

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC., MICROSOFT CORP., MICROSOFT MOBILE OY, AND
MICROSOFT MOBILE INC.,

Petitioners

v.

EVOLVED WIRELESS, LLC

Patent Owner

Case IPR2016-01228

Patent 7,881,236

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO
PETITIONERS' PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW OF
UNITED STATES PATENT NO. 7,881,236**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|------|---|----|
| I. | Introduction | 1 |
| II. | The State of the art | 2 |
| | A. Mobile telephony and LTE | 2 |
| | B. Identifying radio resources | 5 |
| | C. Base station communicates the radio resources it has allocated to a UE with uplink grants | 7 |
| | D. A UE having new data to upload, but lacking radio resources sufficient for the upload, uses the random access procedure to obtain the resources..... | 8 |
| III. | The claims | 12 |
| | A. Independent claim 1 | 12 |
| | B. Independent claim 7..... | 14 |
| IV. | Claim Construction | 15 |
| | A. Claim 1 | 16 |
| | 1. The claim language, properly read, excludes the possibility of transmitting new data along with the Msg3 buffer data | 16 |
| | 2. Petitioners’ claim construction is highly suspect because it claims an inoperative method..... | 19 |
| | 3. Petitioners’ claim construction arguments fail | 20 |
| | a. Petitioners improperly dissect differences in meaning between “only when” and “if” | 20 |
| | b. Petitioners’ reliance on their cases is unfounded | 21 |
| | 4. The broadest reasonable construction for claim 1 must be consistent with the <i>expressio unius</i> principle | 23 |
| | B. Claim 7..... | 23 |
| | 1. The broadest reasonable construction for claim 7 must be consistent with the <i>expressio unius</i> principle | 24 |
| V. | The claims, using the broadest reasonable construction, are not obvious | 26 |
| | A. The Kitazoe reference is unavailing | 27 |

1. Petitioners’ argument that the Kitazoe reference teaches not transmitting the Msg3 buffer data along with the new data fails because it is based on a logical error27

2. Petitioners’ argument that the Kitazoe reference teaches not transmitting the new along with the Msg3 buffer data fails because it uses the wrong claim construction31

B. Petitioners have failed to show, in the prior art, the determining whether there is data in the Msg3 buffer found in the 1(c) and 7(e) limitations.....32

C. Petitioners have failed to determine the scope and content of the prior art.....34

D. Ground 2 fails because it depends on the incorrect analysis found in Ground 136

VI. Conclusion.....36

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Page(s)****Cases**

| | |
|---|--------|
| <i>AIA Eng'g Ltd. v. Magotteaux Int'l S/A</i> , 657 F.3d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 2011) | 19 |
| <i>CAE Screenplates, Inc. v. Heinrich Fiedler GmbH & Co. KG</i> , 224 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2000) | 21, 22 |
| <i>Chevron USA Inc. v. Echazabal</i> , 536 U.S. 77 (2002)..... | 17 |
| <i>Chi. Bd. Options Exch., Inc. v. Int'l Sec. Exch., LLC</i> , 677 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2012) | 21 |
| <i>Despoir, Inc. v. Nike USA, Inc.</i> , 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10845 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 9, 2005) | 17 |
| <i>In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC</i> , 793 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2015), <i>aff'd</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016)..... | 15 |
| <i>PPC Broadband, Inc. v. Corning Optical Communs. RF, LLC</i> , 815 F.3d 747 (Fed. Cir. 2016) | 20, 21 |
| <i>Shenyang Yuanda Aluminum Industry Eng'g. v. United States</i> , 776 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2015) | 17 |

Other Authorities

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.107 | 1 |
|--------------------------|---|

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.107, Patent Owner Evolved Wireless, LLC submits this Preliminary Response to the above-captioned Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,811,236 (“Pet.,” Paper 2).

I. Introduction

The Petition fails to establish a reasonable likelihood that Petitioners would prevail with respect to any claim challenged in the Petition. The failure is manifold. First, the Petition offers unreasonably broad constructions for two limitations of the independent claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,811,236 (the “’236 patent”), Exhibit 1001.

Perhaps recognizing the unreasonableness of its proposed constructions, the Petition also offers narrower constructions, but the Board should deny the Petition under these constructions too. This is because Petitioners’ argument that Exhibit 1005 (the Kitazoe reference) satisfies Petitioners’ “only when” construction is wrong. The Kitazoe reference cannot show that certain acts happen “only when” certain events occur because that reference presents only a limited review of random access procedure that is at issue in the ’236 patent, and it does not consider more complex cases (cases that the ’236 patent inventors did consider). Accordingly, the conclusion Petitioners draw from the Kitazoe reference is unsupported.

Further, the Petition has other failings, notably including its failure to address the state of the art at the time of the invention. More specifically, the Petition mistakenly presents an obsolete standard to be the LTE system standard that was

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.