

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

---

ALARM.COM INC.  
Petitioner

v.

VIVINT, INC.  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2016-00116  
Patent 6,147,601

---

**PETITIONER'S RESPONSE TO PATENT OWNER'S MOTION FOR  
OBSERVATION ON CROSS EXAMINATION OF REPLY WITNESS  
ARTHUR ZATARAIN**

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
US Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Patent Owner Vivint submits 22 observations, none of which undermine Petitioner Alarm.com's record evidence or further develop any existing issue in this case. Thus, as set forth below, all of the observations should be disregarded.

*Response to Observation 1:* Vivint cites testimony suggesting that Mr. Zatarain did not “select[] the arguments” in his Reply Declaration and that attorney “wordsmithing” of Mr. Zatarain’s declaration is “relevant to the credibility of Mr. Zatarain’s opinions”. Pat. Owner’s Mot. at 1 (“Motion”) (citing Ex. 2018, 7:2-25). This observation should be disregarded for at least two reasons. First, Mr. Zatarain testified unequivocally that his Declaration was “my content, my reply”, that the attorneys identified topics addressed by Mr. Denning (Vivint’s expert), and that the attorneys assisted him in formatting citations and other similar clerical work. *See id.* at 7:17-22, 8:1-8. Second, Vivint’s claim about Alarm.com’s attorneys “select[ing] the arguments” is also without merit, as the attorneys merely generated a list of the “arguments” or “topics” *raised by Patent Owner* in its Response. *See* Ex. 2018, 7:13-15. There is no reason to doubt the sincerity of Mr. Zatarain’s opinions, and Vivint does not identify any specific opinion it claims is not credible for this reason.

*Response to Observation 2:* Vivint cites Mr. Zatarain’s agreement that “a system that only obtains data from storage and does not write to storage” comports with the definitions of “access” cited in his Reply Declaration and therefore that

the user interface in Shetty could not be used to modify user profiles. Motion at 1-2. That conclusion is without merit. Mr. Zatarain’s testimony does not contradict his opinions because he opines that a person of ordinary skill in the art (“POSA”) would understand the word “access” to include *both* read-only and read-write systems. *See* Ex. 1130, ¶ 56; *see also* Ex. 2018, 13:23-14:4 (“access” applies to both reading and/or writing); 16:4-9 (same); 17:4-10 (same); 18:5-14 (same). In addition, the plain language definitions of access encompass both reading and writing data, and other disclosures in Shetty make clear to a POSA that users of the system can use the interface to configure the profiles (Ex. 1130, ¶¶ 44-50, 61-72).

*Response to Observation 3:* Vivint cites testimony of Mr. Zatarain stating that he paraphrased, rather than quoted, Mr. Denning with regard to Mr. Denning’s testimony that the word “access” includes both reading and writing data.

Regardless of whether Mr. Denning used the words “as well as”, Mr. Denning testified that he agreed that both “retrieval” of data (reading) and “update” of data (writing) are “access operations”. Ex. 1118, 39:13-19. Thus, there is no substantive difference in meaning, and Mr. Denning’s testimony supports Mr. Zatarain’s contentions concerning a POSA’s understanding of the word “access”. *See* Ex. 1130, ¶¶ 51-55.

*Response to Observation 4:* Vivint cites Mr. Zatarain’s statement that the Shetty reference discloses three logical databases as somehow “undermin[ing]” his

supposed argument that “allowing [a] user to input [sic] into the [Shetty] fleet and machine database” means that “Shetty [also] discloses a user inputting data into the user profile database”. Motion at 2-3 (citing Ex. 1130, ¶ 49). But Mr. Zatarain never contended that the fleet and machine database and the user profile database are the “same database”; instead he opined that adding data to the user profile database is consistent with Shetty’s express disclosures about the fleet and machine database. Specifically, Mr. Zatarain explained that Shetty teaches a customizable system to solve “the problem of having too much data to analyze” with the solution being a “system [that] allows for the users to decide what events they want to be notified about and . . . how the system should contact them”. Ex. 1130, ¶ 47. In that context, Mr. Zatarain explained that a system would be useless if new fleet and machine data could be added to the system, but users could not be notified of events concerning the newly-added machines. *Id.*, ¶¶ 49; 70 (“a PHOSITA would understand that the user profile database would also need to be modified when changes are made to the fleet and machine data, so that notifications could be received based on any new machines . . .”). The observation should be ignored.

*Response to Observation 5:* Vivint cites testimony from Mr. Zatarain agreeing that the word “also” in the sentence “the user interface also allows the user to input information relating to the fleet or machine data” informs a POSA that user interface 110 would allow access to fleet and machine database 104,

rather than also reflecting on Shetty's use of the word "access" in the preceding sentence of the specification. Vivint misstates Mr. Zatarain's testimony because it is incomplete. In fact, Mr. Zatarain testified at page 32, lines 5 through 25 of Exhibit 2018 that, "I think it's using the words as they would be commonly known. Access, input, reading, is all about working with the database, as is commonly known." Review of Mr. Zatarain's complete testimony demonstrates that he did not contradict his opinion, as reflected in paragraphs 69 and 70 of his Reply Declaration.

*Response to Observation 6:* Vivint cites testimony that purportedly "undermines" Mr. Zatarain's argument "that databases are read-write unless otherwise indicated". Motion at 4 (citing Ex. 1130, ¶ 53). First, Mr. Zatarain did not opine that "databases are read-write unless otherwise indicated". *Id.* Rather, he opined that, given the plain meaning of the word "access" and Shetty's unqualified use of that word, he would have expected Shetty to have made clear if the user's "access" was meant to be "read-only". Second, Mr. Zatarain cited many dictionary definitions of the word "access" to support his opinion that the plain meaning of "access" includes read-write capabilities. *Id.*; *see also* Ex. 1130, ¶ 58 (addressing "special case" of online phone directory). The cited testimony does not contradict Mr. Zatarain's declaration; the observation should be disregarded.

*Response to Observation 7:* Vivint cites Mr. Zatarain's testimony that there

# 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.