

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., and
Samsung Electronics America, Inc.,

Petitioner

v.

Evolved Wireless LLC,

Patent Owner

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,218,481**

Case No. IPR2017-00106

Mail Stop Patent Board

Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R § 42.8(a)(1).....	1
	A. Real Parties-In-Interest Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)	1
	B. Related Matters Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)	1
	C. Lead And Back-Up Counsel And Service Information.....	2
II.	PAYMENT OF FEES – 37 C.F.R. § 42.103.....	3
III.	REQUIREMENTS FOR IPR UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104.....	3
	A. Grounds for Standing Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a).....	3
	B. Challenge Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b) and Relief Requested	4
IV.	SUMMARY OF THE '481 PATENT	4
	A. Brief Description.....	4
	B. Summary of the Prosecution History of the '481 Patent.....	5
	C. Claimed Priority Date	6
	D. Background of Technology	6
	1. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art	6
	2. Technical Background.....	7
	3. State of the Art	9
V.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION UNDER 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.104(b)(3)	11
VI.	PRIOR ART REFERENCES	13
	A. Panasonic 792 (Ex. 1002).....	13
	B. Panasonic 114 (Ex. 1003).....	15
	C. Chu (Ex. 1004).....	16
	D. “Printed Publication” Status	17
	1. Panasonic References	18
	2. Chu	23
VII.	MANNER OF APPLYING CITED PRIOR ART TO EVERY CLAIM FOR WHICH AN IPR IS REQUESTED, THUS ESTABLISHING A	

REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT AT LEAST ONE CLAIM OF THE	
‘481 PATENT IS UNPATENTABLE	24
A. Ground 1: Claims 1-2 and 8-9 are invalid based on Panasonic 792.....	24
1. Independent Claim 1	24
2. Dependent Claim 2.....	28
3. Independent Claim 8	29
4. Dependent Claim 9	31
B. Ground 2: Claims 3, 4, 10, and 11 are invalid based on Panasonic 792 and Panasonic 114	32
1. Dependent Claim 3	32
2. Dependent Claim 4.....	33
3. Dependent Claim 10.....	34
4. Dependent Claim 11	35
5. Reasons to Combine the Panasonic References.....	35
C. Ground 3: Claims 6 and 13 are invalid based on Panasonic 792, Panasonic 114, and Chu.....	38
1. Dependent Claim 6.....	38
2. Dependent Claim 13.....	39
3. Reasons to Combine the Panasonic References and Chu	40
VIII. REDUNDANCY	41
IX. CONCLUSION.....	42

EXHIBITS

1001	U.S. Patent No. 8,218,481 to Kwon, et al. (“the ‘481 patent”)
1002	“Random access burst evaluation in E-UTRA uplink,” 3GPP Tdoc R1-060792, Panasonic, TSG-RAN WG1 Meeting #44bis, Athens, Greece, March 27-31, 2006 (“Panasonic 792”)
1003	“Random access design for E-UTRA uplink,” 3GPP Tdoc R1-061114, Panasonic, TSG-RAN WG1 Meeting #45, Shanghai, China, May 8-12, 2006 (“Panasonic 114”)
1004	“Polyphase Codes With Good Periodic Correlation Properties,” D.C. Chu, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, pp. 531-32, July 1972 (“Chu”)
1005	File History of U.S. Patent Application No. 12/303,947, which issued as the 481 Patent (“481 File History”)
1006	“RACH design for E-UTRA,” 3GPP Tdoc R1-060797, Huawei, TSG-RAN WG1 Meeting #44bis, Athens, Greece, March 27-31, 2006 (“Huawei 797”)
1007	U.S. Patent No. US 7,702,028 B2, originally assigned to Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. (“Samsung 028”)

1008	“Proposal for RACH Preambles,” 3GPP Tdoc TSGR1#6(99)893, Motorola and Texas Instruments, TSG-RAN WG1 Meeting #6, Espoo, Finland, July 13-16, 1999 (“Motorola/TI 893”)
1009	“RACH Preamble Design,” 3GPP Tdoc R1-051058, Texas Instruments, TSG-RAN WG1 Meeting #42bis, San Diego, USA, October 10-14, 2005 (“TI 058”)
1010	“Random Access Sequence Design,” 3GPP Tdoc R1-060884, Motorola, TSG-RAN WG1 Meeting #44-bis, Athens, Greece, March 24-26, 2006 (“Motorola 884”)
1011	“On the performances of LTE RACH,” 3GPP Tdoc R1-060908, Nortel Networks, TSG-RAN WG1 Meeting #44-bis, Athens, Greece, March 27-31, 2006 (“Nortel 908”)
1012	“A new preamble shape for the Random Access preamble in E-UTRA,” 3GPP Tdoc R1-060867, Texas Instruments, TSG-RAN WG1 Meeting #44-bis, Athens, Greece, March 27-31, 2006 (“TI 867”)
1013	“Investigations on Random Access Channel Structure for E-UTRA Uplink,” 3GPP Tdoc R1-060992, NTT DoCoMo and NEC, TSG-RAN WG1 Meeting #44bis, Athens, Greece, March 27-31, 2006 (“NTT/NEC 992”)

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.