

Paper No. _____

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.,
Petitioner

v.

TQ DELTA LLC,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2016-01760
Patent No. 9,094,268

PETITIONER'S REPLY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....5

II. Claim Construction.....5

 A. “maintaining synchronization with a second transceiver”5

 B. “parameters associated with the full power mode operation”7

III. Bowie And Yamano Render The Claims Obvious8

 A. Bowie and Yamano render obvious “a transmitter portion of the transceiver does not transmit data... and a receiver portion of the transceiver receives data...”8

 B. The combination of Bowie and Yamano renders obvious “maintaining synchronization with a second transceiver during the low power mode.”12

 1. Yamano’s poll or other timing signal maintains synchronization between the transceivers during low power mode.....12

 2. Yamano’s poll or other timing signal is provided when the receiver is receiving data and in full power mode.....14

 C. Bowie teaches “storing, during the low power mode, at least one parameter associated with a full power mode.”16

IV. A POSITA Would Have Been Motivated To Combine Bowie And Yamano19

 A. The teachings of Bowie and Yamano are compatible.....19

 B. The obviousness analysis is based on the prior art teachings—not hindsight.....21

 C. Bowie and Yamano render obvious that the transmitter enters low power mode.22

D.	Bowie in combination with Yamano renders obvious transmitting or receiving internet and video data while in low power mode.....	23
E.	Dr. Kiaei's deposition testimony is consistent with his declaration.....	25
F.	Yamano's synchronization teachings are applicable to Bowie.....	27
G.	Yamano's synchronization teachings do not render Bowie inoperable for its intended use.....	28
V.	Patent Owner's Attack on Dr. Kiaei Has No Merit.....	30
VI.	Conclusion.....	31
VII.	Certificate of Word Count.....	32

PETITIONER'S UPDATED EXHIBIT LIST

August 23, 2017

Ex.1001	U.S. Patent No. 8,611,404 to Greszczuk et al.
Ex.1002	Prosecution File History of U.S. Patent No. 8,611,404
Ex.1003	Declaration of Sayfe Kiaei under 37 C.F.R. § 1.68
Ex.1004	Curriculum Vitae of Dr. Sayfe Kiaei
Ex.1005	U.S. Patent No. 5,956,323 to Bowie
Ex.1006	U.S. Patent No. 6,075,814 to Yamano et al.
Ex.1007	Reserved
Ex.1008	Reserved
Ex.1009	U.S. Patent No. 6,084,881 to Fosmark et al.
Ex.1010	Declaration of Dr. Chrissan in IPR2016-01160
Ex.1011	Deposition Transcript of Dr. Chrissan
Ex.1012	Second Declaration of Sayfe Kiaei under 37 C.F.R. § 1.68
Ex.1013	Reserved
Ex.1014	Deposition Transcript of Dr. Chrissan in IPR2016-01006
Ex.1015	Reserved
Ex.1016	U.S. Patent No. 5,909,463
Ex.1017	Reserved
Ex.1018	Reserved
Ex.1019	District Court Claim Construction Order

I. Introduction

Patent Owner attempts to distinguish the challenged claims of U.S. 9,094,268 (“the ‘268 patent”) on four bases: (1) that the combination of Bowie and Yamano does not teach “a transmitter portion of the transceiver does not transmit data during the low power mode and a receiver portion of the transceiver receives data during the low power mode;” (2) that the combination of Bowie and Yamano does not teach “maintaining synchronization with a second transceiver;” (3) that the combination of Bowie and Yamano does not teach “parameters associated with the full power mode operation;” and (4) that there is no motivation to combine Bowie and Yamano. Each of these arguments is incorrect.

Patent Owner’s attempt to distinguish the prior art relies on improper claim constructions and mischaracterizes the disclosures of both Bowie and Yamano. For at least these reasons, Patent Owner’s arguments fail to refute the obviousness of the challenged claims.

II. Claim Construction

A. “maintaining synchronization with a second transceiver”

Patent Owner and its expert previously asserted that the term “synchronization” refers to a “*timing relationship between two transceivers.*” IPR2016-01160, Paper 16, p.24; Ex.1010, ¶55; *see also* Ex.1019, 4 (district court construction of “synchronization signal”). Patent Owner now asserts that this term

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.