EXHIBIT 25

Defendant's Invalidity Contentions
Exhibit G3

Invalidity of U.S. Patent No. 6,329,794
by
U.S. Patent No. 5,870,685 to Flynn ("*Flynn*")

The excerpts cited herein are exemplary. For any claim limitation, Defendant may rely on excerpts cited for any other limitation and/or additional excerpts not set forth fully herein to the extent necessary to provide a more comprehensive explanation for a reference's disclosure of a limitation. Where an excerpt refers to or discusses a figure or figure items, that figure and any additional descriptions of that figure should be understood to be incorporated by reference as if set forth fully therein.

Except where specifically noted otherwise, this chart applies the apparent constructions of claim terms as used by Plaintiff in its infringement contentions; such use, however, does not imply that Defendant adopts or agrees with Plaintiff's constructions in any way.

U.S. Patent No. 6,329,794 ("the '794 Patent") claims priority to Japanese Application No. 12-154358, filed May 22, 2000. For purposes of these invalidity contentions, Defendant applies the May 22, 2000, priority date for the '794 Patent. However, Defendant reserves the right to contest Plaintiff's reliance on the May 22, 2000, priority date, should the priority date become an issue in this proceeding.

U.S. Patent No. 5,870,685 to Flynn ("*Flynn*") issued on February 9, 1999. *Flynn* qualifies as prior art with regard to the '794 Patent at least under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(a) and (b) (pre-AIA).

Flynn identifies the Duracell-Intel Smart Battery Data Specification, Rev. 1.0, ("*Duracell Smart Battery Specification*") as part of specifying Duracell smart batteries for particular embodiments. *See Flynn* at 9:38-42. On information and belief the *Duracell Smart Battery Specification* was publicly available at least as early as February 15, 1995. The *Duracell Smart Battery Specification* therefore qualifies as prior art with regard to the '794 Patent at least under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) (pre-AIA).

U.S. Patent No. 6,031,999 to Ogawa ("*Ogawa*") was filed July 25, 1997, and issued February 29, 2000. *Ogawa* qualifies as prior art with regard to the '794 Patent at least under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(a) and (e) (pre-AIA).

U.S. Patent No. 6,501,968 to Ichimura ("*Ichimura*") was filed April 17, 1998, and issued December 31, 2002. *Ichimura* qualifies as prior art with regard to the '794 Patent at least under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) (pre-AIA).

U.S. Patent No. 6,363,266 to Nonogaki ("*Nonogaki*") was filed on March 1, 2000, and issued on March 26, 2002. *Nonogaki* qualifies as prior art with regard to the '794 Patent at least under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) (pre-AIA).

Defendant's Invalidity Contentions
Exhibit G3

U.S. Patent No. 6,609,072 to Yamagata ("*Yamagata*") was filed on December 2, 1998, and issued on August 19, 2003. *Yamagata* qualifies as prior art with regard to the '794 Patent at least under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) (pre-AIA).

Japanese Unexamined Patent Application Publication JP H7-281798 to Tanaka ("*Tanaka*") published October 27, 1995. *Tanaka* qualifies as prior art with regard to the '794 Patent at least under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(a) and (b) (pre-AIA).

U.S. Patent No. 5,886,954 to Asami et al. ("*Asami*") issued March 23, 1999. *Asami* therefore qualifies as prior art with regard to the '794 Patent at least under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(a) and (b) (pre-AIA).

Flynn anticipates or otherwise renders obvious claims 1-3, 8-10, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103(a).

Alternatively, *Flynn* in view of *Duracell Smart Battery Specification* renders claims 1-3, 8-10, and 14 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Alternatively, *Flynn* in view of *Ichimura* renders claims 1-3, 8-10, and 14 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Alternatively, *Flynn* in view of *Ogawa* renders claims 1-3, 8-10, and 14 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Alternatively, *Flynn* in view of *Duracell Smart Battery Specification* and further in view of *Ogawa* renders claims 1-3, 8-10, and 14 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Alternatively, *Flynn* in view of *Ichimura* and further in view of *Ogawa* renders claims 1-3, 8-10, and 14 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Alternatively, *Flynn* in view of *Nonogaki* renders claims 3, 5, and 11 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Alternatively, *Flynn* in view of *Duracell Smart Battery Specification* and further in view of *Nonogaki* renders claims 3, 5, and 11 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Alternatively, *Flynn* in view of *Ichimura* and further in view of *Nonogaki* renders claims 3, 5, and 11 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Alternatively, *Flynn* in view of *Ogawa* and further in view of *Nonogaki* renders claims 3, 5, 6, 11, and 12 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Alternatively, *Flynn* in view of *Duracell Smart Battery Specification* and further in view of *Ogawa* and *Nonogaki* renders claims 3, 5, 6, 11, and 12 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Alternatively, *Flynn* in view of *Ichimura* and further in view of *Ogawa* and *Nonogaki* renders claims 3, 5, 6, 11, and 12 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Alternatively, *Flynn* in view of *Yamagata* renders claim 3 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Alternatively, *Flynn* in view of *Duracell Smart Battery Specification* and further in view of *Yamagata* renders claim 3 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Alternatively, *Flynn* in view of *Ichimura* and further in view of *Yamagata* renders claim 3 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Alternatively, *Flynn* in view of *Ogawa* and further in view of *Yamagata* renders claim 3 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Alternatively, *Flynn* in view of *Duracell Smart Battery Specification* and further in view of *Ogawa* and *Yamagata* renders claim 3 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Alternatively, *Flynn* in view of *Ichimura* and further in view of *Ogawa* and *Yamagata* renders claim 3 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Alternatively, *Flynn* in view of *Asami* renders claims 7 and 13 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Alternatively, *Flynn* in view of *Duracell Smart Battery Specification* and further in view of *Asami* renders claims 7 and 13 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Alternatively, *Flynn* in view of *Ichimura* and further in view of *Asami* renders claims 7 and 13 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Alternatively, *Flynn* in view of *Ogawa* and further in view of *Asami* renders claims 7 and 13 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Alternatively, *Flynn* in view of *Duracell Smart Battery Specification* and further in view of *Ogawa* and *Asami* renders claims 7 and 13 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Alternatively, *Flynn* in view of *Ichimura* and further in view of *Ogawa* and *Asami* renders claims 7 and 13 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Alternatively, *Flynn* in view of *Tanaka* renders claims 5, 7, 11, and 13 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Alternatively, *Flynn* in view of *Duracell Smart Battery Specification* and further in view of *Tanaka* renders claims 5, 7, 11, and 13 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Alternatively, *Flynn* in view of *Ichimura* and further in view of *Tanaka* renders claims 5, 7, 11, and 13 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Alternatively, *Flynn* in view of *Ogawa* and further in view of *Tanaka* renders claims 5, 7, 11, and 13 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

U.S. Patent No. 6,329,794	***Flynn***
Claim 1	
[1(pre)] An information processing device comprising:	To the extent the preamble is limiting, *Flynn* discloses an information processing device, such as battery-powered mobile station 100. *The present invention provides a method and apparatus for controlling the operations of a battery-powered mobile station based on the capacity of its battery. In accordance with the present invention, the mobile station monitors the capacity of its battery to determine whether it has fallen below any one of a plurality of threshold capacity values. When the capacity of the battery falls below the highest of these threshold values, the mobile station sends a registration cancellation message to the serving system and then disables the transmit operation in order to conserve power. Other operations of the mobile station are systematically disabled if the battery capacity falls below one or more lower threshold values.* *Flynn* at Abstract.

DOCKET ALARM

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.