

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

HP INC., LENOVO (UNITED STATES) INC.,
MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC., DELL INC., AND DELL PRODUCTS LP .,
Petitioner

v.

NEODRON LTD.,
Patent Owner.

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,432,173
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.100 *ET SEQ.***

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. §42.8.....	3
III. FEE AUTHORIZATION	6
IV. GROUNDS FOR STANDING.....	6
V. PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED	6
VI. THE CHALLENGED PATENT	7
VII. PATENT PROSECUTION HISTORY	9
VIII. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART.....	10
IX. PRIORITY DATE	10
X. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	11
A. “a sensing element that comprises a sensing path that comprises a length”.....	11
B. “object”.....	12
C. “displacement”	12
D. “the range of parameter values being associated with the length of the sensing path” (Claims 1, 10, 19).....	13
E. “the sensing path comprises a closed loop” (Claims 2, 11).....	13
XI. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE PRIOR ART.....	13
A. Trent	13
B. Engholm	16
C. Bryan	19
XII. DETAILED EXPLANATION OF THE UNPATENTABILITY GROUNDS	22
A. Ground 1: Claims 1-2, 8-11, and 17-19 are rendered obvious by Trent in light of the knowledge of a POSITA.....	22
1. Independent claims 1, 10, and 19 are unpatentable over Trent.....	22

2.	Claims 2, 11: “wherein the sensing path comprises a closed loop”.....	39
3.	Claims 8, 17: “wherein the parameter is selected from the group consisting of temperature, volume, contrast, brightness, and frequency”.....	40
4.	Claims 9, 18: “wherein [the media and] the sensing element [is/are] part of an electronic appliance selected from the group consisting of a cooking oven, microwave oven, television, washing machine, MP3 player, mobile phone, and multimedia device”.....	41
B.	Ground 2: Claims 1-3, 5-12, and 14-19 are rendered obvious by Trent in view of Engholm, and further in light of the knowledge of a POSITA	42
1.	One of skill in the art would be motivated to combine the teachings of Trent and Engholm, and would have a reasonable expectation of success in doing so.....	42
2.	Independent claims 1, 10, and 19 are unpatentable over Trent in view of Engholm	44
3.	Claims 2, 11: “wherein the sensing path comprises a closed loop”.....	51
4.	Claims 3, 12: “[switching/operable to switch] from a first mode of operation to a second mode of operation in response to one or more of the second signals if the displacement corresponding to the second capacitive coupling indicated by the second signals exceeds a pre-determined threshold, the second mode of operation being for adjusting the parameter within the range of parameter values based on the displacement of the object along the sensing path, the first mode of operation being for setting the parameter to the initial value”	53
5.	Claims 5, 14: “wherein adjusting the parameter comprises effecting an incremental change in the parameter from the initial value based on an amount of the displacement exceeding a pre-determined displacement threshold”	56

6.	Claims 6, 15: “wherein adjusting the parameter comprises changing the parameter from the initial value by a number of units based on a number of times an amount of the displacement exceeds a pre-determined displacement threshold”	58
7.	Claims 7, 16: “[mapping/operable to map] all or a portion of the range of parameter values onto the sensing path around the initial value”	59
8.	Claims 8, 17: “wherein the parameter is selected from the group consisting of temperature, volume, contrast, brightness, and frequency”	62
9.	Claims 9, 18: “wherein [the media and] the sensing element [is/are] part of an electronic appliance selected from the group consisting of a cooking oven, microwave oven, television, washing machine, MP3 player, mobile phone, and multimedia device”	63
C.	Ground 3: Claims 1-3, 5-12, and 14-19 are rendered obvious by Bryan in view of Trent and Engholm, and further in light of the knowledge of a POSITA	63
1.	One of skill in the art would be motivated to combine the teachings of Bryan, Trent, and Engholm, and would have a reasonable expectation of success in doing so	63
2.	Independent claims 1, 10, and 19 are unpatentable over Bryan in view of Trent and Engholm	65
3.	Claims 2, 11: “wherein the sensing path comprises a closed loop”	81
4.	Claims 3, 12: “switch[ing/operable to switch] from a first mode of operation to a second mode of operation in response to one or more of the second signals if the displacement corresponding to the second capacitive coupling indicated by the second signals exceeds a pre-determined threshold, the second mode of operation being for adjusting the parameter within the range of parameter values based on the displacement of the object along the sensing path, the first mode of operation being for setting the parameter to the initial value”	82

5.	Claims 5, 14: “wherein adjusting the parameter comprises effecting an incremental change in the parameter from the initial value based on an amount of the displacement exceeding a pre-determined displacement threshold”	82
6.	Claims 6, 15: “wherein adjusting the parameter comprises changing the parameter from the initial value by a number of units based on a number of times an amount of the displacement exceeds a pre-determined displacement threshold”	82
7.	Claims 7, 16: “[mapping/operable to map] all or a portion of the range of parameter values onto the sensing path around the initial value”	83
8.	Claims 8, 17: “wherein the parameter is selected from the group consisting of temperature, volume, contrast, brightness, and frequency”	83
9.	Claims 9, 18: “wherein [the media and] the sensing element [is/are] part of an electronic appliance selected from the group consisting of a cooking oven, microwave oven, television, washing machine, MP3 player, mobile phone, and multimedia device”	83
XIII.	CONCLUSION.....	84

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.