IPR2015-00118 Preliminary Response U.S. Patent No. 8,023,580

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. IPR2015-00118 Patent 8,023,580

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107



TABLE OF CONTENTS

				<u>Page</u>	
I.	INT	RODU	CTION	1	
II.	INSTITUTION OF REVIEW SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER 35 U.S.C. §325(d)				
	A.	Proce	edural Background		
	B. Argument				
		1.	35 U.S.C. §325(d) And Congressional Intent Compel Denial of Petition Because It Is Based On The Same Prior Art And Substantially The Same Argument As That Previously Presented To The Board In The '519 IPR		
		2.	The '118 Petition Is A Response To The Board's Decision Denying Institution of Challenged Claims in the '519 IPR And Should Be Denied On Procedural and Policy Grounds		
III.	OVE	OVERVIEW OF THE '580 PATENT		14	
IV.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AND ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART				
	A.	A Pe	rson Having Ordinary Skill In The Art	16	
	B.	Clair	n Construction	17	
		1.	"First Modulation Method" and "Second Modulation Method"	18	
		2.	"Multipoint Communications Protocol," "Master," And "Slave"	21	



V.	THE	CLAI	NO REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT ANY OF MS 23, 25, 30, AND 41 ARE RENDERED OBVIOUS ATENT NO. 5,706,428 ("BOER") OR THAT CLAIM 29				
	IS R	ENDE	RED OBVIOUS BY THE COMBINATION OF				
	ALL	ALLEGED APA AND BOER					
	A.	Alleg	ged Admitted Prior Art ("APA")	24			
	B.	Summary Of Boer (Ex. 1304)					
	C.	The Petition Does Not Demonstrate A Reasonable Likelihood That Claims 23, 25, Or 30 Are Obvious In View of Boer					
		1.	Claim 23	29			
		2.	Claim 25	31			
		3.	Claim 30	32			
	D.	The Petition Does Not Demonstrate A Reasonable Likelihood That Claim 29 Is Obvious In View of APA and Boer		32			
		1.	Petition Does Not Demonstrate Any Motivation To Combine Boer With APA.	32			
		2.	The Petition Does Not Demonstrate A Reasonable Likelihood That Claim 29 Is Rendered Obvious By APA In View of Boer	38			
	E.	Petition Does Not Demonstrate A Reasonable Likelihood That Claim 41 Is Obvious Over Boer					
V I	CON		CION	11			



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES	Page(s)
3M Innovative Props. Co. v. Avery Dennison Corp., 350 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	18
In re Buszard, 504 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	15
Butamax Advanced Biofuels v. Gevo, Inc., IPR2014-00581, Paper 8 (PTAB Oct. 14, 2014)	5
CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Intern. Corp., 349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	20
Conopco, Inc. dba Unilever v. Proctor & Gamble, IPR2014-00628, Paper 2 (PTAB Oct. 20, 2014)	
In re Cortright, 165 F.3d 1353, 1359, 49 USPQ2d 1464 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	14
Customplay, LLC v. Clearplay, Inc., PR2014-00783, Paper 9 (PTAB November 7, 2014)	5
InTouch Tech., Inc. v. VGO Comm's, Inc., 2014 U.S. App. LEXIS 8745 (Fed. Cir. May 9, 2014)	35
Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc., 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	34
KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	34, 35
Microsoft Corp. v. Enfish, LLC, IPR2014-00576, Paper 12 (PTAB Sept. 29, 2014)	5
In re NTP, Inc., 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	
Phillips v. AWH Corp., 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	19
<i>In re Suitco Surface, Inc.</i> , 603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	14



(PTAB July 7, 2014)	5
Voris v. Eikel, 346 U.S. 328 (1953)	10, 11
In re Weiler, 790 F.2d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	10
Wowza Media Systems, LLC et al. v. Adobe Systems Inc., IPR2013-00054, Paper 12 (PTAB April 8, 2013)	
Zimmer Holdings et al. v. Bonutti Skeletal Innov., IPR2014-01080, Paper 1 (PTAB Oct. 31, 2014)	
STATUTES	
35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	6
35 U.S.C. § 251	10
35 U.S.C. §315(c)	2
35 U.S.C. §325(d)	, 6, 9, 10
OTHER AUTHORITIES	
37 C.F.R. §§ 41 and42.71	12
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)	14
77 Fed. Reg. 48,756, 48,766 (Aug. 14, 2012)	14
157 Cong. Rec. S1042 (daily ed. Mar. 1, 2011)	9
Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) § 2111	15
Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) 8 2141(II)(C)	16



DOCKET

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.

