

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

UNIFIED PATENTS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

CONVERGENT MEDIA SOLUTIONS, LLC,
Patent Owner

CASE No. **IPR2016-00047**
PATENT 8,640,183

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
TO PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
A.	Identification of Grounds Asserted in the Petition	2
II.	Chen Does Not Have Priority Over The Priority Date of The '183 Patent And Is Not Prior Art Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).....	3
III.	<u>GROUND 1:</u> Chen and Elabbady Fail to Disclose All the Elements of the Independent Claims in the '183 Patent.....	6
1.	Chen and Elabbady Fail To Disclose A “Second User Interface” As Required In Section 1.B of Claim 1 of the '183 Patent.....	7
2.	Chen and Elabbady Fail to Disclose A “User Interface” As Required In Claim 58 of the '183 Patent.....	12
3.	Chen and Elabbady Fail to Disclose A “Second User Interface” As Required In Claim 59 of the '183 Patent	13
4.	Chen and Elabbady Fail to Disclose A “Wireless Communication Session” And A “User Interface” As Required In Claim 60 of the '183 Patent.....	13
IV.	<u>GROUND 2:</u> Meade and Elabbady Fail to Disclose All the Elements of the Independent Claims in the '183 Patent.....	15
1.	Grounds 1 And 2 Are Horizontally Redundant And At Least One Of The Grounds Should Not Be Maintained by the Board.....	16
2.	Meade and Elabbady Fail to Disclose A “Second User Interface” As Required In Section 1.B of Claim 1 of the '183 Patent	18
3.	Chen and Elabbady Fail to Disclose A “User Interface” As Required In Claim 58 of the '183 Patent.....	21

4.	Chen and Elabbady Fail to Disclose A “Second User Interface” As Required In Claim 59 of the ‘183 Patent	22
5.	Meade and Elabbady Fail to Disclose A “User Interface” As Required In Claim 60 of the ‘183 Patent.....	23
V.	The Declaration of Jon Weissman is Deficient And Should Not Relied Upon or Used for Grounds 1 and 2.....	24
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Cisco Systems, Inc. v. Constellation Techs, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00914, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 2, 2015).....	3, 5
<i>CFMT, Inc. v. YieldUp Int’l Corp.</i> , 349 F.3d 1333, 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	1
<i>Garmin Int’l Inc. v. Patent of Cuozzo Speed Techs, LLC</i> , Case No. IPR 2012-0001, Paper 15 at 15 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 9, 2013).....	1
<i>In re Royka</i> , 409 F.2d 981, 985 (C.C.P.A. 1974).....	1
<i>In re Rijckaert</i> , 9 F.3d 1531, 1534 (Fed. Cir. 1993).....	1
<i>Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.</i> , CBM2012-00003, Paper 7 at 2 (Oct. 25, 2012).....	16, 17

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 103.....	2
35 U.S.C. § 313.....	1
35 U.S.C. § 314(a).....	1
35 U.S.C. §316(b).....	17

Rules

37 C.F.R. § 42.107.....	1
-------------------------	---

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (November 2015)

M.P.E.P. § 211.05.....	3
M.P.E.P. § 2136.03(III).....	3

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 313 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.107, the Patent Owner hereby provides a Preliminary Response to the Petition for *Inter Partes* Review filed on October 14, 2015 (herein “the Petition”). A Notice issued by the Board dated October 30, 2015 (Paper 3) set January 14, 2016 as the deadline for this Preliminary Response. This Preliminary Response is timely filed, and no fee is due with this Preliminary Response.

The Petition asserts two (2) grounds by which the Petitioner alleges that various claims of U.S. Patent 8,640,183 (the ‘183 Patent) are unpatentable. None of the grounds meet the requirement of describing that there is a reasonable likelihood at least one of the claims in the ‘183 Patent is unpatentable as required by 35 U.S.C. § 314(a). As such, the Patent Owner respectfully requests that the Board deny the Petition and not institute trial.

If a single element of a claim is absent from the prior art, the claim cannot be considered obvious. *See CFMT, Inc. v. YieldUp Int’l Corp.*, 349 F.3d 1333, 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (“Obviousness requires a suggestion of all limitations in a claim”, citing *In re Royka*, 409 F.2d 981, 985 (C.C.P.A. 1974); *In re Rijckaert*, 9 F.3d 1531, 1534 (Fed Cir. 1993) (reversing obviousness rejection where prior art did not teach or suggest all claim limitations); *Garmin Int’l Inc. v. Patent of Cuozzo Speed Techs, LLC*, Case No. IPR 2012-0001, Paper 15 at 15 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 9, 2013) (refusing to

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.