

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TELIT WIRELESS SOLUTIONS INC. &

TELIT COMMUNICATIONS PLC

Petitioner

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

PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW

OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,648,717

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. FORMALITIES	1
A. Real Parties-In-Interest.....	1
B. Related Matters.....	1
C. Designation of Counsel and Power of Attorney.....	3
D. Proof of Service, Service Information and Payment of Fees	3
III. REQUIREMENTS FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW	4
A. Grounds for Standing	4
B. Identification of Claims Being Challenged and Statement of Precise Relief Requested.....	4
C. Threshold for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review.....	5
IV. THE '717 PATENT	5
A. Overview of the '717 Patent and Claims	5
B. Summary of the Prosecution History	7
C. Effective Filing Date of the '717 Patent.....	7
D. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art	8
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	8
A. “programmable”:	8
B. “coded number”:	9

C.	“the transmissions including the at least one telephone number or IP address and the coded number”:	9
D.	“numbers to which the programmable communicator device is configured to and permitted to send outgoing wireless transmissions”:	10
E.	Remark On Capability	12
VI.	‘717 PATENT CLAIMS 1-30 ARE UNPATENTABLE	13
A.	Ground 1: Claims 1-3, 5-18, 22, 23, 29 and 30 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen in View of Bettstetter	13
B.	Ground 2: Claims 24-28 Were Anticipated by Van Bergen	46
C.	Ground 3: Claims 25-27 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen in View of Applicant Admitted Prior Art	48
d.	Ground 4: Claims 29-30 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen And Bettstetter in View of Applicant Admitted Prior Art	49
e.	Ground 5: Claim 4 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen And Bettstetter in View of Sonera	50
f.	Ground 6: Claims 19 And 20 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen And Bettstetter in View of Kuusela	53
g.	Ground 7: Claim 21 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen And Bettstetter in View of Eldredge	55
H.	FOUNDATIONS 8-14:	56
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	56

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,648,717

2.	Ground 9: Claims 24-28 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View Of Falcom	56
3.	Ground 10: Claims 25-27 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen, Bettstetter And AAPA In View Of Falcom	56
4.	Ground 11: Claims 29 And 30 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen, Bettstetter And AAPA In View Of Falcom	56
5.	Ground 12: Claim 4 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen, Bettstetter And Sonera In View Of Falcom	56
6.	Ground 13: Claims 19 And 20 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen, Bettstetter And Kuusela In View Of Falcom	56
7.	Ground 14: Claim 21 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen, Bettstetter And Eldredge In View Of Falcom.....	56
	VII. STATEMENT OF NON-REDUNDANCY	58
	VIII. CONCLUSION.....	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases	Page(s)	Cases
<i>Ex parte Mark L. Hitchin</i> , 2013 Pat. App. LEXIS 7038 (PTAB 2013)		53
<i>Ex parte Takahashi</i> , No. 2004-2192, 2004 WL 2733658 (BPAI 2004)		13, 23, 24
<i>In re Magna Elecs., Inc.</i> , 611 Fed. Appx. 969, 2015 U.S. App. LEXIS 7521 (Fed. Cir., May 7, 2015)		40
<i>IpLearn v. K12 Inc.</i> , 76 F. Supp. 3d 525 (D. Del. 2014)		52
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007)		17
<i>Orthopedic Equip. Co. v. U.S.</i> , 702 F.2d 1005 (Fed. Cir. 1983)		39, 40
<i>Peters v. Active Mfg.</i> , 129 U.S. 530 (1889)		13, 22
<i>Soverain Software v. Newegg, Inc.</i> , 705 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2013)		21
<i>Western Union Co. v. Moneygram Payment Sys. Inc.</i> , 626 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2010)		21
 <u>Statutes</u>		
35 U.S.C. § 102(a)		<i>passim</i>
35 U.S.C. § 102(a)(1).....		7, 8
35 U.S.C. § 102(b)		<i>passim</i>
35 U.S.C. § 102(e)		14, 50, 53, 55
35 U.S.C. § 103(a)		<i>passim</i>
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)		5
U.S.C. § 112		7

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.