

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO. LTD.; SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS
AMERICA, INC.; SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC;
AND SAMSUNG AUSTIN SEMICONDUCTOR, LLC;
Petitioner

v.

REMBRANDT WIRELESS TECHNOLOGIES, LP
Patent Owner

Case IPR2014-00518
Patent 8,023,580

**PETITIONER'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF
ITS PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,023,580**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. CLAIMS 1, 4, 5, 10, 13, 20–22, 54, 57-58, 61-62, 66, 70, AND 76–79 OF THE `580 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE 1

II. PETITIONER HAS ESTABLISHED OBVIOUSNESS 1

A. Uperder Demonstrates Motivation For The Combination..... 2

1. Determinacy And Simplicity Are Important Factors To Consider When Choosing A MAC Protocol..... 2

2. Dr. Koopman Admits That Determinacy and Simplicity Are Reasons To Select A Master/Slave MAC Protocol..... 3

B. Boer Uses A MAC Protocol Having Disadvantages When Compared To A Master/Slave Protocol..... 4

C. A Person Having Ordinary Skill In The Art Would Weigh The Strengths And Weaknesses Of The Various MAC Protocols 5

D. When The Prior Art Discloses Many Embodiments, The Fact That Certain Alternatives Might Be Better Does Not Negate Motivation To Use The Lesser Embodiments..... 5

1. The Alleged Benefits Provided By Boer’s CSMA/CA Do Not Relate To Any Claimed Feature..... 7

2. Uperder Does Not Teach Away..... 8

E. Dr. Koopman’s Testimony Is Suspect..... 9

III. PPM/DQPSK IS A DIFFERENT “TYPE OF MODULATION METHOD” THAN DBPSK..... 9

A. The Proper Construction Of “At Least Two Types Of Modulation Methods” Is Not Limited To “Families Of Modulation Methods” ... 10

1. Patent Owner’s Statement Made During Prosecution Regarding “Families Of Modulation Methods” Is Not Binding On Board10

2. Patent Owner’s Construction Makes No Sense 10

3. Subsequent Prosecution Precludes Patent Owner’s Construction 11

B. Boer Teaches Different Types Of Modulation Methods..... 12

C. Pulse Position Modulation Is Not Coding 15

IV. THE LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART HAS NO BEARING ON THE OUTCOME..... 15

V. CONCLUSION 15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

In re Gurley, 27 F.3d 551 (Fed. Cir. 1994)..... 8

In re Mouttet, 686 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 8

Innovative Biometric Tech., LLC. v. Toshiba Am. Info. Systems, Inc. (S.D. Fla. 2012) 10

Innovention Toys, LLC v. MGA Ent., Inc., 637 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2011)..... 16

KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....5, 6

Lear Siegler, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp., 733 F.2d 881 (Fed. Cir. 1984)..... 9

Sakraida v. Ag Pro, Inc., 425 U.S. 273 (1976)..... 6

Schrader-Bridgeport Int’l, Inc. v. Continental Auto. Sys., Inc., IPR2013-00014, Paper 32 (Mar. 12, 2014)..... 7

Syntex (U.S.A.) LLC v. Apotex, Inc., 407 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 9

Tempo Lighting, Inc. v. Tivoli, LLC, 742 F.3d 973 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 11

EXHIBIT LIST

<i>Exhibit No.</i>	<i>Description</i>
1201	U.S. Patent No. 8,023,580
1202	Complaint, <i>Rembrandt Wireless Technologies, LP v. Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd, et al</i> , No. 2:13-cv-00213 (ED. Tex 2013) (March 15, 2013)
1203	Proof of Service of Samsung Austin Semiconductor, LLC, <i>Rembrandt Wireless Technologies, LP v. Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd, et al</i> , No. 2:13-cv-00213 (ED. Tex 2013) (March 20, 2013)
1204	U.S. Patent No. 5,706,428
1205	Infringement Contentions, <i>Rembrandt Wireless Technologies, LP v. Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd, et al</i> , No. 2:13-cv-00213 (ED. Tex 2013) (July 25, 2013)
1206	“The IEEE Standard Dictionary of Electrical and Electronics Terms,” 6 th Ed., 1996, p. 662
1207	U.S. Application No. 12/543,910, as filed
1208	Office Action mailed on September 1, 2010 for U.S. Application No. 12/543,910
1209	Reply Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.111, dated March 1, 2011, for U.S. Application No. 12/543,910
1210	Reply Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.111, dated March 10, 2011, for U.S. Application No. 12/543,910
1211	Reply Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.111(a)(2), dated May 11, 2011, for U.S. Application No. 12/543,910
1212	Notice of Allowance and Issue Fee(s) Due, dated July 22, 2011
1213	Amendment After Allowance Pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.312, dated July 26, 2011, for U.S. Application No. 12/543,910
1214	U.S. Patent No. 6,614,838
1215	Office Action mailed June 28, 2001 for U.S. Application No. 09/205,205

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.