

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ZTE CORPORATION AND ZTE (USA) INC.
Petitioners

v.

IPR LICENSING, INC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2014-00525
U.S. Patent No.: 8,380,244

**SECOND CORRECTED PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,380,244**

This Second Corrected Petition is filed as part of a motion to correct clerical errors. In particular, the citation on page one of the petition has been modified to replace “Exhibit 1010” with “Exhibit 1011.” No substantive changes have been made to the contents of the petition. Submitted herewith are corrected Exhibit 1010 and corrected Exhibit 1011, which have been renumbered to conform to the numbering in the Table of Exhibits contained herein.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Mandatory Notices (37 C.F.R. § 42.8)	1
A.	Real Party-in-Interest (§ 42.8(b)(1))	1
B.	Related Matters (§ 42.8(b)(2))	1
C.	Counsel and Service Information (§§ 42.8(b)(3)-(4)).....	2
II.	Payment of Fees (§ 42.15(a) and § 42.103).....	3
III.	Requirements for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review	3
A.	Grounds for Standing (§ 42.104(a))	3
B.	Identification of Challenged Claims (§ 42.104(b)(1))	3
C.	Priority Date, Prior Art and Specific Grounds for Challenging Claims (§ 42.104(b)(2)).....	3
D.	Claim Construction (§ 42.104(b)(3))	8
1.	“release,” “allocate,” and “deallocate” in conjunction with the “assigned physical channels”	9
2.	“maintain a communication session with the cellular wireless network in an absence of the plurality of assigned physical channels”	13
IV.	Overview of the Technology	15
A.	Alleged Invention	15
B.	Prior Art.....	16
C.	Prosecution History	17
D.	Level of Skill of a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	18
V.	There Is a Reasonable Likelihood That at Least One Claim of the 244 Patent Is Unpatentable.	19
A.	Ground 1: Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Jawanda alone or in combination with the GPRS and IEEE 802.11 Standards renders the challenged claims obvious.....	19
1.	Jawanda and the GPRS and IEEE 802.11 Standards.....	20

2.	There is a strong motivation to combine Jawanda with the IEEE 802.11 Standard and the GPRS Standards.	26
B.	Ground 2: Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Lemiläinen alone or in combination with the GPRS and IEEE 802.11 Standards renders the challenged claims obvious.	28
1.	Lemiläinen and the GPRS and IEEE 802.11 Standards	29
2.	There is a strong motivation to combine Lemiläinen with the GPRS and IEEE 802.11 Standards.	34
C.	Ground 3: Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the Draft UMTS standards in combination with IEEE 802.11 render the challenged claims obvious.	34
VI.	Secondary Considerations Support Obviousness	37
VII.	Claim Charts	38
A.	Jawanda and the GPRS and IEEE 802.11 Standards	38
B.	Lemiläinen and the GPRS and IEEE 802.11 Standards.....	48
VIII.	Conclusion	61

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit	Description
1001	U.S. Patent No. 8,380,244 B2 (“244 patent”)
1002	Declaration of Dr. Harry Bims in Support of the Petition for Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,380,244 (“Bims Decl.”)
1003	U.S. Patent No. 6,243,581 to Jawanda
1004	U.S. Patent No. 6,681,259 to Lemiläinen
1005	GPRS Standards
1005.01	GSM 02.60 v. 6.1.1 R97
1005.02	GSM 03.02 v. 6.1.0 R97
1005.03	GSM 03.60 v. 6.1.1 R97
1005.04	GSM 04.07 v. 6.1.0 R97
1005.05	GSM 04.08 v. 6.1.1 R97
1005.06	GSM 04.60 v. 6.1.0 R97
1005.07	GSM 04.64 v. 6.1.0 R97
1005.08	GSM 04.65 v. 6.1.0 R97
1005.09	GSM 05.01 v. 6.1.1 R97
1005.10	GSM 03.64 v. 6.1.0 R97
1006	Draft UMTS Standards
1006.01	3GPP TS 25.212 v. 2.0.0
1006.02	3GPP TS 25.201 v. 2.1.0
1006.03	3GPP TS 25.211 v. 2.1.0
1006.04	3GPP TS 23.121 v. 3.0.0
1006.05	3GPP TS 25.101 v. 2.0.0
1006.06	3GPP TS 24.008 v. 3.0.0
1006.07	3GPP TS 25.301 v. 3.0.0
1006.08	3GPP TS 25.213 v. 2.1.0
1006.09	3GPP TS 25.302 v. 2.3.0
1006.10	S2-99712 (Change Request re UMTS)
1007	3GPP TR 21.900 v. 3.1.0
1008	10-8-13 Amended Joint Cl. Const. Chart
1009	Joint Cl. Const. Br. (Public)
1010	337-TA-800 Comm’n Opinion (Public)
1011	337-TA-800 ALJ’s Initial Determination (Public)
1012	Jim Geier, Wireless LANs (Macmillan Tech. Pub. 1999)
1013	Reichert Publication

Second Corrected Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,380,244
Attorney Docket No. 14569.00009

Exhibit	Description
1014	Torsner & Malmgren Publication
1015	Zeisberg Publication
1016	U.S. Patent No. 6,546,425 to Hanson
1017	RFC 2002, IP Mobility Support
1018	12/615,098 Application Prosecution History
1019	IEEE Part 11: Wireless LAN Medium Access Control (MAC) and Physical Layer (PHY) specifications, August 20, 1999
1020	Assignment Records for the 244 Patent
1021	3GPP TR 101 031 v2.2.1 (Hiperlan/2 Standard)
1022	U.S. Patent No. 5,406,643 to Burke
1023	InterDigital's Infringement Contentions as to the 244 Patent (Exhibit 116 to Motion to Amend the Complaint in the 337-TA-868 Investigation)
1024	10/341,528 App., May 5, 2005 Office Action

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.