

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.
Petitioner,

v.

CELLULAR COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT LLC,
Patent Owner

IPR2016-01493
Patent 8,457,676 B2

PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....1

II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....1

III. PETITIONER’S OBVIOUSNESS ANALYSIS WAS PROPERLY PERFORMED.....2

 A. The Obviousness Analysis Did Not Need To Address LTE Because the Claims Are Not Directed to LTE..... 2

 B. Fong and Ericsson Are Properly Combinable 4

IV. INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 1 AND 19 ARE OBVIOUS.....5

 A. Fong Discloses “wherein said at least one threshold is adjustable via a signal to the user equipment” 5

 1. Fong’s MIN_DURATION Threshold is Adjustable.....6

 2. Patent Owner’s Assumption That “Predetermined” Means “Not Adjustable” Is Incorrect.....9

 B. Fong in View of Ericsson Discloses “wherein the set of at least one triggering criterion comprises a criterion being met based on reaching a threshold of the at least one threshold of k transmission time intervals following a previous power control headroom report, wherein k is an integer” 10

 1. Patent Owner’s Argument About MIN_DURATION in Milliseconds Has No Merit11

 2. Patent Owner Attacks the References Individually14

 3. Ericsson Teaches Sending Power Headroom Reports at Specified Intervals15

 4. Ericsson Discloses the Claimed “k is an integer”18

..

5. Patent Owner is Incorrect that the Combination Substitutes the TTIs of Ericsson for Fong’s Uniform Time Intervals	20
6. Patent Owner’s Argument About Fong and CDMA2000 Fails	20
C. Fong in View of Ericsson Discloses “wherein said at least one threshold adjustable via the signal comprises adjusting the threshold integer k”	21
V. DEPENDENT CLAIMS 3 AND 21 ARE OBVIOUS	22
A. Patent Owner’s Continued Focus on LTE and Isolated Disclosures Fails.....	23
B. Bark Teaches “a triggering criterion such that an absolute difference between current and most recent path-loss measurements has reached a threshold of difference”	24
1. Petitioner Does Not Rely on Bark for Disclosing Power Headroom	24
2. Patent Owner’s Arguments Fail To Account For Bark’s Explicit Disclosure of Measuring “Change” In a Parameter	25
VI. CONCLUSION.....	28

...

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Case Law

In re Keller,

642 F.2d 413, 426 (CCPA 1981).....15

KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,

550 U.S. 398, 419 (2007).....4

Outdry Techs. Corp. v. Geox S.P.A.,

859 F.3d 1364, 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....4

I. INTRODUCTION

Patent Owner's Response is predicated upon the premise that the challenged claims of the '676 Patent are applicable only to the LTE standard. This premise is false, as established by the claim language and the specification, and confirmed by Patent Owner's expert during cross-examination. The Response is also permeated by an incorrect understanding of obviousness—one that requires the motivation to combine elements to be the same motivation as the asserted patent. The Federal Circuit has held that that there is no such requirement.

Additionally, when addressing individual claim elements, Patent Owner attacks the prior art references individually and ignores their combined teachings and explicit disclosures. For example, Patent Owner alleges that Fong's teachings are limited to one particular wireless standard and could not be combined with other references directed to different standards, while ignoring Fong's explicit disclosure that its teachings are applicable to other wireless communication standards and protocols.

The arguments raised by Patent Owner are without merit, and the challenged claims should be found unpatentable.

II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION

There is no material dispute on claim construction.

Petitioner agrees with the Board in the Decision to Institute that no further construction of the "processor" terms is necessary.

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.