

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

Microsoft Corporation, Dell Technologies Inc., and Dell Inc.  
Petitioners

v.

Ozmo Licensing LLC  
Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 8,599,814

Filing Date: July 27, 2012

Issue Date: December 3, 2013

Title: Apparatus and Method for Integrating Short-Range Wireless Personal Area  
Networks for a Wireless Local Area Network Infrastructure

---

*Inter Partes* Review No.: IPR2023-01060

---

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW  
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. §§42.1-100, ET SEQ.**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  | <b>Page</b> |
|--|-------------|
| I. Introduction.....   | 1           |
| II. Compliance with Formal Requirements.....   | 1           |
| A. Mandatory Notices Under 37 C.F.R. §§42.8(b)(1)-(4).....                           | 1           |
| 1. Real Party-In-Interest.....   | 1           |
| 2. Related Matters .....   | 1           |
| 3. Lead and Backup Counsel .....   | 1           |
| 4. Service Information.....  | 2           |
| B. Proof of Service on the Patent Owner.....   | 2           |
| C. Power of Attorney .....   | 2           |
| D. Standing.....   | 2           |
| E. Fees.....   | 3           |
| III. Statement of Precise Relief Requested.....                                      | 3           |
| A. Prior Art.....  | 3           |
| B. Grounds .....   | 5           |
| IV. The 814 Patent .....   | 6           |
| A. Overview .....  | 6           |
| B. Prosecution History .....   | 6           |
| C. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....   | 7           |
| V. Claim Construction Under 37 C.F.R. §42.104(b)(3).....                             | 8           |
| A. “wireless personal area network (WPAN)” .....                                     | 8           |
| B. “802.11x” .....   | 8           |
| C. “overlay protocol” .....  | 8           |
| D. “logic for processing data received via the wireless radio circuit”.....          | 9           |
| E. “logic for generating data to be transmitted by the wireless radio circuit” ..... | 9           |
| F. “logic for initiating and maintaining...” .....                                   | 9           |
| G. “logic to coordinate a mutually agreeable inactivity period” .....                | 10          |

|             |  |    |
|-------------|--|----|
| <b>H.</b>   | “routing module for...” .....  | 10 |
| <b>I.</b>   | “logic for uniquely identifying...” .....  | 10 |
| <b>VI.</b>  | Ground 1: Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9-13 Are Obvious Over Sugar, Shin and Bluetooth..... | 11 |
| <b>A.</b>   | Sugar (EX1004).....  | 11 |
| <b>B.</b>   | Shin (EX1005).....   | 11 |
| <b>C.</b>   | Bluetooth Specification (EX1006).....  | 12 |
| <b>D.</b>   | Combination Rationale.....   | 12 |
| <b>E.</b>   | Analysis .....   | 14 |
| 1.          | Claim 1 .....  | 14 |
| <b>a.</b>   | 1.pre .....  | 14 |
| <b>b.</b>   | 1.a.....   | 16 |
| <b>c.</b>   | 1.b .....  | 19 |
| <b>d.</b>   | 1.c.....   | 20 |
| <b>e.</b>   | 1.d .....  | 21 |
| <b>f.</b>   | 1.e.....   | 25 |
| 2.          | Claim 3 .....  | 26 |
| 3.          | Claim 5 .....  | 27 |
| 4.          | Claim 6.....   | 29 |
| 5.          | Claim 7.....   | 29 |
| 6.          | Claim 9.....   | 30 |
| 7.          | Claim 10 .....   | 30 |
| 8.          | Claim 11 .....   | 30 |
| 9.          | Claim 12 .....   | 31 |
| 10.         | Claim 13 .....   | 31 |
| <b>VII.</b> | Ground 2: Claim 2 is Obvious over Sugar, Bluetooth, Shin and Cromer.....         | 31 |
| <b>A.</b>   | Cromer (EX1022).....   | 31 |
| <b>B.</b>   | Combination Rationale.....   | 32 |
| <b>C.</b>   | Claim 2 .....  | 34 |

|       |  |    |
|-------|--|----|
| VIII. | Ground 3: Claims 1, 4, 7-8 Are Obvious Over The Combination of<br>Giaimo and Sinivaara .....   | 35 |
| A.    | Giaimo .....   | 35 |
| B.    | Sinivaara.....   | 36 |
| C.    | Combination Rationale.....   | 36 |
| D.    | Analysis .....   | 39 |
|       | 1. Claim 1 .....   | 39 |
|       | a. 1.pre .....   | 39 |
|       | b. 1.a.....  | 41 |
|       | c. 1.b .....   | 43 |
|       | d. 1.c.....  | 44 |
|       | e. 1.d .....   | 45 |
|       | f. 1.e.....  | 51 |
|       | 2. Claim 4.....  | 53 |
|       | 3. Claim 7.....  | 54 |
|       | 4. Claim 8.....  | 54 |
| IX.   | Ground 4: Claim 1 is Obvious Over Gurevich, Hansen, and 802.11/b/g.....                        | 55 |
| A.    | Gurevich (EX1010) .....  | 55 |
| B.    | Hansen (EX1009).....   | 55 |
| C.    | IEEE 802.11/b/g Overview .....   | 56 |
|       | 1. IEEE 802.11-1999 (EX1017) Overview.....   | 56 |
|       | 2. IEEE 802.11b-1999 (EX1018) Overview.....  | 56 |
|       | 3. IEEE 802.11g-2003 (EX1019) Overview.....  | 57 |
| D.    | Rationale for Combining Hansen, Gurevich, and 802.11-1999,<br>802.11b and 802.11g. ....        | 57 |
|       | 1. Rationale for Combining 802.11-1999, 802.11b and<br>802.11g (collectively, 802.11/b/g)..... | 57 |
|       | 2. Rationale for Combining Hansen, Gurevich, and<br>802.11/b/g. ....                           | 58 |
| E.    | Analysis .....   | 61 |
|       | 1. Claim 1 .....   | 61 |

|            |           |  |    |
|------------|-----------|--|----|
|            | <b>a.</b> | 1.pre .....  | 61 |
|            | <b>b.</b> | 1.a.....   | 62 |
|            | <b>c.</b> | 1.b .....  | 64 |
|            | <b>d.</b> | 1.c.....   | 65 |
|            | <b>e.</b> | 1.d .....  | 67 |
|            | <b>f.</b> | 1.e.....   | 74 |
| <b>X.</b>  |           | This Petition is Proper Under 35 U.S.C. §§314(A) and 325(D) .....        | 75 |
|            | <b>A.</b> | The <i>Fintiv</i> Factors Favor Institution under §314(A).....           | 75 |
|            | <b>B.</b> | Stay .....   | 75 |
|            | <b>C.</b> | Trial Date.....  | 75 |
|            | <b>D.</b> | Parallel Proceeding.....   | 76 |
|            | <b>E.</b> | Same Party .....   | 76 |
|            | <b>F.</b> | Issue Overlap.....   | 77 |
|            | <b>G.</b> | Other Considerations.....  | 77 |
|            | <b>H.</b> | Compelling Merits.....   | 78 |
|            | <b>I.</b> | The <i>Becton Dickinson</i> Factors Favor Institution Under §325(d)..... | 78 |
| <b>XI.</b> |           | Conclusion .....   | 78 |

# 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.