

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

EMERSON ELECTRIC CO.

Petitioner,

v.

OLLNOVA TECHNOLOGIES LTD.

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2023-00626

U.S. Patent No. 7,746,887

**DECLARATION OF DEAN P. NEIKIRK IN SUPPORT OF PETITION
FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,746,887**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. QUALIFICATIONS	4
III. LEGAL UNDERSTANDING	7
A. My Understanding of Claim Construction	7
B. My Understanding of Obviousness	9
C. My Understanding of the Doctrine of Equivalents	14
IV. BACKGROUND OF THE TECHNOLOGY	15
V. THE '887 PATENT	17
A. '887 Patent Overview	17
B. Prosecution History of the '887 Patent	20
VI. THE '887 PATENT PRIORITY DATE	22
VII. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	22
VIII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	24
A. Preambles	24
B. “information associated reading of the indicator” (claim limitation [1.c])	25
C. Third-Party Constructions	25
IX. GROUNDS OF UNPATENTABILITY	29
A. Ground 1: Kates-711 (Claims 1, 3-8, and 18)	32
1. U.S. 7,528,711 (“Kates-711”) Overview	32
2. Invalidity of Claims 1, 3-8, and 18 Over Kates-711	38
(a) Element [1.pre]	38
(b) Element [1.a]	43
(c) Element [1.b]	47
(d) Element [1.c]	51

(e)	Element [1.d]	58
(f)	Element [1.e]	62
(g)	Claim [3]	70
(h)	Claim [4]	74
(i)	Claim [5]	75
(j)	Claim [6]	77
(k)	Claim [7]	78
(l)	Claim [8]	79
(m)	Claim [18]	82
B.	Ground 2: Kates-711 in view of Hitt (Claims 1, 3-8, and 18)	83
1.	Overview of Hitt and Motivation to Modify Kates-711 with Hitt’s Teachings	83
2.	Invalidity of Claims 1, 3-8, and 18 Over Kates-711 in view of Hitt	89
(a)	Element [1.d]	89
(b)	Element [1.e]	92
(c)	Claims [5] and [8]	95
C.	Grounds 3-4: Kates-711 in view of Littrell and Kates-711 in view of Hitt and Littrell (Claims 1, 3-8, 14-15, and 18)	96
1.	Overview of Littrell and Motivation to Modify Kates-711 (and Kates-711 in view of Hitt) with Littrell’s Teachings	96
2.	Littrell’s Further Disclosures of “Information Associated Reading of the Indicator” in Element [1.e] (Claims 1, 3-8, and 18)	108
3.	Littrell’s Further Disclosures both that “An Upper Limit and a Lower Limit of the Predetermined Range May Be Varied” and of a “Band Limit” (Claims 3-7)	112
4.	Claim [14]	117
5.	Claim [15]	121
D.	Grounds 5-8: Kates-505 (Claims 1, 3-8, and 18), Kates-505 in view of Hitt (Claims 1, 3-8, and 18), Kates-505 in view of Littrell (Claims 1, 3-8, 14-15, and 18), and Kates-505 in view of Hitt and Littrell (Claims 1, 3-8, 14-15, and 18)	122

1.	Kates-505 Contains Substantially Similar Disclosures to Kates-711	122
2.	Chart Comparing Kates-711 with Kates-505.....	125
E.	Grounds 9-12: Kates-505 in View of Mueller (Claims 1, 3-8, and 18), Kates-505 in View of Mueller and Hitt (Claims 1, 3-8, and 18), Kates-505 in View of Mueller and Littrell (Claims 1, 3-8, 14-15, and 18), and Kates-505 in View of Mueller, Hitt, and Littrell (Claims 1, 3-8, 14-15, and 18).....	131
1.	Overview of Mueller and Motivation to Modify Kates-505 (and Kates-505 in view of Hitt and/or Littrell) with Mueller’s Teachings	131
2.	Mueller’s further disclosures of “transmit[ting] a most recent reading ... in response to detecting a change in the sensed condition outside a predetermined range and ... [suspending transmission] in response to detecting a change in the sensed condition within the predetermined range” ([1.e]) (Claim 1) and a “band limit” (Claim 5)	136
X.	SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS	141
XI.	CONCLUSION.....	141

I. INTRODUCTION

1. I have been retained by Emerson Electric Co. (“Emerson” or “Petitioner”) to provide my opinions on certain issues related to U.S. Patent No. 7,746,887 (the “’887 patent,” which I understand has been designated as Exhibit 1001) in connection with the above-captioned *inter partes* review (IPR) proceeding. In particular, I have been asked to provide my insights, analysis, and opinions regarding whether claims 1, 3-8, 14-15, and 18 of the ’887 patent (“Challenged Claims”) are obvious over the prior art references identified below and as to whether persons interested and ordinarily skilled in the subject matter or art exercising reasonable diligence could have located these references.

2. I understand the ’887 patent is titled “Dynamic Value Reporting for Wireless Automated Systems,” identifies as its named inventor Norman R. McFarland, and is currently owned by Ollnova Technologies Ltd. I have considered the ’887 patent.

3. I understand that the file history of the ’887 patent has been designated as Exhibit 1003. I have considered this file history, and I will refer to it as the “’887 File History” or by its exhibit number.

4. I understand that the ’887 patent was filed as U.S. Patent Application 11/402,743 on April 12, 2006.

5. I have considered the prior art cited in my declaration, including:

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.