

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

ZTE (USA) INC., HTC CORPORATION, HTC AMERICA, INC., SAMSUNG  
ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., AND SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA,  
INC.,  
Petitioners,

v.

EVOLVED WIRELESS LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2016-00757<sup>1</sup>  
Patent 7,881,236 B2

---

PATENT OWNER'S REQUEST FOR REHEARING

PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d)

---

<sup>1</sup>IPR2016-01345 has been consolidated with this proceeding

**Table of Contents**

	<b>Page</b>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Background.....	2
A. The '236 patent.....	2
B. The Claims .....	3
C. Claim Construction.....	5
III. The Board overlooked and misapprehended matters in its Final Written Decision.....	7
A. The Board overlooked the Patent Owner’s argument that the Petitioner had made a general conclusion based on only a simple random access procedure—one with only one UL grant- -and thus a procedure not capable of testing the “only if” claimed behavior. ....	7
B. The Board overlooked the Patent Owner’s argument that the 321 reference taught the <i>only if</i> behavior only in hindsight.....	11
C. The Board misapprehended the Petitioner’s argument about the 321 reference, and adopted a different basis for the rejection than the Petitioner offered .....	13

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page(s)**

**Cases**

*Allentown Mack Sales & Serv., Inc. v. N.L.R.B.*,  
522 U.S. 359 (1998).....11

*In re Nuvasive*,  
841 F.3d 966, 968 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....14

**Rules**

37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d)(2).....1

The Patent Owner, Evolved Wireless LLC, respectfully asks the Board to reconsider its Final Written Decision in this proceeding, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d)(2).

### **I. Introduction**

The Board should reconsider its Final Written Decision in this matter for three independent reasons.

First, the Board overlooked the Patent Owner's argument that Petitioner had made a general conclusion that its prior art behaves according to the Board's narrow *only if* construction for the first transmitting limitation, even though that prior art does not create the conditions that test the *only if* behavior. The Petitioner's position is analogous to an argument that an observation that every one of a company's employees who flew first class last week used a company-issued voucher confirms that the company has a rule: "Employees may fly first class *only if* they have a voucher." The evidence presented is certainly inadequate if the company's CEO always flies first class, but did not travel last week.

Separately, the Board overlooked the Patent Owner's argument that the 321 reference taught the *only if* behavior only in hindsight. Neither the Board nor the Petitioner suggested that anyone other than the inventors appreciated the problems that reception of additional UL Grants could cause, much less disclosed the

claimed solution in the '236 patent, and so to solve those problems in making the proposed combination is to use impermissible hindsight.

Finally, the Board misapprehended the Patent Owner's argument about the 321 reference. The Board improperly modified the Patent Owner's argument that the 321 reference made the *only if* behavior obvious into one that the 321 reference disclosed that behavior.

## **II. Background**

The Board determined that the challenged claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,881,236 ("the '236 patent") are unpatentable as obvious. (Final Written Decision ("FWD"), Paper 42, at 39.)

### **A. The '236 patent**

The '236 patent is directed to mobile communication technology. (FWD at 2.) It relates to communication between user equipment (UE) and base stations. *Id.* The UE includes cell phones. (*See* '236 patent (Ex. 1001) at 1:22-25; FWD at 2-3.) The '236 patent is focused on random access procedures. (*Id.* at 2.) Cell phones and base stations perform random access procedures at various times, for example when the cell phone initially accesses the base station. (*Id.* at 3-4.)

In the prior art and the claims of the '236 patent, the cell phone transmits three types of data to the base station. *Id.* at 4-5. These are 1.) a preamble, 2.) Message 3 buffer data ("Msg3 buffer data"), and 3.) New data. (*Id.*) The cell phone

# 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.