Ardalan ..... 11

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

A. Whitley and Ardalan Fail to Disclose Material Elements Present in All Independent Claims ..... 15

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

1. "a *programmable interface* for establishing a communication link with at least one monitored technical device" (element (b)) .....17

2. "and a processing module for *authenticating* one or more wireless transmissions sent from a programming transmitter and received by the programmable communicator device *by determining if at least one transmission contains a coded number*" (element (d)).....19

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. "the one or more stored telephone numbers or IP addresses being numbers to which the programmable communicator device is configured to and permitted to send outgoing wireless transmissions;"(element (f)).....28

5. "wherein the programmable communicator device is configured to process data received through the programmable interface from the at least one monitored technical device in response to programming instructions received in an incoming wireless packet switched data message." (element (i)) .....32

6. Whitley and Ardalan do not disclose all of the elements of claim 24. .....36

7. Whitley and Ardalan not disclose all of the elements of claim 29.....38

B. Whitley and Ardalan Fail to Disclose Material Elements Present in Dependent Claims 4 and 5 .....40

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

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).....40

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).....41

C. Petitioners' Obviousness Analysis Is Inadequate .....42

1. The Petitioners failed to articulate the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art.....43

2. The Petitioners have not provided an adequate rationale to combine the references .....45

3. The Petitioners provide no support for their Ground 1 or "alternative" Ground 4 obviousness argument.....48

4. The Petitioners provide no analysis for their Ground 2 obviousness argument.....50

5. The Petitioners provide no analysis for their Ground 3 obviousness argument.....51

VII. CONCLUSION.....52

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

# TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

**Page(s)**

**Cases**

*CAE Screenplates, Inc. v. Heinrich Fiedler Gmbh & Co. KG,*
224 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....3

*Graham v. John Deere Co.*
383 U.S. 1 (1966).....43

*Heart Failure Technologies, LLC v. CardioKinetix, Inc.,*
IPR2013-00183, (PTAB July 31, 2013) .....45

*Integrated Global Concepts, Inc. v. Advanced Messaging Technologies, Inc.,*
IPR2014-01027, (PTAB December 22, 2014) .....12

*Johns Manville Corp. v. Knauf Insulation, Inc.,*
IPR2015-01402, (PTAB October 21, 2015).....14, 43, 45

*Karim v. Jobson,*
Interference No. 105,376, Paper 99, p. 10 (B.P.A.I. Feb. 28, 2007) .....10

*Kinetic Technologies, Inc. v. Skyworks Solutions, Inc.,*
IPR2014-00529, (PTAB September 23, 2014).....46, 47, 50

*KSR Int'l Co. v Teleflex Inc.,*
550 U.S. 398 (2007).....43

*Luminara Worldwide, LLC v. Shenzhen Liown Electronics Co. LTD,*
IPR2015-01183, (PTAB November 5, 2015).....43, 45, 46, 47

*Parsons v. United States,*
670 F.2d 164 (Ct. Cl. 1982).....9

*In re Portola Packaging, Inc.,*
110 F.3d 786 (Fed. Cir. 1997) .....9

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.