

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APPLE INC., MICROSOFT CORPORATION, MICROSOFT MOBILE OY,  
AND MICROSOFT MOBILE INC. (F/K/A/ NOKIA INC.),

Petitioner

v.

EVOLVED WIRELESS LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2016-01228  
Patent 7,881,236

---

**PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Patent Owner’s Exhibit 2009 does not meet the requirements of a declaration, and is entitled to no weight.....	2
III.	Claim Construction.....	3
	A. The Institution Decision correctly found that the claim term “if” means what it says, rather than “only if” .....	4
	B. Patent Owner chose not to file a motion to amend the claims, and instead attempts to narrow the claims with its improper proposed construction of “if” as “only if” .....	5
	C. Patent Owner’s “only if” construction ignores the claim’s focus on “a specific message” .....	6
	D. Patent Owner’s “if then else” claim interpretation is flawed and unsupported by evidence .....	9
	E. Patent Owner’s claim construction analysis ignores the preamble recitation of “comprising” .....	12
	F. The “ <i>expressio unius</i> ” principle relied on by Petitioner is not applicable to claim construction.....	14
	G. Patent Owner mischaracterizes the claims of the ’236 patent and the Petition in arguing that the claims are rendered inoperative .....	18
	H. Patent Owner’s arguments regarding a child patent of the ’236 patent are immaterial to the present proceeding.....	20
IV.	The combination of Kitazoe, TS 36.321, and the AAPA renders the Challenged Claims obvious.....	21
	A. The cited prior art teaches “determining whether there is data stored in a message 3 (Msg3) buffer when receiving the UL Grant signal on the specific message” as recited in the claims .....	21
	B. Patent Owner’s argument regarding the “current LTE system standard” referred to in the ’236 patent is flawed and unsupported by evidence...	23
V.	Conclusion .....	24

## EXHIBIT LIST

- APPLE-1001 U.S. Patent No. 7,881,236 to Park, et al. (“the ’236 patent”)
- APPLE-1002 Prosecution History of the ’236 Patent (“the Prosecution History”)
- APPLE-1003 Declaration of Jonathan Wells (“Declaration”)
- APPLE-1004 Curriculum Vitae of Jonathan Wells
- APPLE-1005 U.S. Patent No. 8,180,058 (“Kitazoe”)
- APPLE-1006 Reserved
- APPLE-1007 3rd Generation Partnership Project; Technical Specification Group Radio Access Network; Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access (E-UTRA) Medium Access Control (MAC) protocol specification (Release 8), 3GPP TS-36.321 V8.1.0, (March 2008) (“3GPP TS-36.321”)
- APPLE-1008 U.S. Patent No. 6,634,020 (“Bates”)
- APPLE-1009 U.S. Publication No. 20090163211 (“Kitazoe-II”)
- APPLE-1010 U.S. Publication 20080059658 (“Williams”)
- APPLE-1011 Van den Brand et al., Streaming consistency: a model for efficient MPSoC design, 10th Euromicro Conference on Digital System Design Architectures, Methods and Tools (2007) (“Van den Brand”)
- APPLE-1012 U.S. Patent No. 6,161,160 (“Niu”)
- APPLE-1013 U.S. Provisional No. 60/955,867 (“Kitazoe Provisional”)
- APPLE-1014 U.S. Patent No. 6,772,417 (“Ko”)

..

- APPLE-1015 U.S. Patent No. 7,675,905 (“Delaney”)
- APPLE-1016 U.S. Provisional No. 61/015,159 (“Kitazoe-II Provisional”)
- APPLE-1017 Joint Claim Construction Statement from Case Nos. 15-542-SLR-SRF, 15-543-SLR-SRF, 15-544-SLR-SRF, 15-545-SLR-SRF, 15-546-SLR-SRF, 15-547-SLR-SRF filed in N.D. Del. On May 17, 2016 (“Joint Claim Construction Statement”)
- APPLE-1018 “3GPP FAQs,” available at <http://www.3gpp.org/about-3gpp/3gpp-faqs> (retrieved June 20, 2016)
- APPLE-1019 “3GPP specification: 36.321,” available at <http://www.3gpp.org/DynaReport/36321.htm> (retrieved June 20, 2016)
- APPLE-1020 “3GPP specification: 36.321,” archived by the Internet Archive Wayback Machine on May 5, 2008, available at <https://web.archive.org/web/20080505041953/http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/Specs/htmlinfo/36321.htm> (retrieved June 20, 2016)
- APPLE-1021 Declaration of Anne Koch Baland
- APPLE-1022 U.S. Patent No. 6,986,122 to Garvey (“Garvey”)

...

## I. Introduction

Petitioners submit this Reply to Patent Owner's Response (Paper 14, hereinafter the "POR"). The POR largely rehashes arguments previously presented in Patent Owner's Preliminary Response and found unpersuasive by the Board at institution. In repeating these arguments, Patent Owner continues its attempt to rewrite the plain language of the claims to replace the claim term "if" with the narrower term "only if" in an effort avoid the prior art.

Patent Owner also fails to provide any credible evidence to support its rehashed arguments. Patent Owner repeatedly cites to Exhibit 2009, styled as a "declaration," for support. But Exhibit 2009 does not include the required warnings regarding the penalties for perjury or a statement by the declarant regarding the truth of the statements therein. Thus, the exhibit falls short of the requirements for declarations in IPR proceedings, and is entitled to no weight. *See* 37 CFR § 1.68; *Fedex v. Katz*, CBM2015-00053, Paper 9 at 7-8 (PTAB June 29, 2015); *Bumble Bee Foods v. Kowalski*, Case IPR2014-00224, Paper 18 at pp. 14-15 (PTAB June 5, 2014).

Nothing in the Patent Owner Response justifies a change in the preliminary conclusions set forth in the Institution Decision. Thus, the Board should maintain conclusions set forth in its Institution Decision and find the Challenged Claims obvious.

# 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.