

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.

Petitioner

v.

UNILOC 2017 LLC

Patent Owner

---

IPR2018-01757

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.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....	3
V.	PETITIONER DOES NOT PROVE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF UNPATENTABILITY FOR ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM.....	3
A.	Claim Construction.....	4
1.	“dominant axis” .....	5
2.	“cadence window” .....	8
3.	“logic” terms.....	8
B.	The Pasolini Reference Was Already Considered by the USPTO.....	9
C.	The Applied References Fail to Disclose a “Cadence Window” .....	10
D.	Petitioner has not and cannot cure Fabio’s deficiencies by offering a new, undefended, and inconsistent definition for “cadence window” .....	13
E.	The Applied References Fail to Disclose Detected Motions “ <i>Within</i> a Cadence Windows” .....	15
F.	The Applied References Fail to Disclose an Update to the Cadence Window as “Actual Cadence” or “Cadence” Changes .....	15
G.	The Applied References Fail to “Assigning a Dominant axis with Respect to Gravity Based on an Orientation of	

the Inertial Sensor” ..... 16

H. The Applied References Fail to Disclose “Detecting a Change in the Orientation of the Inertial Sensor and Updating the Dominant Axis Based on the Change” ..... 18

I. The Petition fails to Prove Obviousness of Any Dependent Claim ..... 20

J. The Petition Redundantly Challenges Claims 4 and 19 ..... 21

II. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED AS REDUNDANT WITH PRIOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW PETITIONS ..... 24

A. The Board Has Held Denial is Appropriate Under These Facts ..... 24

B. The Board’s Precedential Factors Support Denial ..... 25

VI. THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF *INTER PARTES* REVIEW IS THE SUBJECT OF A PENDING APPEAL ..... 26

VII. CONCLUSION ..... 27

**List of Exhibits**

<b>Exhibit No.</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>2001</b>	Declaration of Dr. William C. Easttom

## I. INTRODUCTION

Uniloc 2017 LLC (“Uniloc” or “Patent Owner”) submits this Preliminary Response to Petition IPR2018-01757 for *Inter Partes* Review (“Pet.” or “Petition”) of United States Patent No. 8,712,723 (“the ’723 patent” or “EX1001”) filed by Samsung Electronics America, 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. Accordingly, the inventors introduced determining a rhythmic cadence and a correspondence cadence window concept that could anticipate when an expected periodic user activity is expected to occur. *Id.*, 3:46-4:4.

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. Periodic user activity in a cadence window is counted and the cadence is updated. *Id.*, 3:46-4:4.

### 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

# 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.