

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent of: Billhartz et al.
U.S. Patent No.: 7,321,777 Attorney Docket No. 50095-0107IP2
Issue Date: January 22, 2008
Appl. Serial No.: 11/531,487
Filing Date: September 13, 2006
Title: WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM INCLUDING
A WIRELESS DEVICE LOCATOR AND RELATED
METHODS

Mail Stop Patent Board

Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF UNITED STATES PATENT
NO. 7,321,777 PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. §§ 311–319, 37 C.F.R. § 42**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	REQUIREMENTS FOR IPR—37 C.F.R. §42.104	2
	A. Grounds for Standing—37 C.F.R. §42.104(a).....	2
	B. Challenge and Relief Requested—37 C.F.R. §42.104(b).....	2
	C. Claim Construction—37 C.F.R. §42.104(b)(3)	3
III.	THE '777 PATENT	4
	A. Brief Description.....	4
	B. Background of the Art.....	6
	C. Prosecution History	7
IV.	Level of Ordinary Skill	9
V.	PRIOR ART REFERENCES.....	9
	A. McCorkle.....	9
	B. Leeper.....	17
	C. Tajima.....	18
VI.	THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE	19
	A. Grounds 1-5: Claims 1, 6-9, 12, 16-20, and 23-25 are anticipated by <i>McCorkle</i> , claims 1, 3, 5-9, 12, 14-20, and 22-25 are obvious over <i>McCorkle</i> , claims 1-3 and 5-25 are obvious over <i>McCorkle</i> in view of <i>Leeper</i> , claims 3, 5, 14, 15, and 22 are obvious over <i>McCorkle</i> in view of <i>Tajima</i> , and claims 3, 5, 11, 14, 15, and 22 are obvious over <i>McCorkle</i> and <i>Leeper</i> in further view of <i>Tajima</i>	19
	1. Claim 1.....	19
	2. Claim 2.....	46
	3. Claim 3.....	46
	4. Claim 5.....	55
	5. Claim 6.....	55
	6. Claim 7.....	56
	7. Claim 8.....	57
	8. Claim 9.....	58
	9. Claim 10.....	58
	10. Claim 11.....	60
	11. Claim 12.....	60
	12. Claim 13.....	61
	13. Claim 14.....	62

14.	Claim 15.....	62
15.	Claim 16.....	62
16.	Claim 17.....	63
17.	Claim 18.....	63
18.	Claim 19.....	63
19.	Claim 20.....	64
20.	Claim 21.....	65
21.	Claim 22.....	65
22.	Claim 23.....	65
23.	Claim 24.....	66
24.	Claim 25.....	66
VII.	DISCRETION SHOULD NOT PRECLUDE INSTITUTION	66
A.	The <i>General Plastic</i> Factors Favor Institution—§314(a)	67
1.	Factor 1: Petitioner’s Multiple Petitions Do Not Prejudice Patent Owner	69
2.	Factor 2: Petitioner’s Knowledge of the Prior Art in the Unified Petition Did Not Prejudice Patent Owner.....	69
3.	Factor 3: This Petition Does Not Implicate Road-Mapping or Playbooking Concerns	70
4.	Factors 4 and 5: Petitioner Diligently Prepared This Joinder Petition at the Appropriate Time.....	70
5.	Factors 6 and 7: Institution Efficiently Promotes Patent Quality.	71
B.	The <i>Fintiv</i> Factors Favor Institution—§314(a).....	72
VIII.	PETITIONER’S RANKING OF PETITIONS	74
A.	The Original Petition and the Joinder Petition Are Materially Different	74
B.	Petitioner Ranks the Original Petition Ahead of the Joinder Petition ...	75
IX.	MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8	78
A.	Real Party-in-Interest—37 C.F.R. §42.8(b)(1)	78
B.	Related Matters—37 C.F.R. §42.8(b)(2)	78
C.	Lead and Back-up Counsel and Service Information	79
X.	FEES—37 C.F.R. §42.103.....	79

