

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.,
Petitioner,

v.

M2M SOLUTIONS LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00853
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. INTRODUCTION1

II. BACKGROUND1

III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION2

IV. STANDARD FOR INSTITUTING *INTER PARTES* REVIEW2

V. The board should exercise its discretion under 35 U.S.c. § 325(d) to deny the petition3

VI. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE IT FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS5

 A. Petitioners’ Obviousness Analysis Is Inadequate6

 1. The Petitioners failed to articulate the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art.....6

 B. Grounds 1, 2 and 3, Directed to Dependent Claims 2, 7, 14, and 30, Fail to Demonstrate Obviousness for the Same Reasons Previously Established for Independent Claims 1 and 29 in Patent Owner’s Response Filed in IPR 2015-01823.....7

 1. Claims 2, 7 and 14 Depending From Claim 17

 2. Claim 30 Depending From Claim 29.....8

 C. Whitley in View of the SIM Specification Fails to Disclose All Elements of Dependent Claim 2 or to Render That Claim Obvious as Alleged in Ground 19

 1. The SIM Specification Fails to Teach That the SIM-OS Would Perform the Claimed “Coded Number” Authentication on Wireless Packet Switched Message Transmissions.....11

 2. Whitley Fails to Teach That the SIM-OS Would Perform the Claimed Data Processing of Data Received from a Monitored Technical Device.....12

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

3.	Whitley Fails To Teach That The SIM-OS Would Perform The Claimed Data Processing “In Response To Programming Instructions Received In An Incoming Wireless Packet Switched Data Message”	15
D.	Whitley in View of the SIM Specification and the SAT Specification Fails to Disclose All Elements of Dependent Claim 7 or to Render That Claim Obvious As Alleged in Ground 2.....	18
1.	The SIM-OS and a SIM Application Constitute Multiple Different Processing Modules Rather Than the Single Claimed “Processing Module”	22
2.	The SIM Specification Fails to Teach That the SIM-OS Would Perform the Claimed “Coded Number” Authentication on Wireless Packet Switched Message Transmissions.....	23
3.	Whitley and the SAT Specification Fail to Respectively Teach That the SIM-OS or a SIM Application Would Perform the Claimed Function of Causing the Remote Transmission of the Recited Processed Data.....	23
4.	Whitley Fails to Teach That the SIM-OS or a SIM Application Would Perform the Claimed Function of Causing a Remote Transmission “in Response to Programming Instructions Received in an Incoming Wireless Packet Switched Data Message”	31
E.	Whitley in View of the SIM Specification and the SAT Specification Fails to Disclose All Elements of Dependent Claim 14 or to Render That Claim Obvious As Alleged in Ground 2.....	34
1.	The SIM-OS and a SIM Application Constitute Multiple Different Processing Modules Rather Than the Single Claimed “Processing Module”	38
2.	The SIM Specification Fails to Teach That the SIM-OS Would Perform the Claimed “Coded Number”	

Authentication on Wireless Packet Switched Message Transmissions.....	38
3. Whitley and the SAT Specification Fail to Respectively Teach That the SIM-OS or a SIM Application Would Perform the Claimed Function of Causing the Remote Transmission of the Recited Received Data	39
4. Whitley Fails to Teach That the SIM-OS or a SIM Application Would Perform the Claimed Function of Causing a Remote Transmission “in Response to Programming Instructions Received in an Incoming Wireless Packet Switched Data Message”	45
F. Whitley in View of the SIM Specification and the SAT Specification and the SIM API Specification Fails to Disclose All Elements of Dependent Claim 30 or to Render That Claim Obvious As Alleged in Ground 3.....	48
1. The SIM-OS and a SIM Application Constitute Multiple Different Processing Modules Rather Than the Single Claimed “Processing Module”	52
2. The SIM Specification Fails to Teach That the SIM-OS Would Perform the Claimed “Coded Number” Authentication on Wireless Packet Switched Message Transmissions.....	53
3. The SAT Specification and the SIM API Specification Fail to Collectively Teach a SIM Application That Would Process Data Received from a Monitored Technical Device to Determine Whether It Indicates an Alarm Condition	54
4. Whitley Fails to Teach a SIM Application That Would Perform the Claimed Data Processing “in Response to Programming Instructions Received in an Incoming Wireless Packet Switched Data Message”.....	56
VII. CONCLUSION.....	59

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Butamax Adv. Biofuels LLC v. Gevo, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00581, (PTAB Oct. 14, 2014)	3, 5
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	6
<i>Johns Manville Corp. v. Knauf Insulation, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01402, (PTAB Oct. 21, 2015)	6, 7
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	6
<i>Luminara Worldwide, LLC v. Shenzhen Liown Electronics Co. LTD</i> , IPR2015-01183, (PTAB November 5, 2015).....	7
<i>Standard Innovation Corp. v. Lelo, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00907, (PTAB Dec. 1, 2014)	5
<i>T-Mobile US, Inc., et al. v. TracBeam, LLC</i> , IPR2016-00728, (PTAB May 25, 2016)	4
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 103	5
35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3).....	2
35 U.S.C. § 313	1, 2, 3
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	2, 3
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	3, 4, 5
Other Authorities	
37 C.F.R. § 42.107	1

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.