

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,  
Petitioner

v.

MOBILE TELECOMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2015-01725  
Patent 5,915,210

---

**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. BACKGROUND .....	1
II. INTRODUCTION .....	1
III. PROPER CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	3
A. Construction of Independent Claim Terms .....	7
1. “representing substantially the same information as” of claims 1, 10, and 19 .....	7
2. “transmit[] [the] second plurality of carrier signals in simulcast with the first plurality of carrier signals” of claims 1, 10, and 19 .....	8
3. “each of the first plurality of carrier signals representing a portion of the information signal substantially not represented by others of the first plurality of carrier signals” of claims 1, 10, and 19 .....	9
IV. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS .....	10
V. REFERENCES RELIED UPON BY PETITIONER .....	11
A. <i>Witsaman</i> .....	11
B. <i>Bingham</i> .....	12
VI. GROUND 1 – CLAIMS 1, 10, AND 19 ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER <i>WITSAMAN</i> IN VIEW OF <i>BINGHAM</i> .....	13
A. <i>Witsaman</i> in view of <i>Bingham</i> do not disclose “not represented” limitation of elements 1(a), 10(a), and 19(a).....	13
1. <i>Witsaman</i> does not disclose the “not represented” limitation of elements 1(a), 10(a), and 19(a). .....	13
2. <i>Bingham</i> does not disclose the “not represented” limitation of elements 1(a), 10(a), and 19(a). .....	14
VII. CONCLUSION.....	17

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

### CASES

<i>Ex parte Frye</i> , 94 USPQ 2d 1072 (BPAI 2010) .....	15
<i>Ex parte Papst-Motoren</i> , 1 USPQ2d 1655 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1986) .....	4
<i>Ex Parte Ronald A. Katz Tech. Licensing L.P.</i> , Appeal 2008-005127 (BPAI Mar. 15, 2010).....	4
<i>In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr.</i> , 367 F.3d 1359, 70 USPQ2d 1827 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	5
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	15
<i>In re Morris</i> , 127 F.3d 1048, 44 USPQ2d 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1997) .....	5
<i>In re Royka</i> , 490 F.2d 981 (CCPA 1974) .....	13, 15
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007) .....	16
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	4, 5, 6, 8
<i>Pitney Bowes, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , 182 F.3d 1298 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	6
<i>Vitrionics Corp. v. Conceptoronic</i> , 90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	4

### OTHER AUTHORITIES

35 United States Code § 102.....	1
35 United States Code § 103.....	1
35 United States Code § 312(c) .....	3
37 Code of Federal Regulations § 42.104(b)(3) .....	3
Manual of Patent Examining Procedure § 2111.01 .....	5
Manual of Patent Examining Procedure § 2558 .....	4

## I. BACKGROUND

On August 13, 2015, Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. filed a Petition for *Inter Partes* Review under 37 C.F.R. § 42.100, requesting *inter partes* review of claims 1, 7-8, 10, 15-17, and 19 of the '210 Patent. Petitioner asserts that claims 1, 7-8, 10, 15-17, and 19 of the '210 Patent are unpatentable over the following references under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

**Ground 1** - Claims 1, 7-8, 10, 15-17, and 19 as obvious over *Witsaman* in view of *Bingham*.

The '210 Patent, entitled "Method and System for Providing Multicarrier Simulcast Transmission," was filed on July 24, 1997 and issued on June 22, 1999. The '210 Patent claims priority to U.S. Application No. 07/973,918, filed November 12, 1992, U.S. Patent No. 5,590,403 ("the '403 patent").

The '210 Patent describes and claims a method and system for providing multicarrier simulcast transmission.

## II. INTRODUCTION

Patent Owner, Mobile Telecommunications Technologies, LLC, submits this Preliminary Response to the Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of claims 1, 7-8, 10, 15-17, and 19 of U.S. Patent No. 5,915,210 ("the '210 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.

With regard to Ground 1, U.S. Patent No. 5,365,569 (Ex. 1012, “*Witsaman*”) does not disclose “each of the first plurality of carrier signals representing a portion of the information signal substantially not represented by others of the first plurality of carrier signals,” as recited in claims 1, 10, and 19 of the ‘210 Patent. John A. C. Bingham, Multicarrier Modulation for Data Transmission: An Idea Whose Time Has Come, 28 IEEE (Ex. 1015, “*Bingham*”) does not cure *Witsaman*’s defect and does not disclose or suggest these features. Thus, independent claims 1, 10, and 19 of the ‘210 Patent are not obvious over *Witsaman* in view of *Bingham*.

Dependent claims 7-8 and 15-17 are not obvious over *Witsaman* in view of *Bingham* because independent claims 1 and 10, from which they depend, respectively, are not obvious over *Witsaman* in view of *Bingham* and because of the additional features these claims recite.

It should be noted that a ground similar to the ground of this IPR was presented in both IPR2014-01036 (“the Apple IPR”) and IPR2015-00015 (“the T-Mobile IPR”), and review was not instituted. For example, the Board found in the Apple IPR that “[f]or this additional ground, we exercise our discretion, and do not institute review regarding this alleged ground of unpatentability that claims 1, 10,

# 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.