

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

~~HTC CORPORATION and HTC AMERICA, INC.~~ SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS
AMERICA, INC.

Petitioners,

v.

UNILOC ~~LUXEMBOURG S.A.~~ 2017 LLC,
Patent Owner

PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF

U.S. PATENT NO. 7,653,508

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. MANDATORY NOTICES2

A. Real Party in Interest.....2

B. Related Matters.....2

C. Lead and Back up Counsel and Service Information.....3

III. GROUNDS FOR STANDING.....3

IV. NOTE REGARDING PAGE CITATIONS AND EMPHASIS.....4

V. THE '508 PATENT4

A. Summary of the '508 patent4

B. Prosecution History of the '508 Patent.....6

VI. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART.....7

VII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION7

A. “dominant axis”8

B. “cadence window”9

C. “a dominant axis logic to continuously determine an orientation of a device, to assign a dominant axis, and to update the dominant axis as the orientation of the device changes”9

D. “a counting logic to count periodic human motions by monitoring accelerations relative to the dominant axis”10

E. “a counting logic to identify and count periodic human motions”11

F. “a cadence logic to continuously update a dynamic cadence window”12

G. “a mode logic, to switch the device from a non active mode to an active mode after a number of periodic human motions are detected within appropriate cadence windows by the counting logic”13

H.	Note Regarding the Claim Terms directed to “Logic”	14
VIII.	RELIEF REQUESTED AND THE REASONS FOR THE REQUESTED RELIEF	15
IX.	IDENTIFICATION OF HOW THE CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE	16
A.	Challenged Claims	16
B.	Statutory Grounds for Challenges	16
C.	State of the art at the time of the ’508 Patent	17
1.	Summary of Pasolini	18
2.	Summary of Fabio	20
D.	Challenge #1: Claims 1-2 and 11-12 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Pasolini	24
1.	Claim 1	24
2.	Claim 2	31
3.	Claim 11	32
4.	Claim 12	37
E.	Challenge #2: Claims 6-8, 15-16, and 19 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Fabio	37
1.	Claim 6	38
2.	Claim 7	49
3.	Claim 8	51
4.	Claim 15	52
5.	Claim 16	57
6.	Claim 19	59

~~F. Challenge #3: Claims 3 4, 13 14, and 20 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Pasolini in view of Fabio60~~

~~1. Reasons to Combine Pasolini and Fabio60~~

~~2. Claim 3.....64~~

~~3. Claim 4.....66~~

~~4. Claim 13.....68~~

~~5. Claim 14.....70~~

~~6. Claim 20.....72~~

~~X. CONCLUSION.....73~~

~~CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT.....74~~

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE — 7

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. MANDATORY NOTICES2

A. Real Party-in-Interest2

B. Related Matters.....2

C. Lead and Back-up Counsel and Service Information3

III. GROUNDS FOR STANDING.....4

IV. NOTE REGARDING PAGE CITATIONS AND EMPHASIS.....5

V. THE '508 PATENT5

A. Summary of the '508 patent5

B. Prosecution History of the '508 Patent7

VI. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART8

VII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION8

A.	<u>“dominant axis”</u>	9
B.	<u>“cadence window”</u>	10
C.	<u>“a dominant axis logic to continuously determine an orientation of a device, to assign a dominant axis, and to update the dominant axis as the orientation of the device changes”</u>	11
D.	<u>“a counting logic to count periodic human motions by monitoring accelerations relative to the dominant axis”</u>	12
E.	<u>“a counting logic to identify and count periodic human motions”</u>	13
F.	<u>“a cadence logic to continuously update a dynamic cadence window”</u>	14
G.	<u>“a mode logic, to switch the device from a non-active mode to an active mode after a number of periodic human motions are detected within appropriate cadence windows by the counting logic”</u>	15
H.	Note Regarding the Claim Terms directed to “Logic”	16
VIII.	<u>PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED</u>	17
IX.	<u>IDENTIFICATION OF HOW THE CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE</u>	18
A.	<u>Challenged Claims</u>	18
B.	<u>Statutory Grounds for Challenges</u>	18
C.	<u>State of the art at the time of the ’508 Patent</u>	19
1.	<u>Summary of Pasolini</u>	20
2.	<u>Summary of Fabio</u>	22
D.	<u>Challenge #1: Claims 1-2 and 11-12 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Pasolini</u>	26
1.	<u>Claim 1</u>	26

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.