

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APPLE, INC.

Petitioner

v.

UNILOC LUXEMBOURG, S.A.

Patent Owner

---

IPR2018-01027

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 SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER 35 U.S.C. §  
325(D)..... 2

    A. Petitioner Had In Fact “Located” *Richardson* Prior To  
    Filing Its Petition In IPR2018-00389..... 3

    B. Petitioner Had The Benefit Of Patent Owner’s  
    Preliminary Response In IPR2018-00389..... 6

V. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART..... 7

VI. PETITIONER DOES NOT PROVE A REASONABLE  
    LIKELIHOOD OF UNPATENTABILITY FOR ANY  
    CHALLENGED CLAIM ..... 8

    A. Claim Construction ..... 8

        1. “dominant axis”..... 9

        2. “cadence window” ..... 10

    B. A POSITA Would Not Have Made The Hypothetical  
    Combination of *Fabio*, *Pasolini*, and *Richardson*  
    Because *Pasolini* Fails to Disclose “wherein the lower  
    threshold is adjusted based on at least one of a rolling  
    average of accelerations”; And Because *Pasolini*  
    Teaches Away From Averaging (Claims 4 and 19) ..... 11

        1. A POSITA Would Not Have Made The  
        Hypothetical Combination Because *Pasolini* Does  
        Not Disclose Averaging Of Accelerations ..... 11

        2. *Pasolini* Teaches Away From Averaging ..... 14

C. No *Prima Facie* Obviousness for “assigning a dominant axis with respect to gravity based on an orientation of the inertial sensor” (Claims 1 and 14)..... 15

D. No *Prima Facie* Obviousness for “detecting a change in the orientation of the inertial sensor and updating the dominant axis based on the change” (Claims 1 and 14)..... 19

E. No *Prima Facie* Obviousness for “updating the cadence window as actual cadence changes” (Claims 1 and 14) ..... 21

F. The Petition Should Further Be Denied Because Claims 4 and 19 Ultimately Depend From Claims 1 and 14. .... 23

VII. CONCLUSION..... 23

**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 IPR2018-01027 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 proceedings 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>Apple Inc. v. Uniloc USA, Inc</i>	IPR2018-00389	PTAB	Dec. 22, 2017
<i>Uniloc USA, Inc. et al v. Apple Inc.</i>	4-18-cv-00364	CAND	Jan. 17, 2018

### IV. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(d)

As the Petition admits, on December 22, 2017, Petitioner filed IPR2018-00389, challenging claims 1-3, 5-7, and 10-18 of the same patent that is the subject of the instant Petition (the '723 Patent). Further, Petitioner also acknowledges that Patent Owner had already filed its preliminary response to the Petition in IPR2018-

# 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.