EXHIBITS

Exhibit 1001	U.S. Patent 7,321,777 to Thomas Jay Billhartz et al. (“the ’777 patent”)
Exhibit 1002	Declaration of Michael Braasch, Ph.D. (“Braasch Declaration”)
Exhibit 1003	U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0174048 to McCorkle (“ <i>McCorkle</i> ”)
Exhibit 1004	U.S. Patent 7, 203,500 to Leeper et al. (“ <i>Leeper</i> ”)
Exhibit 1005	U.S. Patent 7,058,414 to Rofheart et al. (“ <i>Rofheart</i> ”)
Exhibit 1006	U.S. Patent 5,381,444 to Tajima (“ <i>Tajima</i> ”)
Exhibit 1007	Chlamtac, Imrish, Marco Conti, and Jennifer J.-N. Liu, Mobile ad hoc networking: imperatives and challenges, 2003, https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1570870503000131
Exhibit 1008	Prosecution File History of the ’777 Patent
Exhibit 1009	[Reserved]
Exhibit 1010	Overview of Secondary Surveillance Radar (SSR) and Identification Friend/Foe (IFF) Systems, https://www.ieee.li/pdf/viewgraphs/overview-of-ssr-and-iff-systems.pdf
Exhibit 1011	U.S. Patent 3,302,199 to Kelly et al. (“ <i>Kelly</i> ”)
Exhibit 1012	U.S. Patent 3,728,728 to Vogel et al. (“ <i>Vogel</i> ”)
Exhibit 1013	U.S. Patent 4,126,859 to Böhm (“ <i>Böhm</i> ”)
Exhibit 1014	U.S. Patent 4,677,441 to Höfgen et al. (“ <i>Höfgen</i> ”)
Exhibit 1015	IEEE Standard for Wireless LAN Medium Access Control (MAC) and Physical Layer (PHY) specifications
Exhibit 1016	U.S. Patent 8,625,481 to Duggi et al. (“ <i>Duggi</i> ”)
Exhibit 1017	U.S. Patent 7,321,783 to Kim (“ <i>Kim</i> ”)
Exhibit 1018	Gudmundson, Björn, Johan Sköld, and Jon K. Ugland. “A comparison of CDMA and TDMA systems.” [1992 Proceedings] Vehicular Technology Society 42nd VTS Conference-Frontiers of Technology. IEEE, 1992.

Exhibit 1019	Bruzzese, Stephanie, and Charles McLellan, Dell Inspiron 5100, March 3, 2003, https://www.zdnet.com/product/dell-inspiron-5100/
Exhibit 1020	Smith, Tony, Palm Tungsten C Wi-Fi PDA, October 27, 2003, https://www.theregister.com/2003/10/27/palm_tungsten_c_wifi_pda/
Exhibits 1021-1099	[Reserved]
Exhibit 1100	Federal Court Management Statistics June 2022 published by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, retrieved from https://www.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/fcms_na_distprofile0630.2022_0.pdf on August 19, 2022
Exhibit 1101	Scheduling Order, <i>Speir Technologies Ltd. v. Apple Inc.</i> , Case 6:22-cv-00077-ADA (WDTX)
Exhibit 1102	Apple's Opening Claim Construction Brief, <i>Speir Technologies Ltd. v. Apple Inc.</i> , Case 6:22-cv-00077-ADA (WDTX)
Exhibit 1103	Speir's Responsive Claim Construction Brief, <i>Speir Technologies Ltd. v. Apple Inc.</i> , Case 6:22-cv-00077-ADA (WDTX)
Exhibit 1104	Order Resetting <i>Markman</i> Hearing, <i>Speir Technologies Ltd. v. Apple Inc.</i> , Case 6:22-cv-00077-ADA (WDTX)
Exhibit 1105	Notice Regarding Agreed Extension to Serve Final Infringement and Invalidity Contentions, <i>Speir Technologies Ltd. v. Apple Inc.</i> , Case 6:22-cv-00077-ADA (WDTX)

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.