

Filed on behalf of TQ Delta, LLC

By: Peter J. McAndrews
Thomas J. Wimbiscus
Scott P. McBride
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

ARRIS GROUP, INC.
Petitioner

v.

TQ DELTA, LLC
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2016-01160
Patent No. 8,611,404

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. SUMMARY OF THE 404 PATENT 5

III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 6

IV. NO REVIEW SHOULD BE INSTITUTED WITH RESPECT TO THE GROUNDS RAISED BY PETITIONER 7

 A. Ground 1: Obviousness of Claims 1-20 Over Bowie, Vanzieleghem, and the ADSL Standard..... 10

 1. The Ground 1 References 10

 2. The Combination of Ground 1 References Fails to Disclose the Claimed “Storing in a Low Power Mode at Least One Parameter Associated with Full Power Mode of Operation” 13

 a. None of Bowie, Vanzieleghem, and the ADSL Standard Discloses Storing, in Low Power Mode, a Fine Gain Parameter or a Bit Allocation Parameter 13

 b. Petitioner’s Invalidity Arguments with Respect to the Storing Limitation Have No Merit 14

 3. Petitioner Fails to Provide Sufficient Non-Conclusory Evidence to Support a Reason to Combine Bowie, Vanzieleghem, and the ADSL Standard 19

 a. The Statements in the Petition 20

 1) The First Statement 20

 2) The Second Statement 21

 3) The Third Statement 22

 4) The Board Has Found Similarly Conclusory Statements

	Regarding	Obviousness	
	Insufficient.....		23
b.	The Statements in the McNally Declaration.....		26
4.	A Person of Skill in the Art Would Not Have Combined the Ground 1 References as Petitioner Proposes		27
B.	Ground 2: Obviousness of Claims 1-20 Over 97-161R1, 97-319, and the ADSL Standard		31
1.	The Ground 2 References		31
2.	The 97-161R1 and 97-319 Contributions Are Not Prior Art		33
a.	The 97-161R1 and 97-319 Contributions		35
b.	The T1 Committee Procedures and ATIS FCC Filing		35
c.	The McNally Testimony.....		37
d.	The T1E1.4 Meeting Report.....		39
e.	The “Wayback Machine” Printout		40
f.	The Contributions Are Not Printed Publications Under <i>Samsung</i> Even if Petitioner’s Allegations Are Accurate.....		42
3.	The Combination of 97-161R1, 97-319, and the ADSL Standard Fails to Disclose the Claimed “Storing in a Low Power Mode at least One Parameter Associated with Full Power Mode of Operation”.....		46
4.	Petitioner Fails to Provide Sufficient Non-Conclusory Evidence to Support a Reason to Combine the References		48
a.	The First Statement.....		49
b.	The Second Statement		50
c.	The Third Statement		52

d.	The Statements in the McNally Declaration.....	54
5.	A Person of Skill in the Art Would Not Have Combined the Ground 2 References as Petitioner Proposes	56
V.	CONCLUSION.....	58

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

AT&T Corp. v. Microsoft Corp.,
No. 01 Civ. 4872, 2004 WL 292321 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 17, 2004)38

BSP Software, LLC v. Motio, Inc.,
IPR2013-00307, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 29, 2013) 21, 50

Customplay, LLC v. Clearplay, Inc.,
IPR2013-00484, Paper 29 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 5, 2014)7

Daifuku Co., v. Murata Machinery, Ltd.,
IPR2015-00084, 87, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. May 4, 2015).....25

Depuy Spine, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc.,
567 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2009)56

Du Pont v. Monsanto Tech., LLC,
IPR2014-00334, Paper 16 (P.T.A.B. July 11, 2014).....7

In re Gordon,
733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984)28

In re ICON Health & Fitness,
496 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2007)28

Jacobs Corp. v. Genesis III, Inc.,
IPR2014-01267, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. January 22, 2015).....8

Kinetic Techs., Inc. v. Skyworks Solutions, Inc.,
IPR2014-00529, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 23, 2014)25

KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007) 16, 19

Moses Lake Indus., Inc. v. Enthone, Inc.,
IPR2014-00243, Paper 6 (P.T.A.B. June 18, 2014) 16, 19

NJOY, Inc. v. Fontem Holdings I B.V.,
IPR2015-01301, Paper 16 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 8, 2015)..... 24, 54

Norian Corp. v. Stryker Corp.,
363 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2004)36

Oxford Nanopore Tech. Ltd. v. University of Washington,
IPR2014-00512, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 15, 2014)9

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.