

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

**ZTE CORPORATION AND ZTE (USA) INC.,  
and  
MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
Petitioners**

**v.**

**IPR LICENSING, INC.,  
Patent Owner.**

---

**Case IPR2014-00525<sup>1</sup>  
U.S. Patent No.: 8,380,244**

---

**Before SALLY C. MEDLEY, MIRIAM L. QUINN, and  
BEVERLY M. BUNTING, Administrative Patent Judges.**

---

**PETITIONERS' REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE**

---

<sup>1</sup> Case IPR2015-00074 has been joined with this proceeding.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. Claim Construction ..... 2

    A. The Plain and Ordinary Meaning of “Assigned Physical Channels” ..... 3

    B. Patent Owner Takes the Word “Select” Out of Context to Require Assignment By the Subscriber Unit ..... 4

    C. The Construction Does Not Require Selecting a Subset..... 5

    D. The Specification Does Not Limit the Meaning of “Assigned Physical Channels” ..... 6

III. Jawanda Alone or in Combination with Known Wireless Protocols Renders the Claims Obvious ..... 8

    A. Claim 1: Jawanda and GPRS Disclose “Assigned Physical Channels” ..... 9

    B. Claim 1: Jawanda and GPRS Disclose a Processor Configured to “Maintain a Communication Session with the Cellular Wireless Network” ..... 9

        1. A Skilled Artisan Would Have Been Motivated to Combine Jawanda and the Publicly Available Draft GPRS Standards ..... 10

        2. Jawanda’s Disclosure of “Optionally Maintaining” Is Consistent with GPRS..... 12

    C. Claim 8: Jawanda Discloses CDMA ..... 13

IV. Patent Owner Provides Insufficient Support for Its Meager Secondary Considerations Arguments ..... 14

V. Conclusion ..... 15

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Cases**

*Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.*,  
598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....7

*Demaco Corp. v. F. Von Langsdorff Licensing Ltd.*,  
851 F.2d 1387 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....14

*In re Bigio*,  
381 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....5

*In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., Inc.*,  
2014-1301 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 4, 2015) .....2

*In re De Blauwe*,  
736 F.2d 699 (Fed. Cir. 1984) .....14

*KSR Int'l Co. v Teleflex Inc.*,  
550 U.S. 389 (2007) ..... 11, 14

*McCarty v. Lehigh Val. R.R. Co.*,  
160 U.S. 110 (1895) .....7

*Source Vagabond Sys. Ltd. v. Hydrapak, Inc.*,  
753 F.3d 1291 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....7

*Verizon Servs. Corp. v. Vonage Holdings Corp.*,  
503 F.3d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....7

**PTAB Decisions**

*Idle Free Sys. Inc. v. Bergstrom Inc.*,  
IPR2012-00027 (PTAB Final Decision, Jan. 7, 2014 (Paper 66)) .....6

*Microstrategy, Inc. v. Zillow, Inc.*,  
IPR2013-00034 (PTAB Final Decision, Mar. 27, 2014 (Paper 42)) .....6

**Rules**

37 C.F.R. § 42.121 .....6

37 C.F.R. § 42.20(c) .....6

**REFERENCED EXHIBITS<sup>2</sup>**

<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Description</b>
1001	U.S. Patent No. 8,380,244 (" <b>244 Patent</b> ")
1002	Declaration of Dr. Harry Bims in Support of the Petition for Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,380,244 (" <b>Bims Decl.</b> ")
1003	U.S. Patent No. 6,243,581 to Jawanda (" <b>Jawanda</b> ")
1005.03	GSM 03.60 v. 6.1.1 R97
1009	Joint Claim Construction Brief (Public), <i>InterDigital Commc'ns, Inc. v. Huawei Techs. Co.</i> , No. 1:13-cv-0008, No. 1:13-cv-0009, No. 1:13-cv-00010 (D. Del. filed Nov. 21, 2013)
1025	Deposition of Dr. Wayne E. Stark (dated March 24, 2015) (" <b>Stark Tr.</b> ")
2005	Declaration of Dr. Wayne E. Stark (dated Jan. 6, 2015) (" <b>Stark Decl.</b> ")
2006	Deposition Transcript of Dr. Harry Bims (dated Dec. 19, 2014) (" <b>Bims Tr.</b> ")
2013	U.S. Patent No. 7,616,970 (" <b>970 parent patent</b> ")
2022	Supplemental Markman Opinion and Claim Construction Order, <i>InterDigital Commc'ns, Inc. v. Nokia Corp.</i> , No. 1:13-cv-0010 (D. Del. Mar. 6, 2015 and Mar. 13, 2015)
2023	<i>InterDigital Commc'ns, Inc. v. U.S. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , No. 2014-1176 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 18, 2015)

---

<sup>2</sup> Petitioners' are filing and serving concurrently with this paper Petitioners'

Updated Exhibit List in its entirety. 37 C.F.R. § 42.63(e).

**STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS IN DISPUTE**

Patent Owner did not submit a statement of material facts in its Patent Owner Response. Accordingly, Petitioners' Reply need not provide a response pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(a), and no facts are admitted.

**ABBREVIATIONS**

Pet.	ZTE's Second Corrected Petition for Inter Partes Review
Prelim. Resp.	Patent Owner's Preliminary Response
PO Resp.	Patent Owner's Response

# 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.