

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

ARRIS GROUP, INC.  
Petitioner

v.

C-CATION TECHNOLOGIES, LLC  
Patent Owner

---

CASE IPR2015-00635  
Patent 5,563,883

---

**PATENT OWNER C-CATION TECHNOLOGIES, LLC'S  
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §42.107**

## Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. STANDARD FOR GRANTING <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW.....	4
III. THE BOARD CAN EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION TO DENY THE PETITION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....	6
A. Procedural History.....	6
B. Argument.....	11
IV. THE PETITION IS BARRED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 315(b).....	15
A. Petitioner Had a Contractual Obligation to Control Comcast’s Participation in the First Action.....	15
B. Petitioner Exercised Control Over Comcast’s Participation in the First Action	19
C. The Petition Is Barred Under 35 U.S.C. § 315(b).....	21
V. OVERVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 5,563,883 .....	21
VI. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	25
VII. THE PETITION FAILS TO ADEQUATELY IDENTIFY HOW CLAIMS 1, 3, OR 4 OF THE ’883 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE .....	31
A. Petitioner’s Reliance on the MPT Specifications .....	32
B. The Channel Hunt Sequence and Normal Operation on Control Channel Does Not Disclose the Steps of Claim 1 .....	34
C. The Fall-Back Procedures Do Not Disclose the Steps of Claim 1 .....	39
D. Claim 3 .....	44
E. Claim 4 .....	44
VIII. CONCLUSION .....	45

## Table of Authorities

### Cases

<i>Apple, Inc. v. Aylus Networks, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01566, Paper 10 (PTAB Apr. 23, 2015) .....	13
<i>Atlanta Gas Light Co. v. Bennett Regulator Guards, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00453, Paper 31 (PTAB. Jan. 22, 2014) .....	21
<i>August Tech. Corp. v. Camtek Ltd.</i> , 655 F.3d 1278 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	5
<i>Butamax Adv. Biofuels LLC v. Gevo, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00581, Paper 8 (PTAB Oct. 14, 2014).....	5, 12
<i>Conopco, Inc. v. The Procter &amp; Gamble Co.</i> , IPR2014-00507, Paper 17 (PTAB Jul. 7, 2014).....	14
<i>Continental Automotive Sys., Inc. v. Wasica Finance GmbH</i> , IPR2014-01454, Paper 14 (PTAB Feb. 13, 2015) .....	14
<i>Ex parte Ronald A Katz Tech. Lic.L.P.</i> , Appl. No. 2008-005127 (BPAI Mar. 15, 2010) .....	25
<i>Heckler v. Chaney</i> , 470 U.S. 821 (1985) .....	11
<i>In re Rambus, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 42 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	25
<i>Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , IPR2013-00324, Paper 19 (PTAB Nov. 21, 2013).....	11
<i>Jiawei Tech. (HK) Ltd. v. Simon Nicholas Richmond</i> , IPR2015-00580, Paper 22 (PTAB May 1, 2015) .....	13
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007) .....	6
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) ( <i>en banc</i> ).....	25
<i>Samsung Electronics Co. v. Rembrandt Wireless Technologies, LP</i> , IPR2015-00118, Paper 14 (PTAB Jan. 28, 2015) .....	14
<i>SAS Inst., Inc. v. ComplementSoft, LLC</i> , IPR2013-00581, Paper 15 (PTAB Dec. 30, 2013).....	5, 34

..

*See ZTE Corp. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.*,  
IPR2013-00454, Paper 12 (PTAB Sept. 25, 2013) ..... 13

*Vizio, Inc. v. International Trade Com'n*, 605 F.3d 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2010)..... 5

*Zimmer Holdings, Inc. v. Bonutti Skeletal Innovations LLC*,  
IPR2014-01080, Paper 17 (PTAB Oct. 31, 2014)..... 14

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 314(a) ..... 1, 4, 5, 11

35 U.S.C. § 315(b)..... 3, 15, 21

35 U.S.C. § 316(e) ..... 5

35 U.S.C. § 325(d)..... 2, 3, 5, 11

**Other Authorities**

77 Fed. Reg. 157 ..... 4

H.R. Rep. No. 112-98, pt. 1, at 48 (2011) ..... 12

**Regulations**

37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b) ..... 12

37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c) ..... 4

37 C.F.R. §§ 42.22..... 32

**Exhibit List**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Exhibit Description</b>
C-Cation 2009	Expert Report of Stuart Lipoff Regarding the Invalidity of U.S. Patent No. 5,563,883, <i>C-Cation Tech., LLC v. Comcast Corp.</i> , No. 2:11-cv-30, dated August 16, 2013
C-Cation 2010	C-Cation's First Amended Complaint, <i>C-Cation Tech., LLC v. Comcast Corp.</i> , No. 2:11-cv-30, dated April 5, 2011
C-Cation 2011	Stipulation of Dismissal, <i>C-Cation Tech., LLC v. Comcast Corp.</i> , No. 2:11-cv-30, dated January 21, 2014
C-Cation 2012	C-Cation's Complaint, <i>C-Cation Tech, LLC v. Time Warner Cable, Inc., et al.</i> , No. 2:14-cv-59, dated February 4, 2014
C-Cation 2013	[REDACTED]
C-Cation 2014	C-Cation Tech's Infringement Contentions Against Comcast, <i>C-Cation Tech., LLC v. Comcast Corp.</i> , No. 2:11-cv-30, dated December 2, 2011
C-Cation 2015	[REDACTED]
C-Cation 2016	[REDACTED]
C-Cation 2017	[REDACTED]
C-Cation 2018	Arris Group Inc.'s Form 10-K annual report for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2009
C-Cation 2019	Arris's Schedule of Redacted Documents and Documents Withheld from Production, dated March 6, 2015
C-Cation 2020	Claim Construction Memorandum and Order, <i>C-Cation Tech, LLC v. Time Warner Cable, Inc., et al.</i> , No. 2:14-cv-59, dated April 20, 2015

# 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.