

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

UNILOC LUXEMBOURG, S.A.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-00395
Patent 6,622,018 B1

Before MIRIAM L. QUINN, CHARLES J. BOUDREAU, and
GARTH D. BAER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

BAER, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Institution of *Inter Partes* Review
37 C.F.R. § 42.108

Apple, Inc. (“Petitioner”) filed a Petition (Paper 2, “Pet.”) requesting *inter partes* review of claims 1–27 of U.S. Patent No. 6,622,018 B1 (Ex. 1001, “the ’018 patent”). Uniloc Luxembourg, S.A. (“Patent Owner”) filed a Preliminary Response (Paper 6, “PO Prelim. Resp.”).

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 314(a), an *inter partes* review may not be instituted unless “the information presented in the petition . . . shows that there is a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition.” Having considered the Petition and the Preliminary Response, we determine that there is a reasonable likelihood that Petitioner would prevail in establishing that claims 1–27 of the ’018 patent are unpatentable. Therefore, for the reasons set forth below, we institute an *inter partes* review of claims 1–27.

I. BACKGROUND

A. RELATED PROCEEDINGS

The parties assert that the ’018 patent is involved in *Uniloc USA, Inc. v. Logitech, Inc.*, 3:17-cv-06733-JSC (N.D. Cal. 2017); *Uniloc USA, Inc. v. Wink Labs Inc.*, 1:17-cv-01656-GMS (D. Del. 2017); *Uniloc USA, Inc. v. Motorola Mobility, LLC*, 1:17-cv-01657-GMS (D. Del. 2017); *Uniloc USA, Inc. v. Peel Technologies, Inc.*, 1:17-cv-01552-UNA (D. Del. 2017); *Uniloc USA, Inc. v. Huawei Device USA, Inc.*, 2:17-cv-00707-JRG (E.D. Tex. 2017); *Uniloc USA, Inc. v. HTC America, Inc.*, 2:17-cv-01558-JLR (W.D. Wash. 2017); *Uniloc USA, Inc. v. LG Electronics U.S.A., Inc.* 4:17-cv-00825-O (N.D. Tex. 2017); *Uniloc USA, Inc. v. Apple, Inc.*, 2:17-cv-00470-JRG (E.D. Tex. 2017); and concurrently filed IPR2018-00394. Pet. 2–3; Paper 4, 2.

B. THE '018 PATENT

The '018 patent is titled “Portable Device Control Console with Wireless Connection” and describes a system for controlling a remote device over a wireless connection. Ex. 1001, Abstract, 1:27–28. The '018 patent teaches that a portable computer system can control a variety of remote devices, including newly introduced devices. *Id.* at 3:2–4. To discover new devices, the portable computer system transmits a broadcast message to discover compliant devices within range. *Id.* at 8:33–41. Compliant devices receiving the broadcast message then reply to the portable computer system with a response. *Id.* at 8:42–44. After one or more devices are discovered, the portable computer system can transmit a command to a selected remote device based on the type of device and its capabilities. *Id.* at 8:56–61. The '018 patent explains that a user can control a remote device by either touching a rendering on the computer system's display or by using an input device such as a stroke or character recognition pad that can register stylus movements on the portable computer system. *Id.* at 6:20–22, 6:67–7:9, 9:25–50.

C. ILLUSTRATIVE CLAIM

Of the challenged claims, claims 1, 11, and 21 are independent.

Independent claim 1 (reproduced below) is representative.

1. A method for controlling a remote devices over a wireless connection, said method comprising:

a) establishing said wireless connection between a transceiver and said remote device by:

broadcasting a message, said message for locating remote devices within range of said transceiver; and

receiving a response from said remote device;

b) manifesting said remote device on a display device;

c) registering a position where contact is made with a surface of an input device, wherein a particular position on said input device is translated into a particular command for controlling said remote device; and

d) transmitting a command to said remote device over said wireless connection.

Ex. 1001, 12:7–19.

D. ASSERTED GROUNDS OF UNPATENTABILITY

Petitioner asserts the following grounds of unpatentability:

References	Basis	Challenged Claim(s)
Leichiner ¹ and Idiot's Guide ²	§ 103(a)	1–7 and 9
Leichiner, Idiot's Guide, and Dara-Abrams ³	§ 103(a)	8
Leichiner, Idiot's Guide, and Bell ⁴	§ 103(a)	10

¹ Japanese Pub. No. JPH06319177 (Nov. 15, 1994) (certified English translation) (Ex. 1027, "Leichiner").

² Preston Gralla, "The Complete Idiot's Guide to PalmPilot and Palm III" (1999) (Ex. 1008, "Idiot's Guide").

³ U.S. Patent No. 6,456,892 B1 (Sep. 24, 2002) (Ex. 1010, "Dara-Abrams").

⁴ U.S. Patent No. 7,894,474 B1 (Feb. 22, 2011) (Ex. 1029, "Bell").

References	Basis	Challenged Claim(s)
Leichiner, Idiot's Guide, and Osterhout ⁵	§ 103(a)	11–17, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, and 27
Leichiner, Idiot's Guide, Osterhout, and Dara-Abrams	§ 103(a)	18 and 26
Leichiner, Idiot's Guide, Osterhout, and Bell	§ 103(a)	20 and 23

Pet. 12.

II. ANALYSIS

A. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION

Neither party offers any express claim constructions. *See id.* at 11; PO Prelim. Resp. 7. We conclude no additional express claim construction is necessary for our determination of whether to institute *inter partes* review of the challenged claims. *See Vivid Techs., Inc. v. Am. Sci. & Eng'g, Inc.*, 200 F.3d 795, 803 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (“[O]nly those terms need be construed that are in controversy, and only to the extent necessary to resolve the controversy.”).

B. ASSERTED PRIOR ART

1. Leichiner (Ex. 1027)

Leichiner is a Japanese patent publication titled “Adaptive Remote Control System.” It teaches “an adaptive intelligent controller similar to a handheld remote controller for interacting with a responding controlled device.” *See Ex. 1027, Abstract.* Leichiner teaches “[t]he controlled device, which is positioned close to the controller, is polled by the controller with regards to availability.” *Id.* Then, “[t]he controlled device responds to the

⁵ U.S. Patent No. 7,149,506 B2 (Dec. 12, 2006) (Ex. 1011, “Osterhout”).

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.