

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

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.

Petitioners

v.

M2M SOLUTIONS LLC
Patent Owner

Patent No. 8,648,717
Issue Date: February 11, 2014
Title: PROGRAMMABLE COMMUNICATOR

Inter Partes Review No. Unassigned

PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.100 *ET. SEQ.*

Table of Contents

Page

I. CONTENTS

I. Introduction 1

II. Notices and Requirements..... 1

 A. Notice of Each Real Party in Interest..... 1

 B. Notice of Related Matters 1

 C. Notice of Lead and Backup Counsel..... 3

 D. Notice of Service Information..... 3

 E. Payment of Fees 3

II. REQUIREMENTS FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW (37 C.F.R. § 42.104) 3

 A. Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)) 3

 B. Identification of Claims Being Challenged (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)) and Statement of Precise Relief Requested..... 4

 C. Threshold for Inter Partes Review (37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c))..... 5

III. 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 7

IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 8

 A. “programmable”..... 8

Table of Contents (continued)

	Page
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
V. ‘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	14
1. Claim 1 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen in View of Bettstetter	18
2. Claim 2 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View Of Bettstetter	28
3. Claim 3 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View Of Bettstetter	29
4. Claim 5 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View Of Bettstetter	29
5. Claim 6 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View Of Bettstetter	31
6. Claim 7 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View Of Bettstetter	32
7. Claim 8 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View Of Bettstetter	32
8. Claim 9 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View Of Bettstetter	33
9. Claim 10 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View Of Bettstetter	34
10. Claim 11 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View Of Bettstetter	35

Table of Contents (continued)

	Page
11. Claim 12 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View Of Bettstetter	37
12. Claim 13 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View Of Bettstetter	37
13. Claim 14 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View Of Bettstetter	38
14. Claim 15 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View Of Bettstetter	39
15. Claim 16 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View Of Bettstetter	40
16. Claim 17 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View Of Bettstetter	41
17. Claim 18 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View Of Bettstetter	42
18. Claim 22 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View Of Bettstetter	43
19. Claim 23 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View Of Bettstetter	43
20. Claim 29 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View Of Bettstetter	44
21. Claim 30 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen In View Of Bettstetter	47
B. Ground 2: Claims 24-28 Were Anticipated by Van Bergen	48
1. Van Bergen Anticipated Claim 24.....	48
2. Van Bergen Anticipated Claim 25.....	49
3. Van Bergen Anticipated Claim 26.....	50
4. Van Bergen Anticipated Claim 27.....	50
5. Van Bergen Anticipated Claim 28.....	50
C. Ground 5: Claim 4 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen And Bettstetter In View Of Sonera	51
D. Ground 6: Claims 19 And 20 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen And Bettstetter In View Of Kuusela.....	55

Table of Contents (continued)

	Page
1. Claim 19 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen And Bettstetter In View Of Kuusela.....	55
2. Claim 20 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen And Bettstetter In View Of Kuusela.....	56
E. Ground 7: Claim 21 Would Have Been Obvious Over Van Bergen And Bettstetter In View Of Eldredge.....	57
VI. CONCLUSION	58

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.