

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

UNILOC 2017 LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2019-01219
Patent 6,836,654 B2

Before JENNIFER S. BISK, NEIL T. POWELL, and
JOHN D. HAMANN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

POWELL, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Denying Institution of *Inter Partes* Review
35 U.S.C. § 314

I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner Samsung Electronics America, Inc., filed a Petition (Paper 1, “Pet.”) requesting an *inter partes* review of claims 10–20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,836,654 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’654 patent”). Patent Owner Uniloc 2017 LLC filed a Preliminary Response. Paper 6 (“Prelim. Resp.”).

Having considered the Petition and Preliminary Response, we conclude the Petition should be denied for the reasons discussed below.

II. BACKGROUND

A. *Related Matters*

The parties identify a number of district court proceedings involving the ’654 patent. Pet. 1; Paper 3, 2. Of the identified district court proceedings, Petitioner is involved in one, specifically *Uniloc 2017 LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Am., Inc.*, Case No. 2-18-cv-00508 (E.D. Tex.) (hereafter “the district court proceeding”). Additionally, Petitioner has filed another Petition challenging the ’654 patent in IPR2019-01218.

B. The Asserted Grounds of Unpatentability

Petitioner contends that claims 10–20 of the '654 patent are unpatentable based on the following grounds:

Claims Challenged	35 U.S.C. §	References/Basis
10–20	103 ¹	Nokia ² , Alos ³
10–12, 14–20	103	Matsukida ⁴ , Alos
13	103	Matsukida, Alos, Miller ⁵

Petitioner also relies on the Declaration of Zygmunt J. Haas, Ph.D. (Ex. 1002).

C. The '654 Patent

The '654 patent relates to protecting against theft of a mobile radiotelephony device. Ex. 1001, code (57). The '654 patent notes a previously disclosed method of protecting a radiotelephone by creating a link between the device and a particular user identification module and preventing normal use of the device in the event that the user identification module installed in the device is not the linked user identification module.

¹ The Leahy-Smith America Invents Act, Pub. L. No. 112-29, 125 Stat. 284 (2011), amended 35 U.S.C. § 103 effective March 16, 2013. Because the '654 patent has an effective filing date prior to the effective date of the applicable AIA amendment, we refer to the pre-AIA version of § 103.

² Owner's Manual for the Nokia 9000i Communicator, Issue 1.1 (Ex. 1004).

³ Published U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0147028 A1, pub. Oct. 10, 2002 (Ex. 1005).

⁴ Japanese Patent Application Publication No. JP H6-216841, pub. Aug. 5, 1994 (Ex. 1021).

⁵ U.S. Patent No. 6,141,563, iss. Oct. 31, 2000, (Ex. 1022).

Id. at 1:21–29. The ’654 patent laments that this method may allow use of a lost or stolen device until the user alerts an operator and the network blocks use of the identification module linked to the device. *Id.* at 1:30–36.

To address this issue, the ’654 patent discloses a method of blocking normal use of a radiotelephony device that has a user identification module. *Id.* at 1:39–50. Specifically, the ’654 patent discloses blocking normal use of the radiotelephony device in response to confirmation of the user identification module and detection of a period of inactivity of the device. *Id.* Consequently, when the device is lost or stolen, by the time a third party has the device, “it has most probably been inactive for a period of time that is sufficiently long for its normal operation to be blocked.” *Id.* at 1:51–54. “Thanks to the invention the lost or stolen device becomes totally unusable.” *Id.* at 1:59–60.

D. Illustrative Claim

Claims 10 and 17 are independent. Each of claims 11–16 and 18–20 depends, directly or indirectly, from one of independent claims 10 and 17. Claim 10 is illustrative and recites:

10. A method of protecting a mobile radiotelephony device, the method comprising:
 - verifying a user identification module mounted inside the mobile radiotelephony device is linked to the mobile radiotelephony device;
 - detecting a period of inactivity of the mobile radiotelephony device during a normal operation of the mobile radiotelephony device, wherein the normal operation includes a processing of all outgoing calls;
 - preventing the normal operation of the mobile radiotelephony device in response to the verification of the linked user

identification module and in response to the detection of the period of inactivity of the mobile radiotelephony device.

Ex. 1001, 5:27–40.

III. ANALYSIS

A. Claim Construction

In an *inter partes* review for a petition filed on or after November 13, 2018, the “[claims] of a patent ... shall be construed using the same claim construction standard that would be used to construe the [claims] in a civil action under 35 U.S.C. § 282(b), including construing the [claims] in accordance with the ordinary and customary meaning of such claims as understood by one of ordinary skill in the art and the prosecution history pertaining to the patent.” Changes to the Claim Construction Standard for Interpreting Claims in Trial Proceedings Before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board, 83 Fed. Reg. 51,340 (Oct. 11, 2018) (codified at 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) (2019)) (amending 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) effective November 13, 2018); *see also Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 1312–14 (Fed. Cir. 2005). Only those terms that are in controversy need be construed, and only to the extent necessary to resolve the controversy. *See Nidec Motor Corp. v. Zhongshan Broad Ocean Motor Co.*, 868 F.3d 1013, 1017 (Fed. Cir. 2017) (citing *Vivid Techs., Inc. v. Am. Sci. & Eng’g, Inc.*, 200 F.3d 795, 803 (Fed. Cir. 1999)).

Petitioner “believes that no express construction is necessary to assess whether the prior art reads on the challenged claims.” Pet. 6. Patent Owner does not dispute this contention.

For purposes of this decision, we need not construe expressly any claim terms.

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.