

DOCKET NO.: 2211726-00152US1

Filed on behalf of Unified Patents Inc.

By: David L. Cavanaugh, Reg. No. 36,476
Michael Van Handel, Reg. No. 68,292
Ellyar Y. Barazesh, Reg. No. 74,096
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
1875 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20006
Tel: (202) 663-6000
Email: David.Cavanaugh@wilmerhale.com

Roshan Mansinghani, Reg. No. 62,429
Jonathan Stroud, Reg. No. 72,518
Unified Patents Inc.
1875 Connecticut Ave. NW, Floor 10
Washington, D.C., 20009
Tel: (214) 945-0200
Email: roshan@unifiedpatents.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

UNIFIED PATENTS INC.
Petitioner

v.

UNILOC LUXEMBOURG S.A. & UNILOC USA

IPR2018-00199
Patent 7,092,671

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 7,092,671
CHALLENGING CLAIMS 1–16
UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 312 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.104**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Mandatory Notices	1
A.	Real Party-in-Interest	1
B.	Related Matters.....	2
C.	Counsel.....	2
D.	Service Information, Email, Hand Delivery, and Postal.....	3
III.	Certification of Grounds for Standing	3
IV.	Overview of Challenge and Relief Requested.....	3
A.	Prior Art Patents and Printed Publications.....	3
B.	Grounds for Challenge	4
V.	Overview Of the '671 patent.....	4
A.	Summary of the Alleged Invention	4
B.	Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	7
C.	Prosecution History	7
VI.	Claim Construction	9
VII.	Specific Grounds for Petition.....	10
A.	Ground I: Claims 1–6 and 9–14 are obvious in view of Yun, Langlois, and Dykes.....	11
1.	Overview of Yun.....	11
2.	Claim 1 is obvious in view of Yun, Langlois, and Dykes	13
3.	Claim 2 is obvious in view of Yun, Langlois, and Dykes	26
4.	Claim 3 is obvious in view of Yun, Langlois, and Dykes	27
5.	Claim 4 is obvious in view of Yun, Langlois, and Dykes	28
6.	Claims 5 and 6 are obvious in view of Yun, Langlois, and Dykes.....	28
7.	Claim 9 is obvious in view of Yun, Langlois, and Dykes	31
8.	Claim 10 is obvious in view of Yun, Langlois, and Dykes	33
9.	Claim 11 is obvious in view of Yun, Langlois, and Dykes	34

10.	Claim 12 is obvious in view of Yun, Langlois, and Dykes	34
11.	Claims 13 and 14 are obvious in view of Yun, Langlois, and Dykes ..	35
B.	Ground II: Claims 7, 8, 15, and 16 are obvious in view of Yun, Langlois, Dykes, and Husemann	35
1.	Claims 7, 8, 15, and 16 are obvious in view of Yun, Langlois, Dykes, and Husemann.....	36
C.	Ground III: Claims 1–7 and 9–15 are obvious over Harris, Langlois, and Dykes.....	38
1.	The Grounds Presented In This Petition Are Not Redundant.....	38
2.	Overview of Harris.....	39
3.	Claim 1 is obvious in view of Harris, Langlois, and Dykes	41
4.	Claim 2 is obvious in view of Harris, Langlois, and Dykes	55
5.	Claim 3 is obvious in view of Harris, Langlois, and Dykes	56
6.	Claim 4 is obvious in view of Harris, Langlois, and Dykes	56
7.	Claims 5 and 6 are obvious in view of Harris, Langlois, and Dykes.....	57
8.	Claim 7 is obvious in view of Harris, Langlois, and Dykes	60
9.	Claim 9 is obvious in view of Harris, Langlois, and Dykes	61
10.	Claim 10 is obvious in view of Harris, Langlois, and Dykes	64
11.	Claim 11 is obvious in view of Harris, Langlois, and Dykes	64
12.	Claim 12 is obvious in view of Harris, Langlois, and Dykes	64
13.	Claims 13 and 14 are obvious in view of Harris, Langlois, and Dykes 65	
14.	Claim 15 is obvious in view of Harris, Langlois, and Dykes	66
D.	Ground IV: Claims 8 and 16 are obvious in view of Harris, Langlois, Dykes, and Husemann	66
1.	Claims 8 and 16 are obvious in view of Harris, Langlois, Dykes, and Husemann.....	66
VIII.	Conclusion	68

I. INTRODUCTION

Unified Patents, Inc. (“Petitioner”) respectfully submits this Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of claims 1-16 of U.S. Patent No. 7,092,671 (“the ’671 patent,” or “’671”) (EX1001). The ’671 patent discloses an automated telephone dialing system, where a “specific telephone number is selectable from a list displayed on [a] handheld computer system,” and where the handheld computer system is “configured to control [a] telephone via [a] wireless communication such that the telephone dials the specific telephone number.” *See, e.g.*, ’671 patent, claim 1. But there was nothing inventive about these claimed concepts when the ’671 patent was filed, and such concepts had been well-known long before the ’671 patent was filed. The ’671 patent’s claims would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the ’671 patent was filed.

II. MANDATORY NOTICES

A. Real Party-in-Interest

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1), Unified Patents Inc. (“Unified” or “Petitioner”) certifies that Unified is the real party-in-interest, and further certifies that no other party exercised control or could exercise control over Unified’s participation in this proceeding, the filing of this petition, or the conduct of any ensuing trial.

B. Related Matters

U.S. Pat. No. 7,092,671 (EX1001) is owned by Uniloc Luxembourg S.A. and is exclusively licensed to Uniloc USA (collectively “Uniloc”). The status of cases asserting this patent is provided in the table below.

Case Caption	Case Number	District	Case Filed	Status
<i>Uniloc USA, Inc. et al. v. Samsung Electronics America, Inc. et al.</i>	2:17-cv-00562	EDTX	August 1, 2017	Dismissed, August 10, 2017
<i>Uniloc USA, Inc. et al. v. Apple Inc.</i>	2:17-cv-00457	EDTX	May 26, 2017	Pending
Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review by Apple Inc.	IPR2018-00282	PTAB	December 6, 2017	Pending

The *Uniloc USA, Inc. et al. v. Apple Inc.* case is still in its early stages. The Petition for *Inter Partes* Review by Apple Inc. is distinct from this Petition because it uses different prior art combinations that address the claims in a different way.

C. Counsel

Lead Counsel: David L. Cavanaugh (Registration No. 36,476)

Backup Counsel: Roshan Mansinghani (Registration No. 62,429)

Backup Counsel: Jonathan Stroud (Registration No. 72,518)

Backup Counsel: Michael Van Handel (Registration No. 68,292)

Backup Counsel: Ellyar Y. Barazesh (Registration No. 74,096)

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.