

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

Shenzhen Zhiyi Technology Co. Ltd., d/b/a iLife,  
Petitioner

v.

iRobot Corp.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Patent No. 6,809,490 to Jones et al.

IPR Case No. IPR2017-02061

---

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF CLAIMS 1-3,  
7, 12, AND 42 OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,809,490 UNDER 35  
U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.100 ET SEQ.**

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF EXHIBITS .....iv

I. MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(1) FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW.....1

    A. Real Party in Interest Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1).....1

    B. Related Matters Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2) .....1

    C. Lead and Backup Counsel Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3) and Service Information under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4).....2

II. PAYMENT OF FEES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.15 .....3

III. CERTIFICATION OF WORD COUNT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(D).....3

IV. REQUIREMENTS FOR IPR UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104.....3

    A. Grounds for Standing Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a).....3

    B. Identification of Challenge Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b) and Relief Requested.....3

V. OVERVIEW OF THE ALLEGED INVENTION .....4

    A. The Prosecution History of the '490 Patent .....4

        1. Priority Date.....4

        2. Prosecution of the '490 Patent .....5

    B. The Challenged Claims .....7

    C. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art (“POSITA”).....7

    D. Claim Construction .....7

        1. Agreed Constructions from Corresponding ITC Investigation.....8

        2. Disputed Terms from Corresponding ITC Investigation.....8

    E. Overview of Prior Art .....9

        1. Overview of Ueno-642 (Ex. 1004-Ueno) .....9

        2. Overview of Bissett-612 (Ex. 1005-Bissett).....11

VI. SPECIFIC GROUNDS FOR PETITION.....14

- A. Ground 1: Ueno-642 anticipates claims 1-3, 7, and 12.....14
  - 1. The scope and content of the prior art .....14
  - 2. Challenged Claims (1-3, 7, 12).....14
- B. Ground 2: Ueno-642 in view of Bissett-612 renders obvious claim 42 .....35
  - 1. The scope and content of the prior art .....35
  - 2. Rationale for combining Ueno-642 and Bissett-612 .....35
  - 3. Challenged Claim (42).....38
- VII. CONCLUSION.....41
- CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE .....42

**TABLE OF EXHIBITS**

<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Description</b>
1001	U.S. Patent No. 6,809,490 (“490 patent”)
1002	File history of U.S. Patent No. 6,809,490
1003	Declaration of C. Douglass Locke, Ph.D., Regarding Invalidity of the Challenged Claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,809,490 (“Locke”)
1004	Certified Translation of Japanese Unexamined Patent Application Publication H11-212642, published August 6, 1999 (“Ueno-642”)
1005	U.S. Patent No. 6,493,612 to Bissett (“Bissett-612”)
1006	Japanese Unexamined Patent Application Publication H11-212642, published August 6, 1999 (non-translated)
1007	Affidavit certifying translation of Japanese Unexamined Patent Application Publication H11-212642
1008	Joint Claim Construction Chart, as submitted in Investigation No. 337-TA-1057, August 18, 2017
1009	U.K. Patent Application 9827758
1010	PCT Publication WO 00/38026

iLife (“Petitioner”) hereby seeks *inter partes* review of Claims 1-3, 7, 12, and 42 (“the Challenged Claims”) of U.S. Patent No. 6,809,490 (Ex. 1001 (the “’490 patent”). The Challenged Claims of the ’490 patent do not claim anything new; they claim previously-known operational modes for mobile robots. The Challenged Claims in the patent should therefore be canceled for the reasons described in this Petition.

**I. MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(1) FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW**

**A. Real Party in Interest Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)**

The real parties-in-interest in this Petition are: Shenzhen Zhiyi Technology Co. Ltd. d/b/a iLife and iRobot Corp.

**B. Related Matters Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)**

There is a pending proceeding before the U.S. International Trade Commission that involves the Challenged Claims of the ’233 patent: *In re Certain Robotic Vacuum Cleaning Devices And Components Thereof Such As Spare Parts*, Investigation No. 337-TA-1057 (the “ITC Investigation”).

There is also a federal district court litigation filed by iRobot Corporation against Petitioner that also involves the Challenged Claims of the ’233 patent: *iRobot Corp. v. Shenzhen Zhiyi Technology Co. Ltd. d/b/a iLife*, Case No. 1:17-cv-10652 (D. Mass.) (the “District Court Case”).

# 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.