

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE, INC.

Petitioner

v.

UNILOC LUXEMBOURG, S.A.

Patent Owner

IPR2018-00389

PATENT 8,712,723

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION

PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §42.107(a)

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. THE '723 PATENT 1

III. RELATED PROCEEDINGS..... 2

IV. THE PETITION DOES NOT DEFINE THE LEVEL OF
ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART 2

V. PETITIONER DOES NOT PROVE A REASONABLE
LIKELIHOOD OF UNPATENTABILITY FOR ANY
CHALLENGED CLAIM..... 3

 A. Claim Construction..... 3

 1. “dominant axis” 4

 2. “cadence window” 5

 3. “a dominant axis logic to determine an orientation
of a device with respect to gravity, to assign a
dominant axis, and to update the dominant axis
when the orientation of the device changes”..... 6

 4. “a counting logic to count periodic human
motions by monitoring accelerations relative to
the dominant axis by counting the periodic human
motions when accelerations showing a motion
cycle that meets motion criteria is detected within
a cadence window” 7

 5. “a cadence logic to update the cadence window as
actual cadence changes” 9

 B. No *Prima Facie* Obviousness for “assigning a dominant
axis with respect to gravity based on an orientation of
the inertial sensor” 10

 C. No *Prima Facie* Obviousness for “detecting a change in

the orientation of the inertial sensor and updating the dominant axis based on the change” 14

D. No *Prima Facie* Obviousness for “updating the cadence window as actual cadence changes” 16

E. The Petition Should Be Denied as To Challenged Dependent Claims 2-3, 5-7, 11-13, and 15-18. 19

VI. THE SUPREME COURT IS CURRENTLY REVIEWING THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF INTER PARTES REVIEW 19

VII. CONCLUSION 19

List of Exhibits

Exhibit No.	Description
2001	Declaration of William C. Easttom

I. INTRODUCTION

Uniloc Luxembourg S.A. (the “Uniloc” or “Patent Owner”) submits this Preliminary Response to Petition IPR2018-00389 for *Inter Partes* Review (“Pet.” or “Petition”) of United States Patent No. 8,712,723 (“the ’723 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 ’723 PATENT

The ’723 patent is titled “Human activity monitoring device.” The ’723 patent issued April 29, 2014, from U.S. Patent Application No. 13/018,321 filed January 31, 2011.

The inventors of the ’723 patent observed that at the time, step counting devices that utilize an inertial sensor to measure motion to detect steps generally required the user to first position the device in a limited set of orientations. In some devices, the required orientations are dictated to the user by the device. In other devices, the beginning orientation is not critical, so long as this orientation can be maintained. EX1001, 1:29-34. Further, the inventors observed that devices at the time were often confused by motion noise experienced by the device throughout a user's daily routine. The noise would cause false steps to be measured and actual steps to be missed in conventional step counting devices. Conventional step counting devices also failed to accurately measure steps for individuals who walk at a slow pace. *Id.*, 1:35-40.

According to the invention of the ’723 Patent, a device to monitor human activity using an inertial sensor assigns a dominant axis after determining the

orientation of an inertial sensor. The orientation of the inertial sensor is continuously determined, and the dominant axis is updated as the orientation of the inertial sensor changes. *Id.*, 2:14-19.

III. RELATED PROCEEDINGS

The following are currently pending cases concerning U.S. Pat. No. 8,712,723 (EX1001).

Case Caption	Case Number	District	Case Filed
<i>Uniloc USA, Inc. et al. v. Apple Inc.</i>	2-17-cv-00522	TXED	June 30, 2017
<i>Uniloc USA, Inc. et al v. Samsung Electronics America, Inc. et al</i>	2-17-cv-00650	TXED	Sept. 15, 2017
<i>Uniloc USA, Inc. et al v. LG Electronics USA, Inc. et al</i>	4-17-cv-00832	TXND	Oct. 13, 2017
<i>Uniloc USA, Inc. et al v. HTC America, Inc.</i>	2-17-cv-01629	WAWD	Nov. 1, 2017
<i>Uniloc USA, Inc. et al v. Huawei Device USA, Inc. et al</i>	2-17-cv-00737	TXED	Nov. 9, 2017
<i>Uniloc USA, Inc. et al v. Apple Inc.</i>	4-18-cv-00364	CAND	Jan. 17, 2018

IV. THE PETITION DOES NOT DEFINE THE LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART

The Petition does not offer a definition of a person of ordinary skill in the art (“POSITA”) and therefore has not provided the perspective from which to properly analyze its patentability challenge. Given that the burden lies with Petitioner, Patent Owner does not cure this deficiency at this preliminary stage by offering its own definition for POSITA. Nevertheless, Patent Owner reserves the right to offer a

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.