

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TELIT WIRELESS SOLUTIONS INC. &

TELIT COMMUNICATIONS PLC

Petitioners

v.

M2M SOLUTIONS LLC

Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 8,648,717

Filed: Jul. 3, 2013

Issued: Feb. 11, 2014

Title: Programmable Communicator

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2016-00055

DECLARATION OF KIMMO SAVOLAINEN

FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,648,717

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Engagement	1
B. Background And Qualifications	1
C. Compensation and Prior Testimony	5
D. Information Considered.....	6
II. LEGAL STANDARDS FOR PATENTABILITY	7
III. THE '717 PATENT.....	10
A. Overview Of The '717 Patent	10
B. Independent Claims Of The '717 Patent	14
IV. BACKGROUND RELEVANT TO THE '717 PATENT.....	16
A. Field of the Claimed Subject Matter	16
B. Person Of Ordinary Skill In The Art.....	17
C. Routine Knowledge	17
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	27
A. “programmable”	27
B. “interface”.....	27
C. “monitored technical device”	28
D. “monitoring device”	28
E. “processing module”	28
F. “coded number”	29

Declaration of Kimmo Savolainen in *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,648,717

G.	“the transmissions including the at least one telephone number or IP address and the coded number”	29
H.	“numbers to which the programmable communicator device is configured to and permitted to send outgoing wireless transmissions”	30
VI.	EFFECTIVE FILING DATE OF THE '717 PATENT.....	33
VII.	PATENTABILITY ANALYSIS OF THE '717 PATENT	37
A.	Ground 1: Claims 1-3, 5-7, 10-18, 22-23, 29 and 30 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View Of Bettstetter	40
1.	Claim 1 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View of Bettstetter.....	47
2.	Claim 2 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View of Bettstetter.....	61
3.	Claim 3 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View of Bettstetter.....	62
4.	Claim 5 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View of Bettstetter.....	62
5.	Claim 6 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View of Bettstetter.....	64
6.	Claim 7 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View of Bettstetter.....	66
7.	Claim 8 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View of Bettstetter.....	66
8.	Claim 9 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View of Bettstetter.....	67
9.	Claim 10 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View of Bettstetter.....	68

Declaration of Kimmo Savolainen in *Inter
Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,648,717

10.	Claim 11 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View of Bettstetter.....	69
11.	Claim 12 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View of Bettstetter.....	71
12.	Claim 13 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View of Bettstetter.....	71
13.	Claim 14 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View of Bettstetter.....	72
14.	14. Claim 15 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View of Bettstetter.....	73
15.	Claim 16 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View of Bettstetter.....	74
16.	Claim 17 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View of Bettstetter.....	75
17.	Claim 18 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View of Bettstetter.....	77
18.	Claim 22 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View of Bettstetter.....	77
19.	Claim 23 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View of Bettstetter.....	78
20.	Claim 29 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View of Bettstetter.....	78
21.	Claim 30 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View Of Bettstetter.....	83
B.	Ground 2: Claims 24-28 Were Anticipated by Van Bergen	83
1.	Van Bergen Anticipated Claim 24	83
2.	Van Bergen Anticipated Claim 25	84

Declaration of Kimmo Savolainen in *Inter
Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,648,717

3.	Van Bergen Anticipated Claim 26	85
4.	Van Bergen Anticipated Claim 27	85
5.	Van Bergen Anticipated Claim 28	85
C.	Ground 3: Claims 25-27 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen in View of Applicant Admitted Prior Art	86
D.	Ground 4: Claims 29-30 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen And Bettstetter In View of Applicant Admitted Prior Art.....	86
E.	Ground 5: Claim 4 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen And Bettstetter In View of Sonera.....	87
F.	Ground 6: Claims 19 And 20 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen And Bettstetter In View of Kuusela	89
1.	Claim 19 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen And Bettstetter In View of Kuusela.....	90
2.	Claim 20 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen And Bettstetter In View of Kuusela.....	92
G.	Ground 7: Claim 21 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen And Bettstetter In View of Eldredge.....	92
H.	Grounds 8-14:.....	95
1.	Ground 8: Claims 1-3, 5-18, 22, 23, 29, And 30 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen And Bettstetter In View of Falcom	95
2.	Ground 9: Claims 24-28 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View of Falcom.....	95
3.	Ground 10: Claims 25-27 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen, Bettstetter And AAPA In View of Falcom.....	95

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.