

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

HTC CORPORATION, HTC AMERICA, INC., AND ZTE (USA), INC.
Petitioners

v.

AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT, LLC,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2019-00485
Patent 8,213,970

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,213,970**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. STANDING2

III. TECHNICAL BACKGROUND3

 A. Overview of the '970 patent (Petitioners 1001).....3

 B. The concepts of the '970 Patent were well known in the prior art.....3

 C. Summary of the prosecution history6

IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION8

 A. Relevant law and person of ordinary skill in the art8

 B. “data transmission means”10

 C. “means for attaching . . .”10

 D. “means for requiring . . .”10

 E. “means for receiving and displaying a listing of which recipient PDA/cell phones have automatically acknowledged . . .”11

 F. “means for periodically resending . . .”11

 G. “means for receiving and displaying a listing of which recipient PDA/cell phones have transmitted . . .”12

V. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE12

 A. Ground 1: Claims 1 and 3-9 are obvious over Kubala and Hammond—references that are prior art to the '970 patent’s *actual* filing date (November 26, 2008).13

 1. Overview: Kubala discloses PDAs that send and receive mandatory-response messages, and Hammond tracks acknowledgements of and responses to such messages.18

 2. Independent claim 123

***Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,213,970**

3.	Dependent claim 3	40
4.	Dependent claim 4	40
5.	Dependent claim 5	41
6.	Independent claim 6	42
7.	Dependent claim 7	47
8.	Dependent claim 8	50
9.	Dependent claim 9	50
B.	<u>Ground 2</u> : Claims 1 and 3-9 are obvious over Hammond in view of Johnson and Pepe—references that are prior art to the '970 patent's <i>earliest effective</i> filing date (September 21, 2004).	51
1.	<u>Overview</u> : Hammond tracks acknowledgements of and responses to mandatory-response messages; Johnson prevents a user from closing a mandatory-response message that has not been responded to; and Pepe discloses PDAs that provide an on-screen menu of possible responses to an incoming message.	52
2.	Independent claim 1	54
3.	Dependent claim 3	66
4.	Dependent claim 4	66
5.	Dependent claim 5	67
6.	Independent claim 6	68
7.	Dependent claim 7	75
8.	Dependent claim 8	76
9.	Dependent claim 9	77
C.	<u>Ground 3</u> : Claims 1 and 3-9 are obvious over Hammond in view of Johnson, Pepe, and Banerjee.	77

Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,213,970

VI. THIS PETITION CONTAINS NEW ARGUMENTS AND PRIOR
ART NOT PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED TO THE OFFICE.78

VII. SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS79

VIII. MANDATORY NOTICES79

IX. CONCLUSION.....81

Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,213,970

EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit No.	Description
1001	U.S. Patent No. 8,213,970 B2 to Beyer (“970 patent”)
1002	Prosecution History of U.S. Patent No. 8,213,970 (Application No. 12/324,122) (“970 Pros. Hist.”)
1003	Declaration of David H. Williams
1004	<i>Curriculum Vitae</i> of David H. Williams
1005	U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0218232 to Kubala <i>et al.</i> (“Kubala”)
1006	U.S. Patent No. 6,854,007 to Hammond (“Hammond”).
1007	U.S. Patent No. 5,325,310 to Johnson <i>et al.</i> (“Johnson”)
1008	U.S. Patent No. 5,742,905 to Pepe <i>et al.</i> (“Pepe”)
1009	U.S. Publication No. 2003/0128195 to Banerjee <i>et al.</i> (“Banerjee”)
1010	<i>Simon Says “Here’s How!” Simon™ Mobile Communications Made Simple</i> , Simon Users Manual, IBM Corp., 1994. (“Simon”)
1011	Prosecution History of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/711,490 (“490 application”)
1012	Prosecution History of U.S. Application No. 11/308,648 (“648 application”)
1013	Prosecution History of U.S. Application No. 11/612,830 (“830 application”)
1014	McKinsey & Company, <i>The McKinsey Report : FDNY 9/11 Response</i> (2002) (“The McKinsey Report”)
1015	<i>History of Mobile Phones</i> , Wikipedia.com, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_mobile_phones (last visited May 10, 2018) (“Hist. Mobile Phones”)
1016	<i>Apple Newton</i> , Wikipedia.com, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Apple_Newton (last visited May 10, 2018) (“Apple”)
1017	<i>Email</i> , Wikipedia.com, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Email (last visited May 10, 2018) (“Email”)

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.