

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE, INC.

Petitioner

v.

UNILOC LUXEMBOURG, S.A.

Patent Owner

IPR2018-00282

PATENT 7,092,671

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION

PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §42.107(a)

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. THE '671 PATENT 1

III. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART 2

IV. PETITIONER DOES NOT PROVE A REASONABLE
LIKELIHOOD OF UNPATENTABILITY FOR ANY
CHALLENGED CLAIM..... 2

 A. Claim Construction..... 3

 B. The Redundant Challenge in Ground 3 is Procedurally
 and Substantively deficient..... 4

 C. No *Prima Facie* Obviousness for “wherein the handheld
 computer system is configured to control the telephone
 via the wireless communication such that the telephone
 dials the specific telephone number.” 5

 1. [Challenge 1 and 2]: *Yun*’s “electronic
 pocketbook” Does Not “control the telephone via
 the wireless communication such that the
 telephone dials the specific telephone number” 6

 2. [Challenge 3]: *Harris*’ “PDA” Does Not “control
 the telephone via the wireless communication
 such that the telephone dials the specific
 telephone number” 9

V. THE SUPREME COURT IS CURRENTLY REVIEWING
THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF INTER PARTES
REVIEW 10

VI. CONCLUSION 11

I. INTRODUCTION

Uniloc Luxembourg S.A. (the “Uniloc” or “Patent Owner”) submits this Preliminary Response to Petition IPR2018-00282 for *Inter Partes* Review (“Pet.” or “Petition”) of United States Patent No. 7,092,671 (“the ’671 patent” or “EX1001”) filed by Apple, Inc. (“Petitioner”). The instant Petition is procedurally and substantively defective for at least the reasons set forth herein.

II. THE ’671 PATENT

The ’671 patent is titled “Method and System for Wirelessly Autodialing a Telephone Number From a Record Stored On a Personal Information Device.” The ’671 patent issued August 15, 2006, from U.S. Patent Application No. 09/727,727 filed November 30, 2000 and originally assigned 3Com Corporation (3Com).

The inventors of the ’671 patent observed that while cellphones shared many attributes with personal information devices, at the time of the invention, cellphones typically had substantially fewer applications and users found them much more difficult to use when entering data such as names and phone numbers than personal information devices. EX1001, 1:46-53. And because of those limitations at the time, cellphones were more typically used just for communication rather than personal information management. *Id.*, 1:54-57. The inventors at 3Com came up with an innovative solution which allowed the applications executed on a user’s personal information device to access the user’s telephone and automatically dial numbers stored in the application program. *Id.* 2:11-22.

According to the invention of the ’671 Patent, the telephone is equipped with

a wireless port for short-range wireless data transfer. Similarly, the personal information device is equipped with a wireless port for short-range wireless data transfer. *Id.*, 2:41-45. The personal information device establishes a wireless communication with the telephone. *Id.* The personal information device is configured to control the telephone via the wireless communications such that the telephone dials a telephone number stored on the personal information device. *Id.*, 2:45-48. The telephone number can be dialed in response to the user interacting with application executing on the personal information device. *Id.*, 2:48-54. The application can be a contact management or address management program. The user can interact with the program, select a contact, address, phone number, or the like, through a user interface of the personal information device, and have this number automatically dialed by the telephone. In this manner, the user's personal information device seamlessly interacts with the user's telephone to dial numbers and establish phone calls without requiring the user to access controls of the telephone. *Id.*

III. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART

Given that the Petition does not offer a definition of a person of ordinary skill in the art (“POSITA”), Patent Owner does not offer a competing definition for POSITA at this preliminary stage, but reserves the right to do so in the event that trial is instituted.

IV. PETITIONER DOES NOT PROVE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF UNPATENTABILITY FOR ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM

Petitioner has the burden of proof to establish entitlement to relief. 37 C.F.R.

§42.108(c) (“review shall not be instituted for a ground of unpatentability unless . . . there is a reasonable likelihood that at least one of the claims challenged . . . is unpatentable”). The Petition should be denied as failing to meet this burden.

The Petition raises the following obviousness challenges:

Ground	Claims	Reference(s)
1	1-6 and 9-14	<i>Yun</i> ¹ and <i>Kikinis</i> ²
2	7 and 15	<i>Yun</i> and <i>Kikinis</i> and in further view of <i>Inoue</i> ³
3	1-7 and 9-15	<i>Harris</i> ⁴ and <i>Kikinis</i>

A. Claim Construction

Patent Owner submits that the Board need not construe any claim term in a particular manner in order to arrive at the conclusion that the Petition is substantively deficient. *Wellman, Inc. v. Eastman Chem. Co.*, 642 F.3d 1355, 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2011) (“need only be construed to the extent necessary to resolve the controversy”).

While the Petition purports to construe the term “wireless port,” as will be described below, the Petition fails to show any of the challenged claims are unpatentable regardless of Petitioner’s proposed construction. Therefore, at this preliminary stage, Patent Owner does not provide a construction for the term “wireless port,” but reserves the right to do so in the event trial is instituted.

¹ EX1005, U.S. Patent 6,084,949 (“*Yun*”).

² EX1006, U.S. Patent 5,790,644 (“*Kikinis*”).

³ EX1007, U.S. Patent 7,080,154 (“*Inoue*”).

⁴ EX1012, U.S. Patent 6,738,643 (“*Harris*”).

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.