

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

T-MOBILE USA INC. and T-MOBILE US, INC.,  
Petitioner

v.

MOBILE TELECOMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2015-00018  
Patent 5,659,891

---

**PATENT OWNER MOBILE TELECOMMUNICATIONS  
TECHNOLOGIES, LLC'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

***Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"***  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. BACKGROUND .....	3
III. PROPER CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	4
A. Construction of Independent Claim Terms .....	7
1. “single mask-defined, bandlimited channel” .....	7
2. “band edge” .....	8
3. “operating” of claims 1, 3, and 5 .....	9
4. “each adjacent carrier” of claims 1, 3, and 5 .....	10
IV. REFERENCES RELIED UPON BY PETITIONER .....	11
A. <i>Petrovic</i> .....	11
B. <i>Raith</i> .....	14
C. <i>Alakija</i> .....	15
D. <i>Cimini</i> .....	16
V. GROUND 1 – CLAIMS 1-5 ARE NOT ANTICIPATED BY <i>PETROVIC</i> . .....	17
A. <i>Petrovic</i> does not anticipate claims 1, 3, and 5.....	17
B. <i>Petrovic</i> does not anticipate dependent claims 2 and 4. ....	37
VI. GROUND 2 – CLAIM 5 IS NOT OBVIOUS OVER <i>PETROVIC</i> IN VIEW OF <i>RAITH</i> AND <i>ALAKIJA</i> . ....	37
A. <i>Petrovic</i> in view of <i>Raith</i> and <i>Alakija</i> does not render claim 5 obvious. ....	37
VII. GROUND 3 – CLAIMS 1-5 ARE NOT ANTICIPATED BY <i>CIMINI</i> . ....	41
A. <i>Cimini</i> does not anticipate claims 1, 3, and 5.....	41
B. <i>Cimini</i> does not anticipate dependent claims 2 and 4. ....	51
VIII. GROUND 4 – CLAIM 5 IS NOT OBVIOUS OVER <i>CIMINI</i> IN VIEW OF <i>RAITH</i> AND <i>ALAKIJA</i> . ....	51

A. *Cimini* in view of *Raith* and *Alakija* does not render claim 5  
obvious. ....51

IX. CONCLUSION.....55

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

### CASES

<i>Advanced Display Sys. Inc. v. Kent State Univ.</i> , 212 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	17
<i>Ex parte Frye</i> , 94 USPQ 2d 1072 (BPAI 2010) .....	39, 54
<i>Facebook, Inc. v. Evolutionary Intelligence, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00093, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 28, 2014) .....	6
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	39
<i>In re Royka</i> , 490 F.2d 981 (CCPA 1974) .....	37, 51
<i>In re Zletz</i> , 13 USPQ2d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 1989) .....	5
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007) .....	39
<i>Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	17, 41
<i>Xerox Corp. v. 3Com Corp.</i> , 458 F.3d 1310 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	17

### OTHER AUTHORITIES

35 United States Code § 102 .....	3
35 United States Code § 103 .....	3
35 United States Code § 312(c) .....	4
37 Code of Federal Regulations § 42.100(b) .....	5, 6
37 Code of Federal Regulations § 42.104(b)(3) .....	4

## I. INTRODUCTION

Patent Owner, Mobile Telecommunications Technologies, LLC, submits this Preliminary Response to the Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of claims 1-5 of U.S. Patent No. 5,659,891 (“the ‘891 Patent”). 37 C.F.R. § 42.107.

Patent Owner respectfully requests that the Board deny the Petition on every ground alleged by Petitioner for, at least, the following reasons.

First, with regard to Ground 1, Dr. Rade Petrovic et al., Permutation Modulation for Advanced Radio Paging, IEEE Proceedings of Southeastcon ‘93 (7 April, 1993) (Exhibit 1007, “*Petrovic*”) does not teach, at least, the following elements of claims 1, 3 and 5 of the ‘891 Patent: (i) “a band edge;” (ii) “a single mask-defined, bandlimited channel;” (iii) “operating or transmitting said carriers... such that the frequency difference between the center frequency of the outer most of said carriers and the band edge of the mask ... is more than half the frequency difference between the center frequencies of each adjacent carrier;” and (iv) “operating or transmitting said carriers from the same location.” Dependent claims 2 and 4 are not anticipated by *Petrovic*, because independent claims 1 and 3, from which they depend respectively, are not anticipated by *Petrovic* and because of the additional features they recite.

Second, with regard to Ground 2, *Petrovic* does not teach limitations (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv) of claim 5, as described above. Therefore, *Petrovic* does not teach

# 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.