

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

Paper No. _____

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SIERRA WIRELESS AMERICA, INC.; SIERRA WIRELESS, INC.;
and RPX CORP.,
Petitioners,

v.

M2M SOLUTIONS LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-01823
Patent 8,648,717

**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. Identity Module	2
	B. Programming Transmitter	3
IV.	STANDARD FOR INSTITUTING <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW	3
V.	ALL GROUNDS SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE THEY PRESENT THE SAME ART AND ARGUMENT PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED BY THE OFFICE.....	4
	A. Whitley Was Considered During Prosecution	5
	B. Digital Cellular Telecommunications System (Phase 2+); Specification of the Subscriber Identity Module – Mobile Equipment (SIM-ME) Interface (GSM 11.11 version 7.4.0 Release 1998) Was Considered During Prosecution	5
	C. The Petitioners Make No Attempt to Overcome the Presumption of Administrative Correctness	5
	D. Petitioners Add Nothing More than What Is Already in the Record with Respect to Whitley and SIM+ME Spec	8
VI.	THE PETITION IS NOT PROPERLY SUPPORTED BY THE NEGUS DECLARATION	9
VII.	THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE IT FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS.....	10
	A. Petitioners’ Obviousness Analysis Is Inadequate	11
	1. The Petitioners failed to articulate the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art.....	11

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

2.	The Petitioners improperly combine and conflate their arguments for Grounds 1 and 2.....	13
3.	The Petitioners have not shown the content of the “Admitted Prior Art” or demonstrated that it is prior art	14
4.	The Petitioners have not provided an adequate rationale to combine the references	15
B.	Whitley in View of the SIM+ME Spec and the Admitted Prior Art Fail Either to Disclose All Elements in the Independent Claims or to Render Those Claims Obvious as Alleged in Grounds 1 and 2	15
1.	“a programmable interface for establishing a communication link with at least one monitored technical device wherein the programmable interface is programmable by wireless packet switched data messages” (element (b));.....	17
2.	“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 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 (d));	23
3.	“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 (g))	35

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

4.	Whitley and the SIM+ME Spec do not disclose all of the elements of claim 24.	38
5.	Whitley and the SIM+ME Spec do not disclose all of the elements of claim 29.	39
C.	Whitley Fails to Disclose Material Elements Present in Dependent Claims 2, 7, 10, 14, and 30	40
1.	“A programmable communicator device according to claim 1, wherein the processing module 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.” (Claim 2)	40
2.	“A programmable communicator device according to claim 6, wherein the processing module is configured to cause the processed data to be transmitted to the at least one monitoring device in response to programming instructions received in an incoming wireless packet switched data message.” (Claim 7).....	42
3.	“A programmable communicator device according to claim 1 further configured to determine whether the processed received data indicates a change in status of the at least one monitored technical device that crosses a threshold parameter, or that otherwise indicates an alarm condition in response to programming instructions received in an incoming wireless packet switched data message.” (Claim 10).....	43
4.	“A programmable communicator device according to claim 13, wherein the processing module is configured to cause the received data to be transmitted to the at least one monitoring device in response to programming instructions received in an incoming wireless packet switched data message.” (Claim 14).....	45

5.	“A programmable communicator device according to claim 29 wherein the processing module processes received data to determine whether it indicates a change in status of the at least one monitored technical device that crosses a threshold parameter, or that otherwise indicates an alarm condition.” (Claim 30)	46
D.	The Petitioners Provide No Analysis for Their Ground 3 Obviousness Argument to Combine Whitley, the SIM+ME Spec, and Kail.....	47
1.	“A programmable communicator device according to claim 1 further comprising a location processing module configured to determine an at least one location of the programmable communicator device, and wherein the programmable communicator device is configured to respond to an at least one transmission initiated by an at least one monitoring device requesting that said location data be sent to the monitoring device in response to programming instructions received in an incoming wireless packet switched data message.” (Claim 16)	47
	“A programmable communicator device according to claim 16 wherein the location processing module comprises a Global Positioning System (GPS) module.” (Claim 17)	48
2.	“A programmable communicator device according to claim 1 wherein the monitored technical device is a health monitoring system.” (Claim 19).....	49
	“A programmable communicator device according to claim 19 wherein the programmable communicator device is configured to receive data from the health monitoring system through the programmable interface representing at least one of body temperature, blood pressure, periodic or continuous electrocardiogram health rhythm, blood glucose concentration, blood electrolyte concentration, kidney function, liver function, and labor contractions in response to programming instructions	

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.