

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

COX COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

Petitioner

v.

C-CATION TECHNOLOGIES, LLC

Patent Owner

---

Case: IPR2015-\_\_\_\_\_

---

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF  
U.S. PATENT NO. 5,563,883**

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
*Submitted Electronically via the Patent Review Processing System*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	MANDATORY NOTICES – 37 C.F.R. § 42.8.....	2
	A. Real Party-In-Interest Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1) .....	2
	B. Related Matters Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2) .....	2
	C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3) .....	3
	D. Service Information Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4).....	3
III.	PAYMENT OF FEES – 37 C.F.R. § 42.103.....	4
IV.	REQUIREMENTS FOR IPR – 37 C.F.R. § 42.104 A.....	4
	A. Grounds for Standing Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a).....	4
	B. Identification of Challenge Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b) and Relief Requested.....	5
	C. Claim Construction Under 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.100(b), 42.104(b)(3).....	6
	D. How the Construed Claims are Unpatentable under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4).....	7
	E. Supporting Evidence under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(5).....	8
V.	SUMMARY AND TECHNICAL BACKGROUND OF THE '883 PATENT .....	8
	A. The Alleged Invention of the '883 Patent.....	8
VI.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....	9
VII.	DETAILED EXPLANATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(B).....	9
	A. Overview of the MPT Specifications .....	9
	1. Technical Overview of the MPT Specifications.....	9
	2. The MPT Specifications Are Printed Publications.....	16
	3. The Functionalities Defined By the MPT Specifications Were Intended to be Combined .....	17
	B. Ground 1: Claims 1 and 4 are Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) As Obvious Over MPT 1343 In View of MPT 1347 and MPT 1327 .....	19
	1. Claim 1 .....	19

a.	Preamble: “In a multiple access communication system comprising a central controller, a shared transmission means for signalling data and user information, and a plurality of remote terminals, a method of allocating signalling data channels between said central controller and said plurality of remote terminals from a plurality of communication channels and of assigning remote terminals . . . .”	19
b.	Limitation [A]: “establishing communications between said central controller and said plurality of remote terminals via a plurality of signalling data channels, each of said remote terminals being initially assigned to a pair of predetermined signalling data channels”	24
i.	Limitation [A], Example 1: Channel Hunt Sequence and Normal Operation on Control Channel	26
ii.	Limitation [A], Example 2: Fall-back Procedures	29
c.	Limitation [B]: “monitoring the status of a plurality of signalling data channels in use between said central controller and said plurality of remote terminals for the usability of said signalling data channels”	31
i.	Limitation [B], Example 1: Channel Hunt Sequence and Normal Operation on Control Channel	32
ii.	Limitation [B], Example 2: Fall-Back Procedures	33
d.	Limitation [CJ]: “determining whether one of said plurality of remote terminals needs to be reassigned to a different signalling data channel other than said predetermined signalling data channel”	34

i.	Limitation [C], Example 1: Channel Hunt Sequence and Normal Operation on Control Channel.....	35
ii.	Limitation [C], Example 2: Fall-Back Procedures .....	36
e.	Limitation [D]: “determining whether a different and suitable signalling data channel is available other than said predetermined channel” .....	38
i.	Limitation [D], Example 1: Channel Hunt Sequence and Normal Operation on Control Channel.....	38
ii.	Limitation [D], Example 2: Fall-Back Procedures .....	42
f.	Limitation [EJ]: “reassigning by said central controller said remote terminal to a different and suitable signalling data channel for communication henceforward”.....	43
i.	Limitation [E], Example 1: Channel Hunt Sequence and Normal Operation on Control Channel.....	43
ii.	Limitation [E], Example 2: Fall-Back Procedures .....	45
2.	Claim 4.....	46
a.	Preamble: “In a multiple access communication system according to claim 1, said step of determining whether one of said plurality of remote terminals needs to be reassigned to a different signalling data channel other than said predetermined signalling data channel comprising the steps of:” .....	46
b.	Limitation [A]: “sensing the status of said predetermined signalling data channel which said terminal has been assigned to for overloading to determine whether said terminal needs to be reassigned to a different signalling data channel because of overloading;” .....	47

c.	Limitation [B]: “sensing the status of said predetermined signalling data channel which said terminal has been assigned to for failure to determine whether said terminal needs to be reassigned to a different signalling data channel because of failure.” .....	49
C.	Ground 2: Claim 3 is Invalid Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) As Obvious Over MPT 1343 In View of MPT 1347 and MPT 1327 as Applied to Claim 1, and Further In View of Zudnek and Dufresne .....	51
1.	Claim 3 .....	51
a.	Preamble: “In a multiple access communication system according to claim 1, said step of monitoring the status of a plurality of the signalling data channels in use between said central controller and said plurality of remote terminals for the usability of said signalling data channels comprising the steps of” .....	51
b.	Limitation [A]: “calculating the aggregate traffic load requirements of said plurality of signalling data channels in use;” .....	52
c.	Limitation [B]: “monitoring the past collision count of said plurality of signalling data channels in use;” .....	55
d.	Limitation [C]: “monitoring the transmission error count of said plurality of signalling data channels in use;” .....	57
e.	Limitation [D]: “sensing the status of said plurality of signalling data channels in use for failure.” .....	58
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	60

# 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.