

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., AND
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,
Petitioners

v.

EVOLVED WIRELESS, LLC
Patent Owner

Case IPR2016-01345
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	6
	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.....	7
III.	The claims	11
	A. Independent claim 1	11
	B. Independent claim 7.....	13
IV.	Claim Construction	14
	A. Claim 1	15
	1. The claim language, properly read, excludes the possibility of transmitting new data along with the Msg3 buffer data	15
	2. Petitioners’ claim construction is highly suspect because it claims an inoperative method.....	18
	3. ZTE’s arguments all fail	19
	a. Petitioners improperly dissect differences in meaning between “only if” and “if”	19
	b. Petitioners’ other arguments fail, too	20
	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	25
V.	Petitioner’s argument that the 321 reference teaches limitation 1(e) is wrong, even using Petitioners’ unreasonable claim construction.....	26
VI.	The petition is wholly redundant.....	28
VII.	The claims, using the broadest reasonable construction, are not obvious	28

A. Petitioners’ argument that the 320 reference teaches not transmitting the Msg3 buffer data along with the new data fails because it is based on a logical error29

B. Petitioners failed to address the proper construction of limitation 1(e), and then failed to find that limitation in the prior art, so Ground 1 fails for this additional reason.....33

C. Petitioners address neither the proper construction of limitation 7(e) nor 7(g), and then failed to find those limitations in the prior art, so Ground 2 fails33

D. Petitioners’ simultaneous development argument is irrelevant and wrong34

VIII. Conclusion35

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)	18
<i>Chef Am., Inc. v. Lamb-Weston, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	20
<i>Chevron USA Inc. v. Echazabal</i> , 536 U.S. 77 (2002).....	16
<i>Despoir, Inc. v. Nike USA, Inc.</i> , 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10845 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 9, 2005)	16
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC</i> , 793 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2015), <i>aff'd</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	14
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.</i> , 2016 U.S. App. LEXIS 13461 (Fed. Cir July 25, 2016)	34
<i>Par Pharm., Inc. v. TWi Pharms., Inc.</i> , 773 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	27
<i>PPC Broadband, Inc. v. Corning Optical Communs. RF, LLC</i> , 815 F.3d 747 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	19, 20
<i>Pods, Inc. v. Porta Stor, Inc.</i> , 484 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	21
<i>Shenyang Yuanda Aluminum Industry Eng'g. v. United States</i> , 776 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	15
<i>Unified Patents, Inc. v. PersonalWeb Techs., LLC</i> , Case No. IPR2014-00702, Paper 13 (PTAB July 24, 2014)	28
Statutes	
35 C.F.R. § 42.107	1

35 U.S.C. § 3251, 28

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.