

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SONY MOBILE COMMUNICATIONS (USA) INC., SONY MOBILE
COMMUNICATIONS AB, SONY MOBILE COMMUNICATIONS, INC.,
SONY ELECTRONICS, INC., SONY CORP. OF AMERICA, and
SONY CORP.,
Petitioner,

v.

ADAPTIX, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2014-01525
Patent 7,454,212 B2

Before HOWARD B. BLANKENSHIP, TREVOR M. JEFFERSON, and
JUSTIN BUSCH, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

BLANKENSHIP, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Institution of *Inter Partes* Review
37 C.F.R. § 42.108

I. BACKGROUND

Sony Mobile Communications (USA) Inc., Sony Mobile
Communications AB, Sony Mobile Communications, Inc., Sony Electronics,

SPRINT 1000

Inc., Sony Corp. of America, and Sony Corp. (collectively, “Petitioner”) filed a request for an *inter partes* review of claims 1, 8–13, 15, 16, 18–21, and 23–30 of U.S. Patent No. 7,454,212 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’212 patent”) under 35 U.S.C. §§ 311–319. *See* Paper 5 (“Petition” or “Pet.”). Patent Owner Adaptix, Inc. filed a preliminary response. *See* Paper 11 (“Prelim. Resp.”). We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 314. Section 314 provides that an *inter partes* review may not be instituted unless “the information presented in the petition . . . shows that there is a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition.”

For the reasons that follow, we institute an *inter partes* review as to claims 1, 8–13, 15, 16, 18–21, and 23–30 of the ’212 patent.

A. Related Proceedings

According to Petitioner, the ’212 patent is involved in the following lawsuits: *Adaptix, Inc. v. AT&T, Inc.*, No. 6:12-cv-00017 (E.D. Tex.); *Adaptix, Inc. v. Pantech Wireless, Inc.*, No. 6:12-cv-00020 (E.D. Tex.); *Adaptix, Inc. v. Cellco Partnership*, No. 6:12-cv-00120 (E.D. Tex.); *Adaptix, Inc. v. Huawei Techs. Co., Ltd.*, Nos. 6:13-cv-00438, ’439, ’440, and ’441 (E.D. Tex.); *Adaptix, Inc. v. ZTE Corp.*, Nos. 6:13-cv-00443, ’444, ’445, and ’446 (E.D. Tex.); *Adaptix, Inc. v. NEC CASIO Mobile Commc’ns, Ltd.*, Nos. 6:13-cv-00585 and ’922 (E.D. Tex.); *Adaptix, Inc. v. Pantech Wireless, Inc.*, No. 6:13-cv-00778 (E.D. Tex.); *Adaptix, Inc. v. Blackberry Limited*, Nos. 5:14-cv-01380, ’386 and ’387 (N.D. Cal.); *Adaptix, Inc. v. Kyocera Corp.*, Nos. 3:14-cv-02894 and ’895 (N.D. Cal.); *Adaptix, Inc. v. Apple, Inc.*, Nos. 5:13-cv-01776, ’1777, and ’2023 (N.D. Cal.); *Adaptix, Inc. v. AT&T, Inc.*,

IPR2014-01525
Patent 7,454,212 B2

No. 5:13-cv-01778 (N.D. Cal.); *Adaptix, Inc. v. Cellco Partnership*, No. 5:13-cv-01844 (N.D. Cal.); *Adaptix, Inc. v. Dell, Inc.*, No. 5:14-cv-01259 (N.D. Cal.); *Adaptix, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.*, No. 5:14-cv-01379 (N.D. Cal.); *Adaptix, Inc. v. Sony Mobile Commc'ns, Inc.*, No. 5:14-cv-01385 (N.D. Cal.); *Adaptix, Inc. v. ASUSTek*, No. 5:14-cv-03112 (N.D. Cal.); and *Adaptix, Inc. v. HTC Corp.*, Nos. 5:14-cv-02359 and '360 (N.D. Cal.). Pet. 1–2. The '212 patent is also involved in Case IPR2015-00318 (PTAB Nov. 26, 2014) and was involved in Case IPR2014-01408 (PTAB Aug. 28, 2014), which was terminated by the Board on January 29, 2015.

B. The '212 Patent

The '212 patent relates to subcarrier selection for each of multiple subscribers (e.g., mobile phones) that includes measuring channel and interference information for subcarriers based on pilot symbols received from a base station. Ex. 1001, Abstract. Orthogonal frequency division multiplexing (OFDM) is an efficient modulation scheme for signal transmission over frequency-selective channels. *Id.* at col. 1, ll. 23–25. The invention employs orthogonal frequency division multiple access (OFDMA), which is a method for multiple access using the basic format of the OFDM modulation scheme. *Id.* at col. 1, ll. 36–51; *see generally id.* at col. 1, l. 14 col. 2, l. 30, col. 3, ll. 4–11.

C. Illustrative Claim

Claim 1, reproduced below, is illustrative.

1. A method for subcarrier selection for a system employing orthogonal frequency division multiple access (OFDMA) comprising:

a subscriber unit measuring channel and interference information for a plurality of subcarriers based on pilot symbols received from a base station;

the subscriber unit selecting a set of candidate subcarriers;

the subscriber unit providing feedback information on the set of candidate subcarriers to the base station;

the subscriber unit receiving an indication of subcarriers of the set of subcarriers selected by the base station for use by the subscriber unit; and

the subscriber unit submitting updated feedback information, after being allocated the set of subcarriers to be allocated an updated set of subcarriers, and thereafter the subscriber unit receiving another indication of the updated set of subcarriers.

D. Asserted Prior Art

Ritter	DE 19800953 C1	July 29, 1999	Ex. 1002 ¹
Kapoor	US 6,795,424 B1	Sep. 21, 2004	Ex. 1003

IEEE Communications Magazine, vol. 38, no. 7, July 2000 (excerpts) (Ex. 1004) (“IEEE”).

¹ The parties refer to Exhibit 1002 as “Ritter,” which is an English translation of DE 19800953 C1. The German patent document has been entered as Exhibit 1021.

Chuang and Sollenberger, *Spectrum Resource Allocation for Wireless Packet Access with Application to Advanced Cellular Internet Service*, IEEE JOURNAL ON SELECTED AREAS IN COMMUNICATIONS, vol. 16, no. 6 (Aug. 1998) (Ex 1007) (“Chuang”).

Cimini, et al., *Advanced Cellular Internet Service (ACIS)*, IEEE Communications Magazine (Oct. 1998) (Ex. 1008) (“Cimini”).

E. Asserted Grounds of Unpatentability

Petitioner asserts the following grounds of unpatentability under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) against claims 1, 8–13, 15, 16, 18–21, and 23–30 (Pet. 4):

Prior Art	Claim(s)
Ritter and Kapoor	1, 8–13, 15, 16, 18–21, and 23–30
IEEE and Chuang	1, 8–13, 15, 16, 18–21, and 23–30
IEEE and Cimini	1, 8–13, 15, 16, 18–21, and 23–30

II. ANALYSIS

A. Claim Interpretation

In an *inter partes* review, the Board construes claim terms in an unexpired patent using their broadest reasonable construction in light of the specification of the patent in which they appear. 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b); Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,756, 48,764 (Aug. 14, 2012).

Although Petitioner submits constructions for several terms (Pet. 7–13), for purposes of this Decision we do not find construction of any terms necessary at this stage in the proceeding. Further, Patent Owner in its

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.