

By: Thomas Engellenner
Pepper Hamilton LLP
125 High Street
19th Floor, High Street Tower
Boston, MA 02110
(617) 204-5100 (telephone)
(617) 204-5150 (facsimile)

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 No. IPR2014-00519
Patent 8,023,580

**PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. OVERVIEW OF THE '580 PATENT	2
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AND ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	3
A. A Person Having Ordinary Skill In The Art	3
B. Claim Construction.....	4
IV. PETITIONER’S ALLEGED “ADMITTED PRIOR ART” CANNOT SERVE AS BASIS FOR INSTITUTING TRIAL	9
1. The Doctrine Of Admitted Prior Art Is Not Applicable To An Inventor’s Own Work.....	9
2. The Decisions Regarding Admitted Prior Art Cited By Petitioner Are Inapposite	11
3. The Inventor’s Own Identification of the Problem to be Solved is Inseparable From the Invention as a Whole and Cannot Be Considered Admitted Prior Art.....	13
V. THERE IS NO REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT CLAIMS 23, 25, 30, 41, 44, 29, 38 OR 47 ARE ANTICIPATED BY BOER OR RENDERED OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF BOER, ALONE OR IN VIEW OF COMBINATION OF ALLEGED APA AND BOER.....	15
A. Summary of Boer	16
B. The Petition Fails To Demonstrate Any Motivation To Combine The Alleged APA With Boer	19
C. The Petition Does Not Demonstrate A Reasonable Likelihood That Claims 23, 25, Or 30 Are Anticipated By, Or Rendered Obvious In View of Boer	24
1. Anticipation.....	24

	<u>Page</u>
2. Obviousness	27
D. Petition Does Not Demonstrate A Reasonable Likelihood That Claims 41 Is Anticipated By Boer	28
E. The Petition Fails To Demonstrate A Reasonable Likelihood That Claims 29, 38 And 47 Are Rendered Obvious By Alleged APA In View of Boer.....	30
1. The Petition Does Not Demonstrate A Reasonable Likelihood That Combination Of Alleged APA And Boer Renders Claim 29 Obvious	30
2. The Petition Does Not Demonstrate A Reasonable Likelihood That Combination Of Alleged APA And Boer Renders Claim 38 Obvious	31
3. The Petition Does Not Demonstrate A Reasonable Likelihood That Combination Of Alleged APA And Boer Renders Claim 47 Obvious	31
VI. The Anticipation Grounds Based On Boer Are Vertically Redundant Relative to Obviousness Grounds In View of Boer	32
VII. CONCLUSION.....	33

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>3M Innovative Props. Co. v. Avery Dennison Corp.</i> , 350 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	8
<i>Connell v. Sears Roebuck & Co.</i> , 722 F. 2d 1542 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	26-27
<i>Constant v. Adv. Micro-Devices, Inc.</i> , 48 F.2d 1560 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	11, 12, 13
<i>Ex Parte Mindrum</i> , Appeal 2010-010342, 2013 WL 1332716 (Patent Tr. & App. Bd. Feb. 27, 2013).....	10
<i>Grain Processing Corp. v. American-Maize Prods. Co.</i> , 840 F.2d 902 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	23
<i>Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbott Labs</i> , 512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	23
<i>In re Buszard</i> , 504 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	3
<i>In re Cortright</i> , 165 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	3
<i>In re Fout</i> , 675 F.2d 297 (C.C.P.A. 1982).....	12
<i>In re Linnert</i> , 309 F.2d 498 (C.C.P.A. 1962).....	13
<i>In re Nomiya</i> , 509 F.2d 566 (C.C.P.A. 1975).....	10, 12, 15
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	23
<i>In re Suitco Surface, Inc.</i> , 603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	3
<i>InTouch Tech., Inc. v. VGO Comm 's, Inc.</i> , 2014 U.S. App. LEXIS 8745 (Fed. Cir. May 9, 2014)	24
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	23
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	23, 24, 28
<i>Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casualty Ins. Co.</i> , CBM2012-00003, Paper 7	32

Page(s)

Net MoneyIn, Inc. v. Verisign, Inc., 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....26, 30

Pharmastem Therapeutics, Inc. v. Viacell, Inc., 491 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2007) 11, 12

Phillips v. AWH Corp., 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)9

Reading & Bates Construction Co. v. Baker Energy Resources Corp., 748 F.2d 645 (Fed. Cir. 1984) 10, 11

Riverwood Int’l Corp. v. R.A. Jones & Co., 324 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2003)9, 10, 12

Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co., 814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987)26

Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc., 90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....6

Wowza Media Systems, LLC et al. v. Adobe Systems Inc., IPR2013-00054, Paper 1223

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 10227

35 U.S.C. § 313 1

OTHER AUTHORITIES

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) 3

37 C.F.R. § 42.107 1

77 Fed. Reg. 48,756 (Aug. 14, 2012).....3

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) § 21113

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) § 21414

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) § 2129 10

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.