

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

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TELIT WIRELESS SOLUTIONS INC.
and
TELIT COMMUNICATIONS PLC,
Petitioners,

v.

M2M SOLUTIONS LLC
Patent Owner

Case IPR2016-00055
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 22313-14

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	1
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	2
A. “Coded Number”	2
B. “The transmissions including the at least one telephone number of IP address and the coded number”	2
C. “numbers to which the programmable communicator device is configured to and permitted to send outgoing wireless transmissions”	4
IV. STANDARD FOR INSTITUTING INTER PARTES REVIEW	7
V. GROUNDS 1, 4-8, AND 10-14 SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE THEY PRESENT THE SAME ART AND ARGUMENT PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED BY THE OFFICE.....	8
A. Bettstetter et al., GSM Phase 2+ General Packet Radio Service GPRS: Architecture, Protocols, and Air Interface, IEEE Communications Survey Was Considered During Prosecution	8
B. Eldredge Was Considered During Prosecution.....	9
C. The Petitioners Make No Attempt to Overcome the Presumption of Administrative Correctness	9
D. Petitioners Add Nothing More than What Is Already in the Record with Respect to Bettstetter and Eldredge.....	11
VI. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE IT FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS.....	12
A. Petitioners’ Obviousness Analysis Is Inadequate	13
1. The Petitioners failed to articulate the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art.....	13
2. The Petitioners improperly embed an additional prior art reference in their arguments for Grounds 1 and 8.	14
3. The Petitioners have not provided an adequate rationale to combine the references	15
B. Van Bergen in View of Bettstetter Fail Either to Disclose All Elements in the Claims 1-3, 5-18, 22, 23, 29 and 30 or to	

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

Render Those Claims Obvious as Alleged in Ground 1 or in View of the Falcom User Manual as Alleged in Ground 8.....	16
1. “wherein the programmable interface is programmable by wireless packet switched data messages” (element (b));.....	18
2. “wherein the programmable communicator device is configured to use a memory to store at least one telephone number or IP address included within at least one of the transmissions as one or more stored telephone numbers or IP addresses if the processing module authenticates the at least one of the transmissions including the at least one telephone number or IP address and the coded number by determining that the at least one of the transmissions includes the coded number,”(element (d)).....	21
3. “the one or more stored telephone numbers or IP addresses being numbers to which the programmable communicator device is configured to and permitted to send outgoing wireless transmissions;” (element (e))	26
4. “wherein the one or more wireless transmissions from the programming transmitter comprises a General Packet Radio Service (GPRS) or other wireless packet switched data message; ” (element (g))	30
5. “wherein the programmable communicator device is configured to process data received through the programmable interface from the at least one monitored technical device in response to programming instructions received in an incoming wireless packet switched data message.”(element (h))	38
6. Van Bergen, Bettstetter and/or Falcom do not disclose all of the elements of claim 29.	40
C. Van Bergen Fails to Disclose Material Elements Present in Dependent Claims 5, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, and 17.	42
1. “A programmable communicator device according to claim 1 further configured to request that an at least one monitored technical device send data through the programmable interface for processing by the programmable communicator device in response to	

programming instructions received in an incoming wireless packet switched data message.” (Claim 5)42

“A programmable communicator device according to claim 1 further configured to request that an at least one monitored technical device send data through the programmable interface for receipt by the programmable communicator device in response to programming instructions received in an incoming wireless packet switched data message.” (Claim 12).....42

2. “A programmable communicator device according to claim 6 further configured to determine whether a data request initiated by the monitoring device includes a required access code in response to programming instructions received in an incoming wireless packet switched data message.”(Claim 8).....44

3. “A programmable communicator device according to claim 1 further configured to determine whether the processed received data indicates a change in status of the at least one monitored technical device that crosses a threshold parameter, or that otherwise indicates an alarm condition in response to programming instructions received in an incoming wireless packet switched data message.” (Claim 10).....45

4. “A programmable communicator device according to claim 1 further configured to transmit the received data to an at least one monitoring device either periodically or in response to a data request initiated by the monitoring device in response to programming instructions received in an incoming wireless packet switched data message.” (Claim 13)47

5. “A programmable communicator device according to claim 1 configured to process an at least one data monitoring or data collection request contained in an at least one transmission received from an at least one monitoring device in response to programming instructions received in an incoming wireless packet switched data message.” (Claim 15).....47

6. “A programmable communicator device according to claim 1 further comprising a location processing module

configured to determine an at least one location of the programmable communicator device, and wherein the programmable communicator device is configured to respond to an at least one transmission initiated by an at least one monitoring device requesting that said location data be sent to the monitoring device in response to programming instructions received in an incoming wireless packet switched data message.” (Claim 16)49

“A programmable communicator device according to claim 16 wherein the location processing module comprises a Global Positioning System (GPS) module.” (Claim 17)49

D. Van Bergen Fails Either to Disclose All Elements in Claims 24-28 as Alleged in Ground 2 or in View of the Falcom User Manual Render Those Claims Obvious as Alleged in Ground 9.....51

1. Van Bergen and/or Falcom do not disclose all of the elements of claim 2451

2. Van Bergen, and/or Falcom do not disclose all of the elements of claims 25-27.52

E. Van Bergen in View of Applicant Admitted Prior Art Fail to Render Claims 25-27 Obvious as Alleged in Ground 3 or in View of the Falcom User Manual as Alleged in Ground 10.....54

F. Van Bergen and Bettstetter in View of Applicant Admitted Prior Art Fail to Render Claims 29-30 Obvious as Alleged in in Ground 4 or in View of the Falcom User Manual as Alleged in Ground 11.....55

G. Van Bergen and Bettstetter in View of Sonera Fail to Render Claim 4 Obvious as Alleged in in Ground 5 or in View of the Falcom User Manual as Alleged in Ground 12.....56

H. Van Bergen and Bettstetter in View of Kuusela Fail to Render Claims 19-20 Obvious as Alleged in in Ground 6 or in View of the Falcom User Manual as Alleged in Ground 13.....57

I. Van Bergen and Bettstetter in View of Eldredge Fail to Render Claim 21 Obvious as Alleged in in Ground 7 or in View of the Falcom User Manual as Alleged in Ground 14.....59

VII. Conclusion60

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.