UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC., et al. Petitioner,

v.

TQ DELTA LLC, Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-01020 (Patent 9,014,243) Case IPR2016-01021 (Patent 8,718,158)

Record of Oral Hearing Held: August 3, 2017

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY, TREVOR M. JEFFERSON, and MATTHEW R. CLEMENTS, *Administrative Patent Judges*



APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:

David L. McCombs, Esquire Theodore M. Foster, Esquire Gregory P. Huh, Esquire Haynes and Boone, LLP 2523 Victory Avenue, Suite 700 Dallas, Texas 75219

ON BEHALF OF THE PATENT OWNER:

Peter J. McAndrews, Esquire Christopher M. Scharff, Esquire Rajendra A. Chiplunkar, Esquire McAndrews Held & Malloy, Ltd. 500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor Chicago, Illinois 60661

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Thursday, August 3, 2017, commencing at 2:56 p.m., at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia.



1	PROCEEDINGS
2	JUDGE MEDLEY: Good afternoon. We are on
3	the record. This is the hearing for IPR 2016 01020
4	and 1021. Cisco Systems, et al. versus TQ Delta.
5	Each side has 40 minutes to argue.
6	Petitioner, you will proceed first,
7	to present your case with respect to the challenged
8	claims and grounds for which we instituted a trial.
9	And then thereafter, patent owner, you may have
10	time to respond and petitioner, you may reserve
11	rebuttal time.
12	At this time we would like the parties
13	to please introduce themselves beginning with
14	petitioner.
15	MR. MCCOMBS: Your Honors, I'm David
16	McCombs with Haynes & Boone, and with me is Theo
17	Foster and Gregory Huh and Dina Blikshteyn. Also we
18	have with us today, on behalf of Dish Networks we
19	Jennifer Volk and Stephen McBride from Cooley. And
20	then also we have for the Comcast entities we
21	have Corey Manley with Duane Morris.
22	JUDGE MEDLEY: And Mr. Foster, you will be
23	presenting?
24	MR. FOSTER: That's correct.
25	JUDGE MEDLEY: And patent owner?
26	MR. MCANDREWS: Good afternoon, Your



1	Honor. I'm Peter McAndrews with McAndrews Held &
2	Malloy. With me I have Rajendra Chiplunkar, Chris
3	Scharff, and Ben Mann from our law firm. I also
4	have from TQ Delta, their representative is Mark
5	Roach and Nada Roget, and one of the inventors from
6	the patent portfolio, Marcos Tzannes.
7	JUDGE MEDLEY: All right. On August 1st,
8	2017, patent owner filed papers styled Patent Owner's
9	Objections to Petitioner's Demonstratives. Patent
10	owner's objections are dismissed because they are
11	improper since patent owner did not demonstrate
12	sufficiently that the contents of the objected-to
13	slides raised new issues or evidence, rather the
14	objected-to slides contained references to arguments
15	and evidence of record.
16	Again, we remind the parties that the
17	demonstratives are not evidence but demonstratives
18	and that we may not even enter them into the
19	record. For all these reasons, we dismiss the
20	objections to petitioners' demonstratives.
21	Petitioner, at this time you may
22	proceed.
23	MR. FOSTER: Thank you, Your Honor.
24	Good afternoon and may it please the
25	court. I'd like to jump straight into the issues
26	in this case and first point out that patent owner



1	does not dispute that the substantive limitations
2	of the claims at issue here are taught in the
3	prior art. The main issue raised in papers
4	concerns the obviousness of combining the two main
5	references. Those are Shively and Stopler. And
6	we believe that that combination, looking at Slide
7	2, that combination flows from ordinary
8	engineering problem solving skills applied in
9	light of three simple observations that would have
10	been apparent to a person of ordinary skill in
11	this art.
12	Those are, first, that Shively's
13	bit-spreading technique, while it improves the
14	data communication by allowing more data to be
15	communicated using otherwise unusable portions of
16	the frequency spectrum, it does have a side effect
17	in that it causes an increase in the
18	peaked-to-average power ratio for PAR of the
19	transmitted signal; second, that increase in PAR
20	is undesirable for a very large number of reasons;
21	and third, that the secondary reference, Stopler,
22	teaches a phase scrambler, which is a well known
23	technique in the prior art for reducing PAR.
24	So the combination would have been
25	obvious to a person of ordinary skill of the art
26	from these three simple statements.



DOCKET

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.

