# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

# **BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

### APPLE INC., MICROSOFT COROPORATION, MICROSOFT MOBILE

OY, and

### MICROSOFT MOBILE INC. (F/K/A/ NOKIA INC.),

Petitioner

v.

**EVOLVED WIRELESS LLC,** 

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-01229

Patent 7,881,236 B2

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

A L A R M Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

DOCKET

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

| I.    | Introduction1  |  |  |
|-------|--|--|--|
| II.   | The State of the art2  |  |  |
| III.  | The problem the inventors solved   |  |  |
| IV.   | The claims7  |  |  |
|       | <ul><li>A. Independent claim 1</li></ul>   |  |  |
| V.    | Claim Construction   |  |  |
| VI.   | <ul> <li>A. Introduction</li></ul>   |  |  |
|       | <ul> <li>"determining whether there is data stored in a message 3 buffer"</li> <li>limitation</li></ul>  |  |  |
| VII.  | The Kitazoe reference is unavailing under the correct claim<br>construction because Petitioners extract teachings from Kitazoe that it<br>does not contain |  |  |
| VIII. | Ground 2 fails because it depends on the incorrect analysis found in<br>Ground 1   |  |  |

|     |            | IPR2016-01229       |
|-----|------------|---------------------|
|     |            | Patent 7,881,236 B2 |
| IX. | Conclusion |                     |

Patent Owner Evolved Wireless, LLC submits this Response to the abovecaptioned Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,811,236 ("Pet.," Paper 2).

## I. Introduction

The challenged claims of the '236 patent are valid. Regardless of the claim construction the Board adopts, the Petition's Niu reference, Exhibit 1012, is not analogous prior art. This reference underlies both Grounds, and therefore all Grounds fail.

Moreover, the Board instituted trial in this matter using a claim construction at odds with the understanding a person of ordinary skill ("POSA"). Expert testimony confirms that the claims at issue are drafted in what a POSA would call a "if condition then action1 else action2" formulation. The testimony further establishes that the construction for such language forbids carrying out action2 when the stated condition calls for action1 to be occur. The Board's initial construction, therefore, is too broad. Further underscoring POSA's proper reading of the claims is the *expressio unius* principle, which, as discussed in more detail below, was recently confirmed, post-Institution, by the Office's grant of a continuation patent of the '236 patent.

In view of the proper "only if"/ "only when" construction, Petitioner has reached unfounded conclusions regarding the disclosure of Petitioners' primary reference (Kitazoe reference, Exhibit 1005). While Kitazoe's teachings are not inconsistent with Petitioners' argument, an analysis of the problem the '236 patent inventors addressed demonstrates that Petitioners' conclusions about Kitazoe are unsupported.

Accordingly, pursuant to the proper claim construction, the Petition should be rejected and no challenged claims should be cancelled.

### II. The State of the art

The '236 patent is titled, "Data Transmission Method and User Equipment for the Same" and generally describes a method "for efficiently transmitting data stored in a message 3 (Msg3) buffer and a user equipment" in a mobile communication system such as a Long Term Evolution ("LTE") system developed and standardized in the 3rd Generation Partnership Project ("3GPP"). Ex. 1001, Abstract, (54), 1:17-32.

Figure 1 below is an annotated version of the '236 patent's Fig. 5. Fig. 5 illustrates communication between a UE (*e.g.*, a mobile telephone) and a base station (*e.g.*, a cell phone tower). Cooklev at ¶ 35-37.<sup>1</sup> In particular, Fig. 5 illustrates a "random access procedure" between a UE and a base station used, for example, to enable the UE to obtain initial access to the base station. Ex. 1001 at 3:45-49. Fig. 5 (the basis for the annotated in Figures 1-3 herein) illustrates a contention-based random access procedure. *Id.* at 6:53-55. In Figures 1-3 below, time increases along the downwards direction.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> "Cooklev" refers to the Declaration of Dr. Todor Cooklev, Ex. 2011.

# DOCKET A L A R M



# 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.