

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

| [APPLE INC/SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.](#),  
Petitioner,

v.

UNILOC LUXEMBOURG S.A.,  
Patent Owner

---

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW**

**OF**

**U.S. PATENT NO. 7,881,902**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<u>I.</u>	<u>INTRODUCTION.....</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>II.</u>	<u>MANDATORY NOTICES .....</u>	<u>1</u>
	<u>A. Real Party-in-Interest.....</u>	<u>1</u>
	<u>B. Related Matters .....</u>	<u>1</u>
	<u>C. Counsel and Service Information .....</u>	<u>32</u>
<u>III.</u>	<u> GROUNDS FOR STANDING .....</u>	<u>43</u>
<u>IV.</u>	<u> NOTE REGARDING PAGE CITATIONS AND EMPHASIS .....</u>	<u>43</u>
<u>V.</u>	<u> OVERVIEW OF THE '902 PATENT .....</u>	<u>43</u>
	<u>A. Summary of the Patent.....</u>	<u>43</u>
	<u>B. Prosecution History.....</u>	<u>54</u>
<u>VI.</u>	<u> LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....</u>	<u>65</u>
<u>VII.</u>	<u> CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....</u>	<u>65</u>
	<u>A. “dominant axis” .....</u>	<u>76</u>
	<u>B. “cadence window” .....</u>	<u>87</u>
<u>VIII.</u>	<u> RELIEF REQUESTED AND THE REASONS FOR THE REQUESTED RELIEF .....</u>	<u>87</u>
<u>IX.</u>	<u> IDENTIFICATION OF HOW THE CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE .....</u>	<u>97</u>
	<u>A. Challenged Claims .....</u>	<u>97</u>
	<u>B. Statutory Grounds for Challenges.....</u>	<u>98</u>
	<u>C. Challenge #1: Claims 1 and 2 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Mitchnick.....</u>	<u>108</u>

1.	<u>Summary of Mitchnick.....</u>	<u>108</u>
2.	<u>Mitchnick’s embodiments are combinable.....</u>	<u>1110</u>
3.	<u>Claim 1.....</u>	<u>1311</u>
4.	<u>Claim 2.....</u>	<u>1716</u>
D.	<u>Challenge #2: Claim 3 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C § 103 over Mitchnick and Sheldon.....</u>	<u>1817</u>
1.	<u>Summary of Sheldon .....</u>	<u>1817</u>
2.	<u>Reasons to Combine Mitchnick and Sheldon.....</u>	<u>1917</u>
3.	<u>Claim 3.....</u>	<u>2120</u>
E.	<u>Challenge #3: Claim 4 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Mitchnick, Sheldon, and Tanenhaus.....</u>	<u>2928</u>
1.	<u>Summary of Tanenhaus.....</u>	<u>2928</u>
2.	<u>Reasons to Combine Mitchnick, Sheldon, Tanenhaus .....</u>	<u>3028</u>
3.	<u>Claim 4.....</u>	<u>3231</u>
F.	<u>Challenge #4: Claim 5-6 and 9-10 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Fabio in view of Pasolini .....</u>	<u>3634</u>
1.	<u>State of the Art at the Time of the ’902 Patent.....</u>	<u>3635</u>
2.	<u>Summary of Fabio .....</u>	<u>3736</u>
3.	<u>Summary of Pasolini .....</u>	<u>4139</u>
4.	<u>Reasons to Combine Fabio and Pasolini .....</u>	<u>4342</u>
5.	<u>Claim 5.....</u>	<u>4745</u>
6.	<u>Claim 6.....</u>	<u>6058</u>
7.	<u>Claim 9.....</u>	<u>6361</u>

8. Claim 10.....	6967
X. CONCLUSION.....	7472
CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT.....	7673
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.....	7774
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. MANDATORY NOTICES.....	1
A. Real Party in Interest.....	1
B. Related Matters.....	1
C. Lead and Back-up Counsel and Service Information.....	2
III. GROUNDS FOR STANDING.....	2
IV. NOTE REGARDING PAGE CITATIONS AND EMPHASIS.....	3
V. OVERVIEW OF THE '902 PATENT.....	3
A. Summary of the Patent.....	3
B. Prosecution History.....	4
VI. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART.....	5
VII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	5
A. “dominant axis”.....	6
B. “cadence window”.....	7
VIII. RELIEF REQUESTED AND THE REASONS FOR THE REQUESTED RELIEF.....	7
IX. IDENTIFICATION OF HOW THE CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE.....	7
A. Challenged Claims.....	7

B. Statutory Grounds for Challenges.....	8
C. Challenge #1: Claims 1 and 2 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C § 103 over Mitchnick.....	8
1. Summary of Mitchnick.....	8
2. Mitchnick’s embodiments are combinable.....	10
3. Claim 1.....	11
4. Claim 2.....	16
D. Challenge #2: Claim 3 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C § 103 over Mitchnick and Sheldon.....	17
1. Summary of Sheldon.....	17
2. Reasons to Combine Mitchnick and Sheldon.....	17
3. Claim 3.....	20
E. Challenge #3: Claim 4 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C § 103 over Mitchnick, Sheldon, and Tanenhaus.....	28
1. Summary of Tanenhaus.....	28
2. Reasons to Combine Mitchnick, Sheldon, Tanenhaus.....	28
3. Claim 4.....	31
F. Challenge #4: Claim 5-6 and 9-10 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C §103 over Fabio in view of Pasolini.....	34
1. State of the Art at the Time of the ’902 Patent.....	35
2. Summary of Fabio.....	36
3. Summary of Pasolini.....	39
4. Reasons to Combine Fabio and Pasolini.....	42
5. Claim 5.....	45

# 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.