

Filed on behalf of: INTERDIGITAL TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION  
Paper No. 9

By: Jonathan D. Link  
Latham & Watkins LLP  
555 11th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20004-1304  
Telephone: (202) 637-2200  
Facsimile: (202) 637-2201  
E-mail: jonathan.link@lw.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

ZTE CORPORATION AND ZTE (USA) INC.  
Petitioner

V.

INTERDIGITAL TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2014-00275  
Patent 7,941,151

---

Mailed: April 17, 2014

Before PATRICK E. BAKER, *Trial Paralegal*

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO  
ZTE'S PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW  
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,941,151

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Summary of Preliminary Response .....	3
III. Overview of 151 Patent .....	3
IV. Claim construction.....	4
A. “same physical downlink control channel” .....	4
B. “channel assignment information” .....	7
C. “shared channel” .....	8
D. “based on WTRU identity (ID)-masked cyclic redundancy check (CRC) parity bits” .....	11
V. 151 patent is valid over Cited Prior art.....	11
A. Ground 1 Fails: Siemens 004 Does Not Anticipate Or Render Obvious Any Of The Claims.....	12
1. Overview of Siemens 004 and HS-SCCH .....	12
2. Siemens 004 does not disclose the preamble of claim 1: “A method for utilizing channel assignment information for an uplink shared channel or a downlink shared channel, the method comprising:” .....	15
3. Siemens 004 Does Not Disclose An “Uplink Shared Channel” (Claim 1).....	16
4. Siemens 004 does not disclose “determining whether the channel assignment information is for assigning radio resources for the uplink shared channel or the downlink shared channel” (Claim 1) .....	18

5.	Siemens 004 does not disclose the order of the two determinations required by “and if so” (Claim 1) .....	19
6.	Siemens 004 does not anticipate dependent claims 2-6 and 8 .....	20
7.	Siemens 004 does not anticipate claim 9 .....	20
8.	Siemens 004 does not anticipate Claim 16 .....	21
9.	Siemens 004 does not anticipate dependent claims 17-21 and 23-24.....	21
10.	Siemens 004, alone, does not render the claims obvious, and any obviousness argument would be redundant .....	21
B.	Ground 2 Is Redundant And Fails: Siemens 004 And The Admitted Prior Art Do Not Render Claims 1-6 and 16-21 Obvious .....	23
C.	Ground 3 is Redundant And Fails: Siemens 004 Combined With 3GPP TS 25.212 Does Not Render Claims 1-6 and 16-21 Obvious .....	27
D.	Ground 4 is Redundant And Fails: Siemens 004 Combined With InterDigital 810 Does Not Render Claims 1-2 and 16-17 Obvious .....	29
E.	Ground 5 Is Redundant And Fails: Siemens 004 Combined With Motorola 683 Does Not Render Claims 8 and 23 Obvious .....	32
F.	Ground 6 Is Redundant And: Siemens 004 and Siemens 010 Do Not Render Claims 8 and 23 Obvious.....	35
VI.	Conclusion .....	38

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page**

**CASES**

*Creston Elecs. v. Norman IP Holdings, LLC*,  
IPR2013-00278 (Paper. No. 11) (PTAB Nov. 15, 2003) .....26

*Heart Failure Techs., LLC v. CardioKinetix, Inc.*,  
IPR2013-00183 (Paper No. 12) (PTAB July 21, 2013).....26

*Helifix Ltd. v. Blok-Lok, Ltd.*,  
208 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....25

*In re Kubin*,  
561 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2009)..... 31, 35, 38

*In re O'Farrell*,  
853 F.2d 894 (Fed. Cir. 1988)..... 31, 35, 38

*Innogentics, N.V. v. Abbott Labs.*,  
512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....26

*Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.*,  
688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....26

*KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*,  
550 U.S. 398 (2007).....26

*Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casualty Ins. Co.*,  
CBM2012-00003 (Paper No. 7) (PTAB Oct. 25, 2012)..... passim

*Oracle Corp. v. Clouding IP, LLC*,  
IPR2013-00088 (Paper No. 13) (PTAB June 13, 2013)..... passim

**OTHER AUTHORITIES**

35 U.S.C. § 102 .....2, 3

35 U.S.C. § 103 .....2, 3

37 C.F.R § 1.111 .....8

37 C.F.R. § 42.8 .....1

# 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.