

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner

v.

UNILOC LUXEMBOURG, S.A.
Patent Owner

IPR2017-2041
U.S. PATENT NO. 8,239,852

**PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a)**

Table of Contents

I.	INTRODUCTION	4
II.	THE ‘852 PATENT	5
	A. Effective Filing Date of the ‘852 Patent	5
	B. Overview of the ‘852 Patent	5
	C. Prosecution History of the ‘852 Patent	8
IV.	THE PETITION IS IMPERMISSIBLY REDUNDANT	12
V.	THERE IS NO REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT EVEN ONE OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS IS UNPATENTABLE	15
	A. Claim Construction	16
	B. No prima facie obviousness for “the unique device identifier [being] generated based at least in part on the determined machine parameters”	17
	1. Michiels is deficient	18
	2. Edwards is deficient	19
	3. Eisen is deficient	20
	4. Schull is deficient	22
	5. Sprong is deficient	26
	C. No Prima Facie Obviousness for Dependent Claims 2–8 and 16-17	28
VII.	THE SUPREME COURT IS CURRENTLY REVIEWING THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF INTER PARTES REVIEW	28
VIII.	CONCLUSION	29

List of Exhibits

Exhibit No.	Description
2001	U.S. Patent No. 6,467,088 to alSafadi
2002	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2009/0037337, listing Baitalmaal as inventor
2003	U.S. Patent No. 6,880,086 to Kidder
2004	Opening Claim Construction Brief in U.S. District Court Case No 2:17-cv-258 between Petitioner and Patent Owner

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §313 and 37 C.F.R. §42.107(a), Uniloc USA, Inc. and Uniloc Luxembourg S.A. (the “Patent Owner” or “Uniloc”) submit Uniloc’s Preliminary Response to the Petition for *Inter Partes* Review (“Pet.” or “Petition”) of United States Patent No. 8,239,852 (“the ‘852 patent” or “Ex. 1001”) filed by Apple Inc. (“Petitioner”) in IPR2017-2041.

In view of the reasons presented herein, the Petition should be denied in its entirety as failing to meet the threshold burden of proving there is a reasonable likelihood that at least one challenged claim is unpatentable. As a procedural deficiency, the Petition should be denied as presenting at least *five* redundant challenges of Claims 1-8 and 16-18 without providing the requisite justification for such redundancy.

Notwithstanding the redundancies in the Petition, and because the Board has yet to decide which grounds it intends to dismiss as impermissibly redundant, Uniloc addresses each redundant ground and provides specific examples of how Petitioner failed to establish that it is more likely than not that it would prevail with respect to at least one of the challenged ‘852 Patent claims. As a non-limiting example described in more detail below, the Petition fails the all-elements-rule in not addressing every feature of the claim.

Accordingly, Uniloc respectfully requests that the Board decline institution of trial on Claims 1-8 and 16-18 of the ‘852 Patent.

II. THE '852 PATENT

A. Effective Filing Date of the '852 Patent

The '852 patent is titled "Remote Update of Computer Based on Physical Device Recognition." The '852 Patent issued on August 7, 2012 from United States Patent Application No. 12/818,906, which claims priority to provisional Application No. 61/220,092, filed on June 24, 2009. The Petition does not dispute the effective filing date of the '852 patent is June 24, 2009.

B. Overview of the '852 Patent

The '852 Patent discloses various embodiments for remote updating of software. The '852 discloses, in a client-server system, a specialized software program stored on the client device that generates a unique device identifier for the client device, which is derived from multiple machine parameters readable on the client device. The unique device identifier when transmitted to the server along with the unique software identifier allows the server to determine, among other things, whether the client device is licensed to receive an upgrade for the application identifier. *See, e.g.*, Ex.1002 (Prosecution History), pp. 994.¹

¹ All citations to Exhibit 1002 ("Ex. 1002") are made to the page numbering in the footer added by Petitioner.

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.