

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MICROSOFT CORPORATION

Petitioner

v.

UNILOC 2017 LLC

Patent Owner

IPR2019-01558

U.S. PATENT NO. 8,724,622

**PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a)**

Table of Contents

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE '622 PATENT	1
	A. Effective Filing Date of the '622 Patent	1
	B. Overview of the '622 Patent	2
	C. The Challenged Claims of the '622 Patent Recite a System for Instant Voice Messaging over a Packet-Switched Network.	6
	D. Prosecution History of the '622 Patent	8
III.	RELATED PROCEEDINGS	10
IV.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	11
V.	THE PETITION IMPROPERLY CHALLENGES THE CLAIMS BASED ON ASSERTED ART CUMULATIVE OF PRIOR ART EVALUATED DURING PROSECUTION	12
VI.	THE PETITION IS YET ANOTHER REDUNDANT PETITION, IMPROPERLY CHALLENGING CLAIMS BASED ON PRIOR ART AS TO WHICH THE BOARD HAS ALREADY DENIED INSTITUTION.	14
VII.	PETITIONER'S ARGUMENT THAT PATENT OWNER IS PRECLUDED FROM RAISING CERTAIN ISSUES IS BASED ON A MISREADING OF FEDERAL CIRCUIT PRECEDENT.	20
VIII.	PETITIONER DOES NOT PROVE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF UNPATENTABILITY FOR ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM	22
	A. Claim Construction	23
	B. "wherein the instant voice message includes an object field including a digitized audio file" (claim 3, and hence in challenged dependent claim 9).	25

C.	No prima facie obviousness for “the communication platform system assigns an IP address to each of the instant voice message client systems when the communication platform receives a connection request from each of the instant voice message client systems” as recited in claim 9.	29
D.	No prima facie obviousness for “the instant voice message application communicates in an intercom mode when a recipient of the instant voice message is currently available to receive the instant voice message and communicates in a record mode when the recipient of the instant voice message is currently unavailable to receive the instant voice message” as recited in claim 36.	32
E.	No prima facie obviousness for “the instant voice message application uses the intercom mode as a default communication mode” as recited in dependent claim 37.	34
F.	No prima facie obviousness for “a user database storing user records identifying users of the plurality of instant voice message client systems, wherein each of the user records includes a user name, a password and a list of other users selected by a user” as recited in claim 1.	35
G.	No Prima Facie Obviousness for Dependent Claim 2	40
IX.	CONCLUSION	40

EXHIBITS

Exhibit 2001

U.S. Patent No. 7,372,826 (Dahod)

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §313 and 37 C.F.R. §42.107(a), Uniloc 2017 LLC (the “Patent Owner” or “Uniloc”) submits Uniloc’s Preliminary Response to the Petition for *Inter Partes* Review (“Pet.” or “Petition”) of United States Patent No. 8,724,622 (“the ’622 patent” or “Ex. 1001”) filed by Microsoft Corporation (“Petitioner”).

In view of the reasons presented herein, the Petition should be denied in its entirety, for *inter alia*, (1) lacking candor by failing to bring to the Board’s attention multiple denied petitions for *inter partes* review against the ’622 patent, (2) presenting challenges based on grounds substantively unchanged from grounds asserted in prior petitions that were denied institution, and (3) as failing to meet the threshold burden of proving there is a reasonable likelihood that at least one challenged claim is unpatentable.

Uniloc addresses each ground and provides specific examples of how Petitioner failed to establish that it is more likely than not that it would prevail with respect to at least one of the challenged ’622 Patent claims. As a non-limiting example described in more detail below, the Petition fails the all-elements-rule in not addressing every feature of any of the challenged claims.

Accordingly, Uniloc respectfully requests that the Board decline institution of trial on Claims 1, 2, 9, 36 and 37 of the ’622 Patent.

II. THE ’622 PATENT

A. Effective Filing Date of the ’622 Patent

The ’622 patent is titled “System and Method for Instant VoIP Messaging.”

The ’622 patent issued May 13, 2014 from U.S. Patent Application No.

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.