

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.

Petitioners

v.

UNILOC LUXEMBOURG, S.A.¹

Patent Owner

IPR2018-01653

PATENT 7,881,902

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION

PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §42.107(a)

¹ 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	3
V.	PROSECUTION HISTORY.....	3
VI.	PETITIONER FAILS TO ESTABLISH UNPATENTABILITY FOR ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM.....	5
A.	Claim Construction.....	6
1.	“dominant axis”	6
2.	“cadence window”.....	12
3.	“periodically sampling acceleration data at a predetermined sampling rate, wherein each sample includes acceleration data measured by the inertial sensor over a predetermined period of time”	12
B.	Ground 4 Fails	14
1.	The cited <i>Fabio</i> and <i>Pasolini</i> references fail to disclose “using a default step cadence window to identify a time frame within which to monitor for a next step” (Claim 5).....	14
a)	Petitioner fails to prove <i>Fabio</i> ’s validation interval (VT) maps onto Petitioner’s own definition for “cadence window”	14
b)	<i>Fabio</i> ’s T _{S1} is not a default cadence window.....	16
2.	The cited <i>Fabio</i> and <i>Pasolini</i> references fail to	

disclose “when the step count is at or above the step count threshold, determining a dynamic step cadence window” (Claim 5)..... 18

3. The cited *Fabio* and *Pasolini* references fail to disclose “using the dynamic step cadence window to identify the time frame within which to monitor for the next step” 20

4. The cited *Fabio* and *Pasolini* references fail to disclose “assigning a dominant axis based on the orientation” 21

5. The Petition should fail as to the challenged dependent claims in Ground 4..... 22

C. Grounds 1-3 Fail 22

1. The Petition Fails to Show *Mitchnick*’s Embodiments Are Combinable 22

a) *Mitchnick* fails to teach an embodiment that can be a “mobile device” as claimed 23

b) Petitioner fails to provide the required analysis and explanation of how and why *Mitchnick* would be modified to make the hypothetical “external device” 25

2. There is no *Prima Facie* obviousness for “detecting motion by an inertial sensor included in a mobile device” 29

3. *Mitchnick* fails to disclose “determining, by the mobile device, whether the motion has a motion signature indicative of a user activity that the mobile device is configured to monitor.” 30

4. The Petition Fails as to challenged dependent claims in Grounds 1-3 32

VII. THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF INTER PARTES REVIEW IS THE SUBJECT OF A PENDING APPEAL..... 32

VIII. CONCLUSION.....32

List of Exhibits

Exhibit No.	Description
2001	Declaration of William C. Easttom
2002	United States Patent No. 5,593,431 to Sheldon (“ <i>Sheldon II</i> ”)

I. INTRODUCTION

Uniloc 2017 LLC (“Uniloc” or “Patent Owner”) submits this Preliminary Response to Petition IPR2018-01653² for *Inter Partes* Review (“Pet.” or “Petition”) of United States Patent No. 7,881,902 (“the ’902 Patent” or “EX1001”) filed Samsung Electronics America, 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

² The instant Petition and Petitioner seek joinder to IPR2018-00424. *See* Paper 3. Furthermore, as Petitioners state, the instant Petition is “substantially similar” to the original petition in IPR2018-00424. *Id.*, at 2.

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.