

**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

---

**PETITIONERS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION TO CORRECT  
CLERICAL ERRORS AND RESUBMIT EXHIBITS**

Petitioners respectfully submit this reply in support of their motion to correct clerical errors in the petition and resubmit two exhibits. The reply is narrowly tailored to address misleading and inaccurate statements in the Patent Owner's opposition to Petitioners' motion.

Contrary to the Patent Owner's assertions, it will not be prejudiced by Petitioners' motion or by submission of a complete copy of the ALJ's Initial Determination from the ITC 800 Investigation as Exhibit 1011. First, Patent

Owner inaccurately states that the complete contents of Exhibit 1011 “had not previously been part of the record.” Opp. at 2. On the contrary, Petitioner filed and served a *complete* copy of the document (then-labeled Exhibit 1010) when Petitioners filed the petition on March 21, 2014. Thus, the complete document was in fact previously part of the record, and Patent Owner was on notice of that fact. Petitioners’ subsequent and inadvertent replacement of the exhibit with a truncated copy was obviously a mistake, and Petitioners now seek to correct it.

Second, Patent Owner’s argument that it has been prejudiced because its preliminary response did not address the contents of Exhibit 1011 is misplaced. Opp. at 2. Patent Owner directly addressed the invalidity findings contained in the inadvertently truncated portion of the exhibit, including the ALJ’s claim construction. Patent Owner Initial Response at 12-13. Accordingly, granting Petitioners’ motion and re-entering a complete copy of the Initial Determination as an exhibit does not justify a supplement to Patent Owner’s preliminary response.

For the reasons stated above and in its motion, Petitioners respectfully request that this motion be granted and that the Patent Owner’s request for leave to supplement its preliminary response be denied. Should the Board allow Patent Owner to supplement its preliminary response, the supplement should be narrowly limited to further addressing the ALJ’s determination that the parent of the 8,380,244 patent is invalid.

Dated: Aug. 11, 2014

Respectfully submitted,

/Charles M. McMahon/

Charles M. McMahon

Registration No. 44,926

Attorney for Petitioners ZTE

Corporation and ZTE (USA) Inc.

**Brinks Gilson & Lione**

NBC Tower, Suite 3600

455 North Cityfront Plaza Drive

Chicago, IL 60611-5599

**Telephone:** (312) 321-4200

**Fax:** (312) 321-4299

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a true copy of the foregoing **PETITIONERS' REPLY  
IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION TO CORRECT CLERICAL ERRORS AND  
RESUBMIT EXHIBITS** has been served on August 11, 2014, by electronic mail  
on the following counsel of record for Patent Owner IPR Licensing, Inc.:

<b>Lead Counsel</b>	<b>Backup Counsel</b>
Jonathan D. Link Reg. No. 41,548 Latham & Watkins LLP 555 11th Street, NW Suite 1000 Washington, D.C. 20004-1304 Telephone: (202) 637-2200 Facsimile: (202) 637-2201 E-mail: jonathan.link@lw.com	Julie M. Holloway Reg. No. 44,769 Latham & Watkins LLP 505 Montgomery Street Suite 2000 San Francisco, California 94111-6538 Telephone: (415) 391-0600 Facsimile: (415) 395-8095 E-mail: julie.holloway@lw.com

/s/ Charles M. McMahon  
Charles M. McMahon