

Filed on behalf of Intellectual Ventures II LLC

By: Sharon A. Hwang  
Peter J. McAndrews  
McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.  
500 West Madison Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60661  
Tel.: (312) 775-8000  
Fax: (312) 775-8100  
Email: shwang@mcandrews-ip.com

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

ERICSSON INC. AND TELEFONAKTIEBOLAGET  
LM ERICSSON,  
Petitioners

v.

INTELLECTUAL VENTURES II LLC  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2015-01664  
Patent No. 7,787,431

---

**PATENT OWNER RESPONSE**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	1
II.	SUMMARY OF PRIOR PROCEEDINGS .....	2
III.	OVERVIEW OF THE '431 PATENT .....	4
IV.	CONSTRUCTION OF DISPUTED CLAIM TERMS .....	8
A.	Claim Terms Identified By Petitioner .....	8
1.	“Core-Band” .....	10
2.	“Primary Preamble” .....	10
3.	“Peak-To-Average Ratio” .....	12
B.	Claim Terms Identified By Patent Owner.....	13
1.	“Transmit[ting] a Broadcast Channel In An OFDMA Core-Band” .....	14
2.	“First Plurality of Subcarrier Groups” .....	16
3.	“Second Plurality of Subcarrier Groups”.....	17
4.	“Control and Data Channels”.....	20
5.	“Variable Band” .....	21
V.	THE PETITION DOES NOT SHOW BY A PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE THAT CLAIM 1 OR 2 IS OBVIOUS.....	22
A.	Petitioner’s Prior Art Combination Fails To Disclose “Transmit[ting] A Broadcast Channel In An Orthogonal Frequency Division Multiple Access (OFDMA) Core-Band” As Claimed .....	27
1.	Petitioner’s Analysis Of Claim Elements 8.1 And 18.1 Is Deficient.....	27
2.	The Board’s Institution Decision Incorrectly Assumes That Yamaura’s Broadcast Burst Occupies Only A Narrow-band .....	32

B.	Petitioner Fails to Demonstrate That Its Prior Art Combination Teaches The Claim Element “Transmitting Control and Data Channels Using A Variable Band Including A Second Plurality Of Subcarrier Groups” .....	37
1.	Dulin Does Not Teach The Claimed “Variable Band” .....	38
2.	Petitioner’s Proposed Prior Art Combination Fails To Disclose A Second Plurality Of Subcarrier Groups Distinct From The First Plurality Of Subcarrier Groups .....	40
3.	The Board’s Analysis Mistakenly Ignores The Claim Element “Control and Data Channels” .....	45
VI.	A PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART WOULD NOT BE MOTIVATED TO COMBINE DULIN, YAMAURA, HWANG, AND ZHUANG TO ACHIEVE THE INVENTIONS SET FORTH IN CHALLENGED CLAIMS 8-12 AND 18-22.....	47
A.	Petitioner’s Hindsight Analysis Should Be Rejected.....	47
B.	A Person of Ordinary Skill In the Art Would Not Have Combined Dulin With Yamaura, Hwang and Zhuang.....	50
1.	Dulin Teaches Away From Yamaura .....	51
2.	A Person of Ordinary Skill In The Art Would Have Not Have A Reasonable Expectation of Success In Combining Dulin and Yamaura .....	55
C.	Petitioner’s Expert Improperly Assumes An Extraordinary Level Of Skill In The Art .....	61
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	63

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Cases**

*Belden, Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC*,  
805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....55

*Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.*,  
732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013) ..... 51, 53

*Cuozzo Speed Technologies, LLC v. Lee*,  
Docket No. 15-446 (argued April 25, 2016).....8

*Custom Accessories, Inc. v. Jeffrey-Allan Indus., Inc.*,  
807 F.2d 955 (Fed. Cir. 1986) .....63

*Cutsforth, Inc. v. Motivepower, Inc.*,  
-- F.3d --, No. 2015-1314, 2016 WL 1358628 (Fed. Cir. Apr. 6, 2016) .....35

*Digital-Vending Servs. Int’l, LLC v. Univ. of Phoenix, Inc.*,  
672 F.3d 1270 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....11

*DirectTV, LLC v. Qurio Holdings, Inc.*,  
IPR2015-02006, Paper 6 (P.T.A.B. April 4, 2016) .....49

*Ericsson Inc. et al. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC*,  
IPR2014-01195 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 4, 2015)..... passim

*Ericsson Inc. et al. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC*,  
IPR2015-01664, (P.T.A.B. Feb. 11, 2016)..... passim

*Graham v. John Deere Co*  
383 U.S. 1 (1966)..... 47, 48

*Grain Processing Corp. v. Am. Maize-Prods. Co.*,  
840 F.2d 902 (Fed. Cir. 1988) ..... 47, 54

*In re Gordon*,  
733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984) .....53

*In re Gurley*,  
27 F.3d 551 (Fed. Cir. 1994) .....53

...

*Patent Owner Response*  
*IPR2015-01664*

<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	54
<i>In re Wesslau</i> , 353 F.2d 238, 241 (CCPA 1965) .....	49
<i>KSR Int’l v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	48, 49, 53
<i>McGinley v. Franklin Sports, Inc.</i> , 262 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....	53
<i>Oracle Corp. v. Crossroads Systems, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01207, Paper 78 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 29, 2016) .....	54
<i>Orthopedic Equip. Co. v. United States</i> , 702 F.2d 1005 (Fed. Cir. 1983) .....	54
<i>PPC Broadband, Inc. v. Corning Optical Comm’ns RF, LLC</i> , -- F.3d --, No. 2015-1364, 2016 WL692369 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 22, 2016) .....	35
<i>Pride Mobility Products Corp. v. Permobil, Inc.</i> , -- F.3d __, No. 2015-1585, -1586, 2016 WL 1321145 (Fed. Cir. Apr. 5, 2016) .....	35
<i>ProBatter Sports, LLC v. Sports Tutor, Inc.</i> , No. 3:05-CV-01975-VLB, 2016 WL 1178050 (D. Conn. Mar. 23, 2016) .....	63
<i>Redline Detection, LLC v. Star Envirotech</i> , 811 F.3d 435 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	56
<i>St. Jude Med., Inc. v. Access Closure, Inc.</i> , 729 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	1
<i>Standard Oil Co. v. American Cyanamid Co.</i> , 774 F.2d 448 (Fed. Cir. 1985) .....	63
<i>Suprema, Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 742 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2013), <i>reh’g en banc granted, opinion vacated</i> , 36 ITRD 392 (Fed. Cir. 2014), <i>and on reh’g en banc</i> , 796 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2015), <i>and opinion reinstated in part</i> , 626 F.App’x 273 (Fed. Cir. 2015) ...	49, 56
<i>Unigene Labs., Inc. v. Apotex Inc.</i> , 655 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	55

# 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.