

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC., BROCADE COMMUNICATIONS SYS., INC.,
AND RUCKUS WIRELESS, INC.
Petitioner

v.

MOBILE TELECOMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES, LLC
Patent Owner

Case IPR2017-00640
Patent 5,659,891

**PATENT OWNER MOBILE TELECOMMUNICATIONS
TECHNOLOGIES, LLC'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

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

	<u>Page</u>
I. BACKGROUND	1
II. INTRODUCTION	2
III. PROPER CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	5
A. Rules Governing Claim Construction – The <i>Phillips</i> Standard Governs.	5
1. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have the following qualifications.	5
2. The ‘891 Patent has expired so the <i>Phillips</i> standard governs.	5
i. When construing claim terms look to claims themselves and then the specification.	6
ii. Limitations from the specification can be read into the claims.	6
iii. Extrinsic evidence can be relied upon.	7
B. Construction of Independent Claim Terms	8
1. Claims 1 and 3 – Same Location Limitation – The limitation of transmitting the plurality of paging carriers or at least two paging carriers “from the same location” means that “the multiple paging carriers emanate from the same location or antenna.”	8
2. Claim 5 – Independent Carrier Reception Limitation – The limitation of “a plurality of mobile receiving units independently receiving one of said plurality of carriers” means “a mobile receiving unit is capable of receiving one carrier of the plurality of carriers independent from the other carriers of the plurality of carriers.”	11
3. Claims 2 and 4 – adjacent [carriers/subchannels] overlap with each other.	13
4. Claims 1, 3, and 5 – Asymmetric Condition Limitation – This limitation means that “the frequency difference between the center frequency of the outer most of said	

	carriers and the band edge of the mask defining said channel is more than half the frequency difference between the center frequencies of each adjacent carrier <i>where the mask is defined relative to the center frequencies of the unmodulated carriers.</i> ”	14
	i. The asymmetric condition of the ’891 Patent, requires that $D_m > D_c$	19
IV.	REFERENCES RELIED UPON BY PETITIONER	21
	A. <i>MTel Petition</i>	21
	B. ‘960 Publication	22
	C. <i>Petrovic</i>	22
V.	GROUND 1 – CLAIMS 1-4 ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER <i>MTEL PETITION</i>	24
	A. A patent claim is obvious <i>only if</i> all of its limitations are taught or suggested by prior art and combined in a manner that contains articulated reasoning and a rational underpinning.	24
	B. <i>MTel Petition</i> does not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations of independent Claims 1 and 3.	25
	1. <i>MTel Petition</i> does not teach or suggest the Same Location Limitation of independent Claims 1 and 3, so Claims 1 and 3 are not rendered obvious.	25
	2. <i>MTel Petition</i> does not teach or suggest the Asymmetric Condition Limitation of independent Claims 1 and 3, so Claims 1 and 3 are not rendered obvious.	30
	3. Dependent Claims 2-4 are not rendered obvious by <i>MTel Petition</i> , because independent Claims 1 and 3 are not rendered obvious by <i>MTel Petition</i>	38
VI.	GROUND 2 – CLAIM 5 IS NOT OBVIOUS OVER <i>MTEL PETITION</i> IN VIEW OF ‘960 PUBLICATION	40
	A. A patent claim is obvious <i>only if</i> all of its limitations are taught or suggested by prior art and combined in a manner that contains articulated reasoning and a rational underpinning.	40

B.	<i>MTel Petition</i> in view of ‘960 Publication does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations of Claim 5, so Claim 5 is not rendered obvious.	41
1.	Neither <i>MTel Petition</i> nor ‘960 Publication teaches or suggests the Independent Carrier Reception Limitation of Claim 5, so Claim 5 is not rendered obvious.....	41
2.	Neither <i>MTel Petition</i> nor ‘960 Publication teaches or suggests the Asymmetric Condition Limitation of Claim 5, so Claim 5 is not rendered obvious.....	49
VII.	GROUND 3 – CLAIM 5 IS NOT OBVIOUS OVER <i>PETROVIC</i> IN VIEW OF <i>MTEL PETITION</i>	50
A.	A patent claim is obvious <i>only if</i> all of its limitations are taught or suggested by prior art and combined in a manner that contains articulated reasoning and a rational underpinning.....	50
B.	<i>Petrovic</i> in view of <i>MTel Petition</i> does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations of Claim 5, so Claim 5 is not rendered obvious.	51
1.	Neither <i>Petrovic</i> nor <i>MTel Petition</i> teaches or suggests the Independent Carrier Reception Limitation of Claim 5, so Claim 5 is not rendered obvious.....	51
2.	Neither <i>Petrovic</i> nor <i>MTel Petition</i> teaches or suggests the Asymmetric Condition Limitation of Claim 5, so Claim 5 is not rendered obvious.	56
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	61

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

<i>Ex parte Frye</i> , 94 USPQ 2d 1072, 1076 (BPAI 2010)	25, 40, 50
<i>Ex parte Papst-Motoren</i> , 1 USPQ2d 1655 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1986)	6
<i>In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr.</i> , 367 F.3d 1359, 70 USPQ2d 1827 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	7
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 41 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	25, 40, 50
<i>In re Morris</i> , 127 F.3d 1048, 44 USPQ2d 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	7
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398, 418 (2007)	25, 40, 50
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	passim
<i>Pitney Bowes, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , 182 F.3d 1298 (Fed. Cir. 1999)....	7, 15
<i>Vitrionics Corp. v. Conceptoronic</i> , 90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	6, 8

OTHER AUTHORITIES

35 United States Code § 103.....	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.100	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.107	2
Manual of Patent Examining Procedure § 2111.01	7
Manual of Patent Examining Procedure § 2558	5

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.