

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BROADCOM CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

v.

WI-FI ONE, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2013-00601

Patent 6,772,215

Case IPR2013-00602

Patent 6,466,568

Case IPR2013-00636

Patent 6,424,625

Held: December 8, 2014

BEFORE: KARL D. EASTHOM, KALYAN K. DESHPANDE, and
MATTHEW R. CLEMENTS, Administrative Patent Judges.

APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:

DOMINIC E. MASSA, ESQUIRE
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
60 State Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02109

Case IPR2013-00601 Patent 6,772,215; Case IPR2013-00602
Patent 6,466,568; Case IPR2013-00636 Patent 6,424,625

ON BEHALF OF PATENT OWNER:

PETER J. AYERS, ESQUIRE
JOHN M. SHUMAKER, ESQUIRE
Lee & Hayes
13809 Research Boulevard
Suite 405
Austin, Texas 78750

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Monday,
December 8, 2014, commencing at 1:00 p.m., at the U.S. Patent and
Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia.

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 - - - - -

3 JUDGE EASTHOM: Good afternoon.

4 Judge Clements, are you with us? We couldn't hear you.

5 JUDGE CLEMENTS: Do you hear me now?

6 JUDGE EASTHOM: Okay. Great. Welcome.

7 Welcome, everybody. This is Broadcom versus Ericsson.

8 We have three cases, IPR2013-601, 602 and 636; three patents
9 involved, 6,772,215, 6,466,568, 6,424,625.

10 The way we set out the hearing order, Ericsson will go --
11 I'm sorry, Broadcom will go first. Petitioner will reserve however
12 much you want out of your 90 minutes, then Patent Owner has the
13 burden on the amendments.

14 I understand there's only two cases you have amendments
15 in, right? Okay. And then if you want to reserve rebuttal time to

1 respond to whatever Petitioner says on behalf -- or about your
2 amendments, then we'll go from there.

3 We'll probably take a short break after Patent Owner, a
4 five-minute break, maybe give the stenographer a chance to rest and
5 the rest of us take a breather.

6 So with that, Petitioner introduce yourself, please.

7 MR. MASSA: Yes, Your Honor. Dominic Massa from
8 Wilmer Hale on behalf of Broadcom. And with me today from
9 Wilmer Hale is Mike Diener and Zach Piccolomini and Kate Saxton.
10 From Broadcom, Associate General Counsel Tony Drew, Associate
11 General Counsel Chris Perry and Managing Counsel Kris Dawes.

12 JUDGE EASTHOM: Welcome, everyone.

13 Are you going to start the case, Mr. Massa?

14 MR. MASSA: I will, Your Honor.

15 JUDGE EASTHOM: Okay. Whenever you're ready.

16 MR. MASSA: Your Honor, I have a copy of the
17 demonstratives. May I approach to hand those up?

18 JUDGE EASTHOM: Sure. Thank you.

19 MR. MASSA: I have three copies.

20 JUDGE EASTHOM: Thanks.

21 MR. MASSA: And, Your Honor, we propose to argue the
22 cases in the order of their filing numbers, starting with the 601 case.
23 If we can go to slide number 2 in the deck.

24 We'll start with the '215 patent, which was instituted on the
25 grounds of anticipation by the Seo reference. Now we're on slide

1 number 3. The '215 patent relates to a communication system in
2 which feedback messages are exchanged to acknowledge either
3 positively the acceptance of a packet or negatively to acknowledge
4 that a packet was not received.

5 Claim 1 is the one we'll discuss first. Slide 4 generally
6 shows the sequence of communication from an entity on the left,
7 communicating packets to the entity on the right and you'll see three
8 arrows down, between the second and third arrow down on the right
9 side, that S-PDU, ACK is an acknowledgment message, which is sent
10 from the receiver back to the transmitter, and it's that's exchange of
11 messages that the '215 is directed to.

12 We turn to slide 5. The admitted prior art in the '215 patent
13 describes two types of feedback messages. One is a list feedback
14 that's shown in Figure 2, which provides for the length of the feedback
15 message and then lists the sequence numbers SN of those packets,
16 which have either been received affirmatively or also negative
17 received acknowledgements, so NAKs. Those could be either ACKs
18 or NAKs.

19 In Figure 3 of the '215 shows a bitmap format. So instead
20 of providing the sequence number of the received packets, it provides
21 a starting sequence number and then a bitmap, which goes
22 sequentially to show which sequence number packets have been
23 received and which have not. Both the list format and the bitmap
24 format were acknowledged prior art.

1 Going to slide 6, the alleged invention of the '215 is
2 providing a type field to identify the type of feedback, and in Figure 4
3 the type equals bitmap and that's the same bitmap in the prior art and
4 Figure 5 shows the list, and, again, that's the same type of list we saw
5 in the admitted prior art. And the '215 patent claims as its invention
6 this provision of a type identifier to distinguish among different types
7 of feedback responses.

8 And that's what's claimed on slide 7, the constructing of a
9 message field for a second data unit. That's the data unit sent from the
10 receiver back to the transmitter, said message field including a type
11 identifier field.

12 Moving on to slide 8, the type identifier is the claim
13 element at issue here. The construction by the Board is on the screen
14 at slide 8. The type identifier field is, as construed by the Board in the
15 institution, a field of a message that identifies the type of that
16 message, as well as an alternative construction, but, first, I'll focus on
17 the narrower construction on which there was institution.

18 And slide 9 just shows the Board's decision in institution
19 and the claims on which the IPR has been instituted.

20 So let's get to the heart of the matter. The Seo patent
21 discloses exactly what is claimed in the '215 as the type identifier
22 field. It is highlighted on slide 10 in yellow. It's called NAK
23 underscore type. The specification at column 5, lines 54 through 57,
24 describes exactly what that field does. A field NAK type with a
25 length of two bits indicates a NAK type. That's precisely what the

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.