

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

HUAWEI DEVICE USA, INC. and  
ZTE (USA), INC.  
Petitioner

v.

ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS  
RESEARCH INSTITUTE  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2015-00203  
Patent 8,532,231

---

**EXCLUSIVE LICENSEE SPH AMERICA, LLC'S  
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....	1
II. Background.....	3
a. About U.S. Patent No. 8,532,231 (the “‘231 patent” or “Yu”).....	3
b. Claim Construction.....	9
c. Petitioners’ Grounds of Challenge Rely On Art Already Considered by the USPTO Examiner .....	20
III. Response to Statement of Material Facts .....	24
IV. Argument .....	29
a. The Petition Fails to Name All Real Parties in Interest .....	29
b. Ground 1’s Challenge Fails to Disclose all Features of Claims 16 and 47, and Lacks Any Basis to Combine the Reference Teachings.....	34
i. There is Inadequate Basis to Combine N’085 and Alamouti.....	34
ii. Any Combination Still Fails to Disclose All Features of the Challenged Claims .....	40
c. Ground 5’s Challenge Also Lacks a Basis to Combine the Reference Teachings and Lacks All Features .....	45
d. Grounds 2 and 6 Do Not Establish Obviousness of Independent Claims 35 and 54.....	50
e. The Grounds Directed to the ‘231 Patent’s Dependent Claims Fail to Remedy the Petition’s Underlying Deficiencies .....	51
f. The Board Should Exercise Its Discretion to Dismiss All Challenges Based on Previously-Considered Art .....	56
V. Conclusion .....	57

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Advanced Display Sys., Inc. v. Kent State Univ.</i> , 212 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	37
<i>Atlanta Gas Light Co. v. Bennett Regulator Guards, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00453 (PTAB 1/6/2015).....	30
<i>Callcopy, Inc. v. Verint Americas, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00486 (PTAB 2/5/2014).....	12
<i>Cisco Systems, Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2014-00454 (PTAB 8/29/2014).....	10, 11
<i>Cook Biotech Inc. v. Acell, Inc.</i> , 460 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	37
<i>Gonzalez v. Banco Cent. Corp.</i> , 27 F.3d 751 (1st Cir. 1994).....	30
<i>Heart Failure Technologies, LLC v. Cardiokinetix, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00183 (PTAB 7/31/2013).....	35
<i>In re Bigio</i> , 381 F.3d 1320 (Fed Cir. 2004).....	9
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	37, 46
<i>In re Paulsen</i> , 30 F.3d 1475 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	9
<i>In re Translogic Tech., Inc.</i> , 504 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	9
<i>In re Van Geuns</i> , 988 F.2d 1181 (Fed. Cir. 1993).....	9
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007) .....	passim
<i>LG Display Co., Ltd. v. Innovative Display Technologies LLC</i> , IPR2014-01092 (PTAB 01/13/2015).....	36, 37, 45, 46
<i>Zenon Environmental, Inc. v. U.S. Filter Corp.</i> , 506 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	37, 38

### Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102.....	25
35 U.S.C. § 112.....	15
35 U.S.C. § 119.....	2
35 U.S.C. § 120.....	2
35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3).....	12
35 U.S.C. § 314(a) .....	passim
35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....	21, 45, 57

...

**Other Authorities**

MPEP 2163.02 .....16  
Office Patent Trial Practice Guide,  
77 Fed. Reg. 48756, 48766 (Aug. 14, 2012) ..... 9, 29, 30

**Rules**

37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(3)..... passim  
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)..... 1, 29, 33  
37 C.F.R. § 42.62(a).....42  
37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a)..... passim  
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) .....9  
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4).....12

## LIST OF EXHIBITS

<u>Exhibit</u>	<u>Description</u>
2001	U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0163081 filed by Aoki <i>et al.</i> (“Aoki ‘081”)
2002	<i>Cisco Systems, Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2014-00454 paper 12 (PTAB 8/29/2014)
2003	U.S. Patent No. 7,408,976, issued to Narasimhan <i>et al.</i>
2004	U.S. Patent No. 7,796,681 issued to Narasimhan <i>et al.</i>
2005	Joint Motion for Dismissal Without Prejudice of ZTE Corporation in <i>SPH America, LLC v. ZTE (USA), Inc.</i> , Case No. 3:13-cv-02326-CAB (Dkt. 15)
2006	HUAWEI DEFENDANTS’ ANSWER, AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES, AND COUNTERCLAIMS TO PLAINTIFF SPH AMERICA’S SUPPLEMENTAL FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT in <i>SPH America, LLC v. Huawei Technologies, Co., Ltd.</i> , Case No. 3:13-cv-02323-CAB (Dkt. 43, pp. 1-2)
2007	File History of U.S. Patent No. 7,577,085 issued to Narasimhan (pp. 302-347)

# 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.