Paper 62

Entered: November 3, 2014

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

._____.

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

POLARIS WIRELESS, INC., Petitioner,

v.

TRUEPOSITION, INC., Patent Owner.

Case IPR2013-00323 Patent 7,783,299 B2

Before JAMESON LEE, JONI Y. CHANG, and MICHAEL W. KIM, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

KIM, Administrative Patent Judge.

FINAL WRITTEN DECISION 35 U.S.C. § 318(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.73



I. BACKGROUND

A. Introduction

Polaris Wireless, Inc. ("Petitioner") filed a Petition requesting *inter* partes review of claims 111–114 of U.S. Patent No. 7,783,299 B2 (Ex. 1001, "the '299 patent"). Paper 1 ("Pet."). Petitioner relies upon the following prior art references:

| Zell | WO 99/33303 | July 1, 1999 | Ex. 1007^1 |
|-----------|-----------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Abbadessa | U.S. Patent 6,088,587 | July 11, 2000 | Ex. 1011 |
| Havinis | U.S. Patent 6.167.266 | Dec. 26, 2000 | Ex. 1012 |

TruePosition, Inc. ("Patent Owner") timely filed a Patent Owner Preliminary Response. Paper 6 ("Prelim. Resp."). On November 15, 2013, the Board instituted trial for claims 111–114 on the following grounds of unpatentability:

| Reference(s) | Basis | Claims Challenged |
|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Zell | § 102(b) | 111–114 |
| Abbadessa and Havinis | § 103(a) | 111–114 |

Paper 9 ("Dec.").

After institution of trial, Patent Owner filed a Patent Owner Response. Paper 21 ("PO Resp."). Petitioner subsequently filed a Reply to the Response. Paper 30 ("Reply"). Petitioner filed a Motion to Exclude (Paper 39; "Pet. Mot."), to which Patent Owner filed an Opposition (Paper 47; "PO



¹ Although Zell is Exhibit 1007, Zell is written in French. Accordingly, all citations to Zell in this Decision will be to Exhibit 1008, which is a certified English language translation of Zell.

Opp."). Petitioner then filed a Reply (Paper 51; "Pet. Reply"). Patent Owner filed a Motion to Exclude (Paper 38; "PO Mot."), to which Petitioner filed an Opposition (Paper 48; "Pet. Opp."). Patent Owner then filed a Reply (Paper 50; "PO Reply"). An oral hearing was held on July 15, 2014. The transcript of the hearing has been entered into the record. Paper 61.

We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(c). This final written decision is issued pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 318(a).

Petitioner has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that claims 111–114 of the '299 patent are *unpatentable*.

Petitioner's Motion to Exclude is dismissed.

Patent Owner's Motion to Exclude is *dismissed-in-part* and *denied-in-part*.

B. Related Proceedings

Both Petitioner and Patent Owner indicate that the '299 patent was asserted against Petitioner in a co-pending district court case captioned *TruePosition, Inc. v. Polaris Wireless, Inc.*, Case No. 1:12-cv-00646 (D. Del.). Pet. 3; Paper 23, 2.

C. The '299 patent

The subject matter of the '299 patent relates to locating wireless devices, also called mobile stations ("MS"), such as those used in analog or digital cellular systems, personal communications systems, enhanced specialized mobile radios, and other types of wireless communications systems. Ex. 1001, 1:23–28. The '299 patent discloses that wireless location systems have been installed in more than 40,000 Base Transceiver Stations (BTS), providing emergency location coverage for wireless



subscribers across the continental United States. Ex. 1001, 1:62–67. According to the '299 patent, widespread deployment of these systems can reduce emergency response time, save lives, and save enormous costs because of the reduced use of emergency response resources. Ex. 1001, 2:6–9. In addition, the '299 patent discloses that surveys and studies have concluded that various wireless applications, such as location sensitive billing, fleet management, and others, will have great commercial value in coming years. Ex. 1001, 2:9–12.

Early work related to wireless location systems used time difference of arrival techniques to locate cellular telephones. Ex. 1001, 1:39–43. Over time, the cellular industry has increased the number of air interface protocols available for use by wireless telephones, increased the number of frequency bands in which wireless or mobile telephones may operate, and expanded the number of terms that refer or relate to mobile telephones to include "personal communications services," "wireless," and others. Ex. 1001, 1:51–57.

Air interface protocols use two categories of channels, where a channel is defined as one of multiple transmission paths within a single link between points in a wireless network. Ex. 1001, 2:19–22. A channel may be defined by frequency, by bandwidth, by synchronized time slots, by encoding, by shift keying, by modulation scheme, or by any combination of these parameters. Ex. 1001, 2:22–24. The first channel category, called a control or access channel, is used to convey information about the wireless telephone or transmitter, for initiating or terminating calls, or for transferring intermittent data. Ex. 1001, 2:25–28. The second channel category, known



as a voice or traffic channel, typically conveys voice or data communications over an air interface. Ex. 1001, 2:33–35.

There are some difficulties in integrating wireless location services with certain air interface protocols. For example, one protocol, Code-Division Multiple Access ("CDMA"), uses both frequency and code separation. Ex. 1001, 3:7–9. Because adjacent cell sites may use the same frequency sets, CDMA must operate under very careful power control, producing a situation known to those skilled in the art as the near-far problem, making it difficult for most methods of wireless location to achieve an accurate location. Ex. 1001, 3:9–13. In another example, networks that use Global System for Mobile Communications ("GSM") protocol also present a number of potential problems to existing wireless location systems. Ex. 1001, 4:8–9. GSM networks use encryption on the traffic channel and use temporary nicknames (Temporary Mobile Station Identifiers (TMSID)) for security reasons, making it difficult to identify properly a desired MS in order to trigger or task wireless location systems. Ex. 1001, 4:11–15. Furthermore, an MS connected to GSM networks does not transmit signals to regional receivers except during call setup, voice/data operation, and call breakdown, reducing the number of opportunities to detect the MS. Ex. 1001, 4:15–21.

To solve these and other problems, methods and systems are disclosed that are employed by a wireless location system (WLS) for locating a wireless device operating in a geographic area served by a wireless communications system. Ex. 1001, 4:39–42. According to the '299 patent, an exemplary method includes monitoring a set of signaling links of a



DOCKET

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.

