

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ZTE (USA) INC., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO. LTD., SAMSUNG
ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., HTC CORPORATION,
AND HTC AMERICA, INC.,
Petitioners,

V.

EVOLVED WIRELESS, LLC,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2016-01280
Patent 7,746,916

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO
PETITIONERS' PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW OF
UNITED STATES PATENT NO. 7,746,916**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	3
A. United States Patent No. 7,746,916	3
B. Challenged Claims	6
C. Overview of Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review	10
1. Zhuang175 (Ex. 1012)	10
2. Hou (Ex. 1011).....	14
3. Fukuta (Ex. 1013)	15
4. Popović (Ex. 1009)	18
III. PROSECUTION HISTORY	19
IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	22
V. THE PETITION IS WHOLLY REDUNDANT	29
VI. PETITIONERS FAIL TO ESTABLISH A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS AS TO ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM.....	30
A. Legal Standard.....	30
B. Zhuang175 is redundant in view of the prosecution history. [Grounds 1 and 2].....	33
C. Zhuang175 does not disclose the claimed “circular shift.” [Grounds 1 and 2].....	34
D. Petitioners have failed to show how the combination of Zhuang175 and Hou discloses the claimed circular shift. [Grounds 3 and 4].....	41

E. Petitioners have failed to show how the combination of Zhuang175 and Fukuta discloses the claimed circular shift. [Grounds 5 and 6].....42

1. Fukuta alone does not disclose the claimed “circular shift.”43

2. Petitioners have not articulated a reason to combine Zhuang175 with a modified Fukuta to disclose the claimed circular shift.....45

F. Petitioners have failed to show how combining Popović with the remaining references renders obvious “wherein the code sequence having the first length is a Zadoff-Chu (ZC) sequence.” [Grounds 2, 4, and 6]48

VII. CONCLUSION.....52

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>ATD Corp. v. Lydall, Inc.</i> , 159 F.3d 534 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	50
<i>CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Intern. Corp.</i> , 349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	31
<i>Continental Can Co. v. Monsanto Co.</i> , 948 F.2d 1264 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	40
<i>Cutsforth, Inc. v. MotivePower, Inc.</i> , 643 F. App'x 1008 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	22
<i>In re Bigio</i> , 381 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	29
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended—Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	31
<i>In re Rijckaert</i> , 9 F.3d 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993)	38
<i>In re Suitco Surface, Inc.</i> , 603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	23
<i>In re Turlay</i> , 304 F.2d 893 (C.C.P.A. 1962)	40
<i>Invitrogen Corp. v. Biocrest Mfg., L.P.</i> , 327 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	25
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	31
<i>Mantech Envtl. Corp. v. Hudson Envtl. Servs., Inc.</i> , 152 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	25

McGinley v. Franklin Sports, Inc.,
262 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2001)35

Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.,
789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015)23

Nora Lighting, Inc. v. Juno Mfg., LLC,
Case No. IPR2015-00601, Paper 13 (PTAB Aug. 12, 2015)33

Ortho-McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Mylan Labs, Inc.,
520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008)49

PPC Broadband, Inc. v. Corning Optical Communs. RF, LLC,
815 F.3d 747 (Fed. Cir. 2016)22

Prism Pharma Co., Ltd. v. Choongwae Pharma Corp.,
IPR2014-00315, Paper 14 (PTAB July 8, 2014)33

Procter & Gamble Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.,
566 F.3d 989 (Fed. Cir. 2009)31

Sanofi-Synthelabo, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.,
550 F 3d 1075 (Fed. Cir. 2008)31

Unified Patents, Inc. v. PersonalWeb Techs., LLC,
Case No. IPR2014-00702, Paper 13 (PTAB July 24, 2014)30

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 314(a)32

35 U.S.C. § 325(d)30, 33

Rules

37 C.F.R. 42.100(b)22

37 C.F.R. § 42.20(c).....30

37 C.F.R. § 42.1071

37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c).....31

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.