

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APPLE, INC.

Petitioner

v.

UNILOC LUXEMBOURG, S.A.<sup>1</sup>

Patent Owner

---

IPR2018-01028

PATENT 7,881,902

---

**PATENT OWNER RESPONSE TO PETITION**

**PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §42.120**

---

<sup>1</sup> The owner of this patent is Uniloc 2017 LLC.

## Table of Contents

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	THE '902 PATENT .....	1
III.	RELATED PROCEEDINGS.....	2
IV.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....	2
V.	PROSECUTION HISTORY .....	3
VI.	PETITIONER FAILS TO MEET ITS BURDEN OF PROOF .....	5
A.	No construction needed for “cadence window” term.....	5
B.	The fatal deficiencies of Ground 1 taint the entire Petition.....	6
1.	The Board correctly found Fabio’s validation window TV is not a default cadence window .....	6
2.	The Petition fails to prove Fabio’s threshold time Ts1 is a “default cadence window” as claimed.....	8
3.	The Petition fails to prove it would have been obvious to <i>modify</i> Fabio’s validation window TV to allegedly map onto the claimed “default cadence window” .....	10
4.	The Petition fails to prove obviousness of “when the step count is at or above the step count threshold, determining a dynamic step cadence window and using the dynamic step cadence window to identify the time frame within which to monitor for the next step” .....	13
C.	Petitioner fails to prove obviousness of the additional limitations recited in dependent claim 8.....	16
VII.	CONCLUSION .....	19

## I. INTRODUCTION

Uniloc 2017 LLC (“Uniloc” or “Patent Owner”) submits this Response to Petition IPR2018-01028 for *Inter Partes* Review (“Pet.” or “Petition”) of United States Patent No. 7,881,902 (“the ’902 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 ’902 PATENT

The ’902 patent is titled “Human activity monitoring device.” The ’902 patent issued February 1, 2011, from U.S. Patent Application No. 12/694,135 filed January 26, 2010, and is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application No. 11/644,455 filed December 22, 2006.

The inventors of the ’902 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, 1:23–30. 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.*, 1:31–38. These non-exhaustive, example deficiencies of the art are among those that certain disclosed embodiments of the ’902 patent overcome.

According to certain embodiments of the '902 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.*, 2:8–15.

### III. RELATED PROCEEDINGS

The following proceedings are currently pending cases concerning U.S. Pat. No. 7,881,902 (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	September 15, 2017
<i>Uniloc USA, Inc. et al v. LG Electronics USA, Inc. et al</i>	4-17-cv-00832	TXND	October 13, 2017
<i>Uniloc USA, Inc. et al v. HTC America, Inc.</i>	2-17-cv-01629	WAWD	November 1, 2017
<i>Uniloc USA, Inc. et al v. Huawei Device USA, Inc. et al</i>	2-17-cv-00737	TXED	November 9, 2017
<i>Apple Inc. v. Uniloc USA, Inc.</i>	IPR2018-00424	PTAB	Jan. 5, 2018
<i>Uniloc USA, Inc. et al v. Apple Inc.</i>	4-18-cv-00364	CAND	January 17, 2018

### IV. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART

The Petition alleges that “a person of ordinary skill in the art (“POSITA”) would include someone who had, at the priority date of the '902 Patent (i) a

Bachelor's degree in Electrical Engineering, Computer Engineering, and/or Computer Science, or equivalent training, and (ii) approximately two years of experience working in hardware and/or software design and development related to MEMS (micro-electro-mechanical) devices and body motion sensing systems.” Pet. 5. Given that Petitioner fails to meet its burden of proof when purportedly applying its own definition of a person of ordinary skill in the art, Patent Owner does not offer a competing definition for purposes of this proceeding.

## V. PROSECUTION HISTORY

The Petition neglects to mention it relies upon a reference the U.S. Patent Office has already found to be distinguishable from certain limitations also recited in the challenged claims. The '902 patent is part of a family of related patents including U.S. Patent Nos. 8,712,723 (“the '723 patent”). The '902 and '723 patents share a specification in common.

During prosecution of the application that issued as to the related '723 patent, the Examiner cited the same *Pasolini* reference<sup>2</sup> primarily relied upon in the instant Petition. In response, the Applicant successfully distinguished *Pasolini* as failing to “teach or suggest the use of cadence windows.”<sup>3</sup> In doing so, Applicant

---

<sup>2</sup> The prosecution history of the '723 patent references the printed publication (U.S. Serial App. Pub. No. 2007/0143068) of the same *Pasolini* reference that ultimately issued as U.S. Patent No. 7,463,997. The Petition opted to cite the issued patent in lieu of the printed publication.

<sup>3</sup> See Public File Wrapper of '723 patent, Response dated Jan. 29, 2013 (at p. 6 of 9) to Office Action dated Sept. 26, 2012 (*also filed by Petitioner as Exhibit 1002 in related-matter IPR2018-00389, at pp. 142 of 454*).

# 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.