

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SPRINT SPECTRUM L.P., CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON

WIRELESS, AND AT&T MOBILITY LLC,

Petitioners

v.

ADAPTIX, INC.,

Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No.: 8,934,375

Issue Date: January 13, 2015

OFDMA WITH ADAPTIVE SUBCARRIER-CLUSTER

CONFIGURATION AND SELECTIVE LOADING

Case IPR2016-00824

ADAPTIX, INC.

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES iv

LIST OF EXHIBITS v

STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS IN DISPUTE..... i

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

 A. Grounds of the Petitioners’ proposed rejections. 2

II. BACKGROUND..... 3

 A. Summary of the prosecution of the ‘375 patent. 3

 B. Summary of the claimed subject matter of the ‘375 patent 5

III. STANDARD FOR GRANTING *INTER PARTES* REVIEW 8

IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS..... 9

 A. Claim construction. 9

V. THE CLAIMS OF THE ‘375 PATENT ARE PATENTABLE OVER THE
PETITIONERS’ PROPOSED REJECTIONS BASED ON OBVIOUSNESS.
..... 10

 A. Claims 2, 8, 14, 18, 24, and 30 are patentable over the proposed
obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Ritter in view
of Gesbert and Thoumy..... 10

 B. Claims 2 and 18 are patentable over the proposed obviousness rejection
under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Ritter in view of Gesbert and
Thoumy..... 24

 C. Claims 14 and 30 are patentable over the proposed obviousness rejection
under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Ritter in view of Gesbert and
Thoumy..... 25

D. Claims 4-7, 11, 13, 20-23, 27, and 29 are patentable over the proposed obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Ritter in view of Gesbert, Thoumy, and Gitlin.....29

E. Claims 5 and 21 are patentable over the proposed obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Ritter in view of Gesbert, Thoumy, and Gitlin.30

F. Claims 6-8, 11, 13, 22-24, 27, and 29 are patentable over the proposed rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Thoumy in view of Gesbert and Gitlin34

G. Claims 2, 14, 18, and 30 are patentable over the proposed obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Thoumy in view of Gesbert and Ritter.47

H. Claims 2 and 18 are patentable over the proposed obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Thoumy in view of Gesbert and Ritter.48

I. Claims 14 and 30 are also patentable over the proposed rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Thoumy in view of Gesbert and Ritter49

J. Claims 4, 5, 20, and 21 are patentable over the proposed obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Thoumy in view of Gesbert, Gitlin, and Ritter.....50

K. Claims 5 and 21 are patentable over the proposed obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Thoumy in view of Gesbert, Gitlin, and Ritter.51

VI. CONCLUSION.....53

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Aristocrat Techs. Austral. PTY Ltd. v. Int’l Game Tech., 709 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2013)27

Cuozzo Speed Technologies, LLC v. Lee, 579 U.S. ____ (2016)9

In re Kahn, 441 F. 3d 977 (Fed. Cir 2006)33

In re Ratti, 270 F.2d 810 (CCPA 1959)..... 12, 13

In re Translogic Tech., Inc., 504 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2007)9

KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007) passim

Merck & Co. v. Teva Pharms. USA, Inc., 395 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....27

Phillips v. AWH Corp., 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)27

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) passim

35 U.S.C. § 314(a) 8, 53

35 U.S.C. § 325(d)1

Other Authorities

MPEP § 2143.01(VI) 12, 13

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c)..... 10, 34

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)9

37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c).....1

37 C.F.R. § 42.23(a)..... i

37 C.F.R. § 42.24(d)54

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit No.	Exhibit
2101	Expert report of Thomas Fuja, Ph.D. regarding invalidity of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,947,748 and 7,454,212, July 7, 2014.
2102	Patent Trial and Appeal Board Decision Denying Institution of <i>Inter Partes</i> Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,454,212, June 10, 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.