

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

EMERSON ELECTRIC CO,  
Petitioner

v.

SIPCO, LLC,  
Patent Owner

Case IPR2015-01973  
U.S. Patent 8,013,732

---

SIPCO, LLC'S PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND ..... 6

    A. Conventional Control and Monitoring Systems ..... 6

    B. The '732 Patent: Mr. Thomas D. Petite and Richard M. Huff Invent A New Type Of Distributed System For Remote Monitoring and Control. .... 9

III. SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED GROUNDS FOR REVIEW ..... 14

IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ..... 15

    A. Sensor (claims 13, 20, 26 and 31)..... 16

V. THE PRIOR ART ..... 17

    A. Kahn (Ex. 1002)..... 17

    B. Admitted Prior Art (APA) ..... 18

    C. Burchfiel (Ex. 1003) ..... 19

VI. THE PETITIONER CANNOT PREVAIL ON ANY OBVIOUSNESS GROUND AGAINST ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM OF THE '732 PATENT ..... 20

    A. The Combination Of Kahn, the APA, and Burchfiel Would Not Have Taught That A “data controller [of a wireless device] is configured to receive data packets comprising a function code, and in response to the function code, implement a function” As Recited In Claim 16..... 21

    B. The Combination Of Kahn, the APA, and Burchfiel Would Not Have Taught “wireless enabled thermostat device ... comprising: a memory to store one or more function codes corresponding to the thermostat device, the function codes corresponding to a number of functions the data controller can implement” As Recited In Claim 18 And As Similarly Recited In Claims 17 and 24..... 25

    C. The Combination Of Kahn, the APA, and Burchfiel Would Not Have Taught That A “transceiver [of a wireless communication device] has a plurality of distinct predetermined function codes for inclusion into a data packet, and wherein the predetermined function codes are unique to the transceiver” As Recited In Claim 28 And As Similarly Recited In Claim 29..... 26

    D. The Combination Of Kahn, the APA, and Burchfiel Would Not Have Taught That “a controller [of a wireless communication system] comprises a memory

containing a plurality of function codes specific to the sensor” As Recited In  
Claim 35.....30

E. The Petitioner Failed To Show That It Would Have Been Obvious To Modify  
Kahn With the APA To Achieve A Device Having A Transceiver That Is  
Configured To Wirelessly Retransmit Select Information, Identification  
Information Of A Nearby Transceiver, and Its Own Identification Information  
And A Data Controller Coupled To The Transceiver and Sensor, As Required  
By Each Of The Challenged Independent Claims Of The ‘732 Patent. ....31

F. The Petitioner Failed To Show That It Would Have Been Obvious To  
Combine Kahn and Burchfiel and APA To Achieve The Invention Of Any Of  
Claims 16-18, 24, 28, 29 and 35 The ‘732 Patent.....40

G. The Petitioner Failed To Show That It Would Have Been Obvious To  
Combine Kahn, APA and Cerf To Achieve The Invention Of Claim 32 Of The  
‘732 Patent. ....41

H. The Petitioner Failed To Show That It Would Have Been Obvious To  
Combine Kahn, APA and Fisher Catalog Achieve The Invention Of Claim 23  
Of The ‘732 Patent.....44

I. The Petitioner Failed To Show That It Would Have Been Obvious To  
Combine Kahn, the APA, Burchfiel, HART Data Link, and HART Command  
To Achieve The Invention Of Claims 27 and 34 Of The ‘732 Patent. ....45

J. The Prior Art Would Not Have Taught Or Suggested “a data controller  
operatively coupled to the transceiver and the sensor, the data controller  
configured to ... receive data from the sensor,” As Recited in Independent  
Claim 13 And As Similarly Recited In Independent Claims 20, 26, and 31  
Would Not Have Been Obvious In View Of The Prior Art.....46

K. The Prior Art Would Not Have Taught Or Suggested “an actuator configured  
to receive command data from the controller and in response implement the  
command,” As Recited in Claim 19, And As Similarly Recited In Claims 14,  
25 And 30.....50

L. The Prior Art Would Not Have Taught Or Suggested A Controller Configured  
to “format some data packets by concatenating received data packets with data  
packets formatted by the controller enabling the controller to prepare data for  
transmission that includes repeated data and sensed data,” As Recited In  
Independent Claim 26. ....52

M. The Petitioner Failed To Set Forth A Proper Obviousness Analysis.....55

VII. CONCLUSION .....58

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**CASES**

*Graham v. John Deere Co.*,  
383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966)..... 1, 19, 53

*KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*,  
550 U.S. 398 (2007) ..... 1, 53

*OSRAM Sylvania, Inc. v. Am Induction Techs., Inc.*,  
701 F.3d 698 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 1, 19, 37

*In re Translogic Tech., Inc.*, 504 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2007)..... 15

*In re Suitco Surface, Inc.*, 603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010)..... 15

**OTHER AUTHORITIES**

*Epistar, et al. v. Trustees Of Boston University*,  
IPR2013-00298, Paper No. 18 (P.T.A.B. November 15, 2103) ..... 1, 37

*Liberty Mutual v. Progressive Casualty*,  
CMB-2012-00003, Paper No. 7 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 25, 2012) ..... 1, 53

*Liberty Mutual v. Progressive Casualty*,  
CMB-2012-00003, Paper No. 8 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 25, 2012) ..... 4, 54

MPEP § 2143..... 19

EXHIBITS

<b>Exhibit No.</b>	<b>Description</b>
2001	Expert Report of Dr. Kevin Almeroth.
2002	Dr. Kevin Almeroth's Curriculum Vitae
2003	K. Ramachandran, E. Belding, K. Almeroth, and M. Buddhikot, "Interference-Aware Channel Assignment in Multi-Radio Wireless Mesh Networks," IEEE Infocom, Barcelona, SPAIN, April 2006.
2004	B. Greeves, "SCADA Uses Radio to Bridge the Gap," Sensor Review, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 31-34, 1994.
2005	Bristol Babcock Network 3000 Communications Users Guide
2006	O. Gurewitz, V. Mancuso, J. Shi, and E. Knightly, "Measurement and Modeling of the Origins of Starvation in Congestion Controlled Mesh Networks," IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking, vol. 17, num. 6, Pgs. 1832-1845, December 2009.
2007	Open Bristol System Interface Utilities Manual
2008	A. Flowers and S. Zeadally, "Cyberwar: The What, When, Why, and How," IEEE Technology and Society Magazine, vol. 3, num. 3, Pgs. 14-21, Fall 2014.
2009	Deposition Transcript of Dr. Heppe

# 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.