

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'S RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 CFR § 42.120

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
UPDATED TABLE OF EXHIBITS.....	v
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. SUMMARY OF THE '580 PATENT	3
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AND ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	6
A. Legal Standard.....	6
B. A Person Of Ordinary Skill In The Art.....	6
C. Claim Construction	9
1. “Multipoint Communications Protocol,” “Master,” And “Slave”	9
IV. SUMMARY OF ALLEGED PRIOR ART	12
A. Admitted Prior Art (“APA”)	12
B. U.S. Patent No. 5,706,426 Of Boer (“Boer”).....	12
C. The Upender/Koopman Article	14
V. LEGAL STANDARDS	14
A. Petitioner Has The Burden Of Proof.....	14
B. Legal Standard For Obviousness.....	15
C. Each Prior Art Reference Must Be Considered <i>In Its Entirety</i>	17
VI. ARGUMENTS	18
A. The CSMA/CA System of Boer Is Fundamentally Different From A Master/Slave Multipoint Communications Protocol.....	18
B. Dr. Goodman’s Declaration Regarding Motivation To Combine The Alleged APA With Boer Is Unreliable	22
1. Dr. Goodman Failed To Fully Consider The Upender/Koopman Article As A Whole.....	23
2. Dr. Goodman Has No Understanding Of The Conclusion Reached In The Article	25
3. Dr. Goodman’s Reasoning Is Flawed Because “Simplicity and Determinacy” Are At Odds With “Flexibility and Efficiency”	26

4.	Dr. Goodman’s Declaration Is Unreliable Because It Is Unclear What Level Of Skill He Equated With One Of Ordinary Skill In The Art.....	29
C.	Dr. Koopman, the Coauthor of the Article, Testified that the Teachings of Upender/Koopman Do Not Support Combination of the Alleged APA with Boer	30
1.	Combining Boer And The Alleged APA Would Reduce Flexibility And Efficiency	32
2.	There Are Fundamental Tradeoffs Between Master/Slave Polling And CSMA/CA Protocols Which Teach Away From Using Master/Slave In Boer	35
D.	CLAIMS 38 AND 47ARE NOT RENDERED OBVIOUS BY THE COMBINATION OF ALLEGED APA AND BOER.....	38
1.	The Petition Does Not Prove The Combination Of Alleged APA And Boer Renders Dependent Claim 38 Obvious	38
2.	The Petition Does Not Prove The Combination Of Alleged APA And Boer Renders Independent Claim 47 Obvious	41
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	42

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>CCS Fitness, Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.</i> , 288 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	6
<i>Environmental Designs Ltd v. Union Oil</i> , 713 F.2d 693 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	8
<i>Grain Processing Corp. v. American-Maize Prods. Co.</i> , 840 F.2d 902 (Fed. Cir. 1988))	16
<i>Hodosh v. Block Drug Co., Inc.</i> , 786 F.2d 1136 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	18, 26
<i>In Heart Failure Techs., LLC v. CardioKinetix, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00183, Paper No. 12 (July 31, 2013)	16
<i>In re Grasselli</i> , 713 F.2d 731 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	18
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	16
<i>In re Translogic Tech., Inc.</i> , 504 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	6
<i>In re Wesslau</i> , 147 U.S.P.Q. 391 (C.C.P.A. 1965)	17
<i>InTouch Tech., Inc. v. VGO Comm’s, Inc.</i> , 2014 U.S. App. LEXIS 8745 (Fed. Cir. May 9, 2014)	16
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	15, 16
<i>Macronix Int’l v. Spansion LLC</i> , IPR2014-00106, Paper 13 (Apr. 24, 2014)	6
<i>Motorola Mobility LLC, et al. v. Arendi S.A.R.L.</i> , IPR2014-00203, Paper No. 10 (June 5, 2014)	16
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc)	6, 8
<i>Unigene Labs., Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 655 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	15
<i>W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.</i> , 220 U.S.P.Q. 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....	17

Wowza Media Systems, LLC et al. v. Adobe Systems Inc., IPR2013-00054,
Paper No. 12 (April 8, 2013) 16, 17

STATUTES

OTHER AUTHORITIES

37 C.F.R. §42.100(b) 6
77 Fed. Reg. 48,756 (Aug. 14, 2012) 6
MPEP § 2111 8
MPEP § 2141 15
MPEP § 2145(X)(D)(1)(3)..... 18

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.