

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

UNIFIED PATENTS INC  
Petitioner

v.

SOUND VIEW INNOVATIONS, LLC  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2019-01113  
Patent 6,034,621

---

**PATENT OWNER SOUND VIEW INNOVATIONS, LLC'S  
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE  
TO UNIFIED PATENTS INC'S PETITION  
FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW  
OF UNITED STATES PATENT NO. 6,034,621**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	THE DISCLAIMED CLAIMS.....	2
III.	THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS .....	3
IV.	THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OF THE '621 PATENT ARE DIRECTED TO METHODS OF WIRELESS REMOTE SYNCRONIZATION OF DATA BETWEEN A PC AND A PDA “AUTOMATICALLY WITHOUT USER INTERVENTION.” .....	6
V.	THE PETITON FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE THAT CLARK IN VIEW OF CASHMAN RENDER THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OBVIOUS (ALL CHALLENGED CLAIMS, GROUND 1). .....	10
A.	Clark And Cashman Do Not Teach “Monitoring A Change To Said Data File ... Automatically Without User Intervention.” .....	10
B.	Clark And Cashman Do Not Teach “Transmitting Said Synchronization Data Packet ... Over Said Wireless Telephonic Network ... Automatically Without User Intervention.” .....	18
C.	Clark In View Of Cashman Do Not Teach “Monitoring A Change To Said Data File,” “Assembl[ing] A Synchronization Information Data Packet Including Information Regarding Said Detected Change” And Then “Transmitting Said Synchronization Information Packet” “Over [A] Wireless Telephonic Network.” .....	21
VI.	THE PETITON FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE THAT FALLS IN VIEW OF FOLADARE RENDERS THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OBVIOUS (ALL CHALLENGED CLAIMS, GROUND 2).....	29
A.	Falls And Foladare Do Not Teach “After Detection Of Said Change To Said Data File ... Triggering A Synchronization Routine.”.....	30
1.	<i>The Petition fails to specify where “after detection of said change to said data file ... triggering a synchronization routine” is allegedly found in the asserted references. ....</i>	30
2.	<i>The portions of Falls cited in the Petition fail to teach “after detection of said change to said data file ... triggering a synchronization routine.” .....</i>	34

B.	Falls And Foladare Do Not Teach “Synchroniz[ing] A Data File ... Automatically Without User Intervention.” .....	36
1.	<i>The Petition fails to demonstrate that Falls teaches “monitoring,” “triggering,” and “transmitting” steps that “are all performed automatically without user intervention.” .....</i>	37
2.	<i>Falls plainly states that its synchronization routine is not automatic and does require user intervention. ....</i>	40
3.	<i>Falls discloses no “triggering” “after detection of said change to said data file” that is performed “automatically.” .....</i>	42
4.	<i>Falls’ synchronization requires user intervention such as reconnecting to a network and selecting data to be copied prior to disconnection from the network. ....</i>	44
VII.	ALL CLAIMS CHALLENGED IN THE PETITION’S THIRD GROUND HAVE BEEN DISCLAIMED (GROUND 3) .....	48
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	49

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page(s)**

**COURT DECISIONS**

*Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.*,  
815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....34

*Intelligent Bio-Sys. v. Illumina Cambridge, Ltd.*,  
821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....30

*Vectra Fitness, Inc. v. TNWK Corp.*,  
162 F.3d 1379 (Fed. Cir. 1998) ..... 2, 49

**AGENCY DECISIONS**

*Conopco, Inc. v. Procter & Gamble Co.*,  
IPR2013-00510, Paper 9 (PTAB Feb. 12, 2014).....12

*Whole Space Indus. Ltd. v. Zipshade Indus. (B.V.I.) Corp.*,  
IPR2015-00488, Paper 14 (PTAB July 24, 2015).....12

**STATUTES**

35 U.S.C. § 253 ..... 2, 48

35 U.S.C. § 312 .....33

**RULES AND RULEMAKING**

37 C.F.R. § 1.321 .....2

37 C.F.R. § 42.104 ..... 30, 33, 34, 38

37 C.F.R. § 42.107 ..... 2, 49

37 C.F.R. § 42.22 .....33

77 Fed. Reg. 48,680, 48,689 (Aug. 14, 2012) .....2

<b>EXHIBIT LIST</b>	
<b>2001</b>	Disclaimer in Patent Under 37 CFR 1.321(a), U.S. Pat. No. 6,034,621, cls. 1-8, 15-18, 21-38, and 40-44 (08/972,453 Sept. 4, 2019)
<b>2002</b>	IBM Article, <i>ACID Properties of Transactions</i> (accessed Aug. 31, 2019) (available at <a href="https://www.ibm.com/support/knowledgecenter/en/SSGMCP_5.4.0/product-overview/acid.html">https://www.ibm.com/support/knowledgecenter/en/SSGMCP_5.4.0/product-overview/acid.html</a> )

# 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.