

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
Petitioner,

v.

UNILOC 2017 LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

IPR2019-01471  
Patent 6,836,654 B2

---

Record of Oral Hearing  
Held: November 10, 2020

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

IPR2019-01471  
Patent 6,836,654 B2

APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:

TODD M. SIEGEL, ESQUIRE  
Klarquist Sparkman LLP  
One World Trade Center  
Suite 1600  
Portland, OR 97204

ON BEHALF OF PATENT OWNER:

BRIAN KOIDE, ESQUIRE  
Etheridge Law Group  
1100 Queensborough Blvd.  
Suite 200  
Mount Pleasant, SC 29464

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Tuesday, November 10, 2020, commencing at 10:00 a.m., EST, at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, by video/by telephone, before Julie Souza, Notary Public.

P R O C E E D I N G S

1 - - - - -

2 JUDGE HAMANN: Good morning. We are here for IPR 2019-  
3 01471, Microsoft Corporation v. Uniloc 2017 L.L.C. I am Judge Hamann.  
4 Also on the panel today are Judges Bisk and Powell. I would like to begin  
5 by having the parties introduce themselves. So first who is present on behalf  
6 of Petitioner, please?

7 MR. SIEGEL: Todd Siegel from Klarquist Sparkman on behalf of  
8 Petitioner Microsoft.

9 JUDGE HAMANN: Good morning. Is anyone else present from  
10 Petitioner today on the call?

11 MR. SIEGEL: Not with me, Your Honor.

12 JUDGE HAMANN: Okay. But no one's present from another  
13 location for Petitioner, correct?

14 MR. SIEGEL: I sent out a public line information. I do not know if  
15 anybody has dialed in.

16 JUDGE HAMANN: Fair enough. Thank you, Mr. Siegel. And for  
17 Patent Owner, who is present on today's video call for Patent Owner, please?

18 MR. KOIDE: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Brian Koide of  
19 the Etheridge Law Group for Patent Owner Uniloc 2017 L.L.C. With me on  
20 the telephone public line today is Mr. Steve Peterson who is Uniloc's general  
21 counsel.

22 JUDGE HAMANN: Good morning to everyone and as the parties  
23 have already noted there is a public access line, audio line so to the extent  
24 members of the public have called in to listen to today's hearing, we

1 welcome them.

2 The printed Oral Hearing Order, each side will have 60 minutes to  
3 present its arguments. We're going to, because Petitioner bears the burden  
4 of unpatentability, we'll begin with Petitioner followed by Patent Owner's  
5 response, followed by any time reserved by Petitioner for rebuttal and then  
6 finishing with time reserved by Patent Owner for surrebuttal. I will  
7 endeavor to track time and provide appropriate warnings on times, but you  
8 may find it helpful to also track your own time during the presentation.

9 As we of course are doing this video conferencing, I suggest it'll  
10 provide and make it easier for the panel as well as for the record if before  
11 speaking referencing a particular slide or part of the record, please identify  
12 which slide by slide number or appropriate cite to where in the record is  
13 being referred to. I will also ask when you're not speaking to mute your mic  
14 so we don't have unnecessary noise. With that, I'd ask the Petitioner how  
15 much time would it like to reserve for rebuttal?

16 MR. SIEGEL: Twenty minutes please, Your Honor.

17 JUDGE HAMANN: Twenty minutes, okay. Thank you Mr. Siegel.  
18 You may proceed when you're ready.

19 MR. SIEGEL: May it please the Board. We are here today to discuss  
20 why the petition proves that claims 10 through 20 of U.S. patent No.  
21 6,836,654, we'll refer to it as the '654 patent, why those claims are  
22 unpatentable as obvious over the prior art. The '654 patent is titled "Anti-  
23 theft protection for a radiotelephony device" and on slide 2 of Petitioner's  
24 demonstratives we see the two grounds. They're both obviousness grounds  
25 challenging claims 10 through 20. Ground 1 is the Owner's Manual for the

1 Nokia mobile device combined with the Barvesten patent and ground 2 is  
2 the Barvesten patent as the lead reference combined with a Motorola  
3 technical disclosure bulletin by Schultz.

4 Perhaps the best way to summarize the subject matter of the '654  
5 patent is to look at slide, look at claim 10 and we have that on slide 3. So  
6 claim 10 of the '654 patent, it has three primary steps. It's a method of  
7 protecting the mobile device and the three primary steps are verifying a user  
8 identification module inside the device is linked to the mobile device, then  
9 detecting a period of inactivity of the mobile device during normal operation  
10 of the device, and then preventing the normal operation of the mobile device  
11 in response to those two steps.

12 JUDGE HAMANN: Mr. Siegel, what steps, if any, of method claim  
13 10 does Petitioner believe are in dispute?

14 MR. SIEGEL: Right. We have highlighted on slide 3 the only  
15 limitation that Patent Owner has indicated that speaksto that, and so it's the  
16 verifying limitation. So we have that highlighted, so that is what we will be  
17 speaking primarily about. I will note that the detecting a period of inactivity  
18 step is really a limitation that was the focus of the prosecution history and  
19 was the reason why the patent was allowed. But today, the only limitation in  
20 dispute is the verifying limitation that we have highlighted.

21 And on slide 4 we show the highlighted passages on slide 4 of what  
22 we submit are pertaining to the highlighted limitation, the verifying  
23 limitation on slide 3, and so the '654 patent a detailed description, it's just a  
24 couple of columns long and what we have highlighted here on slide 4 are the  
25 passages that we think are most pertinent to our discussion today. Just

# 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.