

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

M2M SOLUTIONS LLC,  
a Delaware limited liability company,

Plaintiff,

v.

SIERRA WIRELESS AMERICA, INC., a  
Delaware corporation, and SIERRA  
WIRELESS, INC., a Canadian corporation,

Defendants.

**C.A. No. 12-030-RGA**

---

M2M SOLUTIONS LLC,  
a Delaware limited liability company,

Plaintiff,

v.

CINTERION WIRELESS MODULES GMBH,  
a German limited liability company,  
CINTERION WIRELESS MODULES NAFTA  
LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,

Defendants.

**C.A. No. 12-031-RGA**

---

M2M SOLUTIONS LLC,  
a Delaware limited liability company,

Plaintiff,

v.

ENFORA, INC., a Delaware corporation,  
NOVATEL WIRELESS SOLUTIONS,  
INC., a Delaware corporation, and  
NOVATEL WIRELESS, INC, a  
Delaware corporation,

Defendants.

**C.A. No. 12-032-RGA**

M2M SOLUTIONS LLC,  
a Delaware limited liability company,

Plaintiff,

v.

MOTOROLA SOLUTIONS, INC., a Delaware  
corporation, TELIT COMMUNICATIONS PLC,  
a United Kingdom public limited company, and  
TELIT WIRELESS SOLUTIONS INC., a  
Delaware corporation,

Defendants.

**C.A. No. 12-033-RGA**

M2M SOLUTIONS LLC,  
a Delaware limited liability company,

Plaintiff,

v.

SIMCOM WIRELESS SOLUTIONS CO.,  
LTD., a Chinese limited company, SIM  
TECHNOLOGY GROUP LTD, a Bermuda  
limited company, MICRON ELECTRONICS  
L.L.C., a Delaware limited liability company,  
and KOWATEC CORPORATION, a California  
corporation,

Defendants.

**C.A. No. 12-034-RGA**

**CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ORDER**

After having considered the submissions of the parties and hearing oral argument on the matter, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED that, as used in the asserted claims of U.S. Patent No. 8,094,010 (“‘010 patent”):

1. The term “permitted caller” is construed to mean “a telephone number or IP address on a list of numbers that are designated to cause the programmable

communicator to accept an incoming call received from that number.”

2. The term “coded number” is construed to mean “a designated, unique sequence of characters.”
3. The term “a programmable interface” is construed to mean “an interface that is able to be directly programmed.”
4. The term “processing module” is construed to mean “components or units of a computer program.”
5. The term “monitoring device” is construed to mean “a device configured to remotely monitor a programmable communicator device and/or a monitored technical device.”
6. The term “wireless communications circuit for communicating through an antenna” is construed to mean “a complete wireless circuit that transmits and receives data and includes an antenna.”
7. The term “monitored technical device” is construed to mean “a device that provides information to the remote monitoring device through the programmable communicator device.”
8. Pursuant to the parties’ agreement, as used in claims 92 and 94, the term “a programmable communicator device . . . configured to be incorporated into the at least one monitored technical device such that it becomes an integrated part of the monitored technical device” should be construed to mean “a programmable communicator device configured to be physically embedded within a monitored technical device so as to form a single device.”

SO ORDERED this 19<sup>th</sup> day of Nov, 2013.

Richard G. Andrews  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE