

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**  
**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

Parrot S.A. and Parrot, Inc.

Petitioners,

v.

Drone Technologies, Inc.

Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 7,584,071

Filed: March 19, 2008

Issued: September 1, 2009

Inventor: Yu-Tuan Lee

Assignee: Drone Technologies, Inc.

Title: Remote-Controlled Motion Apparatus With Sensing Terrestrial Magnetism  
And Remote Control Apparatus Therefor

---

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD, PTAB  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,584,071  
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.100 ET SEQ.**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	MANDATORY NOTICES .....	3
A.	Real Party-In-Interest .....	3
B.	Related Matters.....	3
1.	Related Litigation.....	3
2.	Related Applications .....	4
C.	Lead and Back-Up Counsel.....	4
D.	Service Information .....	4
III.	PAYMENT OF FEES .....	5
IV.	REQUIREMENTS FOR <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW.....	5
A.	Grounds for Standing .....	5
B.	Identification of Challenge.....	5
1.	The Specific Art and Statutory Ground(s) on Which the Challenge is Based .....	6
2.	How the Construed Claims Are Unpatentable Under the Statutory Grounds Identified in 37 C.F.R. § 42.204(B)(2) and Supporting Evidence .....	7
V.	FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	8
A.	Declaration Evidence .....	8
B.	The State of the Art .....	8
C.	The Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	11
D.	The '071 Patent .....	11
E.	Prosecution History of the '071 Patent .....	15

<b>VI.</b>	<b>BROADEST REASONABLE CONSTRUCTION.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>A.</b>	“difference of motion” .....	17
<b>B.</b>	“information of the remote controller’s motion in the 3D space” .....	17
<b>VII.</b>	<b>REPRESENTATIVE PROPOSED REJECTIONS AND SHOWING THAT PETITIONER IS LIKELY TO PREVAIL.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>A.</b>	Claims 1-5 and 10-14 Are Anticipated Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by Smith.....	18
<b>1.</b>	The “comparison” as required by claim 2 is inherent in Smith	26
<b>2.</b>	The “difference of motion” as required by claim 4 is inherent in Smith .....	27
<b>3.</b>	Conversion to “baseband” as required by claim is inherent in Smith .....	28
<b>B.</b>	Whether or Not Anticipated, Claims 2, 4, and 10 Are Rendered Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) by Smith Taken in View of the Knowledge of a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	28
<b>C.</b>	Claims 6 and 7 Are Rendered Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) by Smith Taken in View of Barr .....	29
<b>D.</b>	Claims 8 and 9 Are Rendered Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) by Smith Taken in View of Fouche .....	32
<b>E.</b>	Claim 15 is Rendered Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) by Smith Taken in View of Spirov and/or Bathiche and/or Shkolnikov.....	35
<b>F.</b>	Claims 1-3, 5, and 10-13 Are Anticipated Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by Potiron .....	41
<b>1.</b>	“comparison” as required by Claim 2 is Inherent in Potiron....	45
<b>2.</b>	Conversion to “baseband” as required by Claim 10 is Inherent in Potiron.....	46
<b>G.</b>	Whether or Not Anticipated, Claims 2 and 10 Are Rendered Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) by Potiron Taken in View of the Knowledge of a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	47

<b>H.</b>	Claim 4 is Rendered Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) by Potiron, or Potiron in View of Fouche .....	47
<b>I.</b>	Claims 6 and 7 Are Rendered Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) by Potiron Taken in View of Barr .....	49
<b>J.</b>	Claims 8 and 9 Are Rendered Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) by Potiron Taken in View of Fouche .....	51
<b>K.</b>	Claim 14 is Rendered Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) by Potiron Taken in View of Smith, Spirov, Bathiche, or Shkolnikov .....	53
<b>L.</b>	Claim 15 is Rendered Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) by Potiron Taken in View of Spirov and/or Bathiche and/or Shkolnikov.....	54
<b>VIII.</b>	CONCLUSION.....	59

## EXHIBIT LIST

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Reference Name</b>
Ex. 1001	U.S. Patent No. 7,584,071 (the '071 Patent)
Ex. 1002	U.S. Patent No. 5,043,646 ("Smith")
Ex. 1003	French Patent Publication No. 2,789,765 to Potiron
Ex. 1004	Certified English Translation of French Patent No. 2,789,765 ("Potiron")
Ex. 1005	U.S. Patent No. 7,219,861 ("Barr")
Ex. 1006	U.S. Patent No. 6,751,529 ("Fouche")
Ex. 1007	U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0144994 to Spirov ("Spirov")
Ex. 1008	U.S. Pat. No. 7,145,551 ("Bathiche")
Ex. 1009	U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0263479 ("Shkolnikov")
Ex. 1010	Expert Declaration of Dr. Raffaello D'Andrea, PhD, with Attachments A-C
Ex. 1010, Att. A	U.S. Patent No. 613,809 to Tesla ("Tesla")
Ex. 1010, Att. B	U.S. Patent No. 3,101,569 to Giardina ("Giardina")
Ex. 1010, Att. C	U.S. Patent No. 8,072,417 to Jouanet ("Jouanet")
Ex. 1011	Claim Chart Demonstrating Invalidity of the '071 Patent

# 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.