

Filed on behalf of TQ Delta, LLC  
By: Peter J. McAndrews  
McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.  
500 W. Madison St., 34th Floor  
Chicago, IL 60661  
Tel: 312-775-8000  
Fax: 312-775-8100  
E-mail: pmcandrews@mcandrews-ip.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC., DISH NETWORK, LLC,  
COMCAST CABLE COMMUNICATIONS, LLC,  
COX COMMUNICATIONS, INC.,  
TIME WARNER CABLE ENTERPRISES LLC,  
VERIZON SERVICES CORP., and ARRIS GROUP, INC.,  
Petitioners,

v.

TQ DELTA, LLC  
Patent Owner

---

Case No. IPR2016-01020<sup>1</sup>  
Patent No. 9,014,243

---

**PATENT OWNER'S REQUEST FOR REHEARING  
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d)**

---

<sup>1</sup> DISH Network, L.L.C., who filed a Petition in IPR2017-00254, and Comcast Cable Communications, L.L.C., Cox Communications, Inc., Time Warner Cable Enterprises L.L.C., Verizon Services Corp., and ARRIS Group, Inc., who filed a Petition in IPR2017-00418, have been joined in this proceeding.

I. INTRODUCTION .....1

II. THE PANEL’S CONSTRUCTION OF “SCRAMBLING THE PHASE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CARRIER SIGNALS” IS OVERBROAD .....1

    A. There Is Universal Agreement That Scrambling Phases As Claimed Reduces PAR .....3

    B. The FWD’s Construction Includes Situations in Which PAR Is Not Reduced .....5

III. STOPLER DOES NOT DISCLOSE “SCRAMBLING THE PHASE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CARRIER SIGNALS” .....6

    A. Stopler’s “Phase Scrambling” Must Be Compatible with Single-Carrier CDMA.....6

    B. There Is No Way to Reduce PAR in a Single-Carrier System by Phase Scrambling As Claimed .....7

IV. THE FWD IS PREDICATED ON MISAPPREHENDED ASSUMPTIONS AND OVERLOOKED TESTIMONY .....8

V. THE FWD MISAPPREHENDS THAT SHIVELY DOES NOT HAVE AN “INCREASED” OR “HIGH” PAR BECAUSE OF THE ENORMOUS REDUCTION IN TRANSMISSION POWER.....12

VI. CONCLUSION.....15

## I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d), TQ Delta, LLC (“Patent Owner”) requests rehearing of the Panel’s final written decision (“FWD”), Paper 41. The FWD is based on an overbroad construction of “scrambling the phase characteristics of the carrier signals” that misapprehends or overlooks the specification of the ’243 patent, Patent Owner’s discussion, and the statements of Petitioners, including their own expert. Furthermore, given a proper construction of “scrambling the phase characteristics of the carrier signals,” the FWD misapprehends or overlooks that Stopler’s<sup>2</sup> alleged phase scrambling is different than what is claimed. The FWD also mistakenly concludes, based on a misapprehension of the record, that one of skill in the art would have (1) considered Shively’s<sup>3</sup> PAR without the frame of reference of its clipping rate and (2) considered Shively to have a “high” or “increased” PAR. But the relative terms “high” or “increased” PAR lack meaning without a frame of reference.

## II. THE PANEL’S CONSTRUCTION OF “SCRAMBL[E/ING]...A PLURALITY OF CARRIER PHASES” IS OVERBROAD

Patent Owner asserted that this term (and the similar term “scramble ... a plurality of phases”) should be construed to mean “adjusting the phases of a

---

<sup>2</sup> U.S. Patent No. 6,625,219 B1; issued Sept. 23, 2003 (Ex. 1012) (“Stopler”).

<sup>3</sup> U.S. Patent No. 6,144,696 B1; issued Nov. 9, 2000 (Ex. 1011) (“Shively”).

plurality of carriers in a single multicarrier symbol by pseudo-randomly varying amounts.” POR, Paper 12 at 14. Petitioners, on the other hand, argued that it needs no construction, “since [Stople] uses the same ‘phase scrambling’ terminology to describe pseudo-random phase changes.” Reply, Paper 20 at 7.

The FWD, however, diverged from both of these approaches and construed the term to mean “adjusting the phases of a plurality of carriers in a single multicarrier symbol.” FWD, Paper 41 at 9. But this cannot be a proper construction of this term because it leaves open the possibility that all of the phases within a single multicarrier symbol are adjusted by a single (*i.e.*, same) amount. The FWD misapprehends or overlooks that, under any proper construction, there must at a minimum be *varying amounts* by which the phases are adjusted within a single multicarrier symbol (*i.e.*, *from carrier-to-carrier*) such that PAR is reduced. Under the construction set forth in the FWD, the claim term would still be met where the phases of a plurality of carriers in a single multicarrier signal are adjusted even if each of the phases of the plurality of carriers in the single multicarrier symbol are adjusted by the same amount. Such uniform adjustment, however, would not result in the recited “scrambling” where phase adjustment varies among carriers—and therefore would not reduce PAR.

**A. There Is Universal Agreement That Scrambling Phases As Claimed Reduces PAR**

As both Patent Owner and Petitioners explained, the claimed “scrambling” must lower PAR. Patent Owner’s discussion on this point is clear, unrefuted, and fully supported by the ’243 patent. *See, e.g.*, POR, Paper 12 at 16 (“As the ’243 patent explains, PAR in the transmission signal is reduced by adjusting the carrier phases within a single DMT symbol. *See* [Ex. 1001] at 6:30–53. If the carrier phases were only adjusted from one symbol to the next, PAR would not be reduced. *See* Ex. 2003 at ¶¶ 41–42.”); Ex. 2003 (Short Decl.) at ¶ 42; Ex. 1001 at 6:30–53.

Petitioners’ arguments showed that they agree that the claims required adjusting phases of the individual carriers. For example, Petitioners alleged:

A POSITA would have known that one way to reduce PAR is to scramble phases of individual carriers.

Reply, Paper 17 at 12.<sup>4</sup> Another example is Petitioners’ section heading: “IV. Stopler’s phase scrambler reduces PAR because it scrambles phases of individual QAM symbols.” Reply, Paper 17 at 16.

---

<sup>4</sup> Patent Owner disagrees and contests Petitioners’ conclusions and untimely submission of evidence, but agrees that the claimed phase-scrambling must reduce

# 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.