

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 CORRECTED 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<br>Governs. ....   | 5           |
| 1. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have the<br>following qualifications. ....   | 5           |
| 2. The ‘891 Patent has expired so the <i>Phillips</i> standard<br>governs. ....   | 5           |
| i. When construing claim terms look to claims<br>themselves and then the specification. ....  | 6           |
| ii. Limitations from the specification can be read into<br>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<br>limitation of transmitting the plurality of paging carriers<br>or at least two paging carriers “from the same location”<br>means that “the multiple paging carriers emanate from<br>the same location or antenna.” .....  | 8           |
| 2. Claim 5 – Independent Carrier Reception Limitation –<br>The limitation of “a plurality of mobile receiving units<br>independently receiving one of said plurality of carriers”<br>means “a mobile receiving unit is capable of receiving<br>one carrier of the plurality of carriers independent from<br>the other carriers of the plurality of carriers.” ..... | 11          |
| 3. Claims 2 and 4 – adjacent [carriers/subchannels] overlap<br>with each other. ....  | 13          |
| 4. Claims 1, 3, and 5 – Asymmetric Condition Limitation –<br>This limitation means that “the frequency difference<br>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 where the mask is defined relative to the center frequencies of the unmodulated carriers.” ..... | 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> .....  | 25 |
|     | 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. ....  | 25 |
|     | B. <i>MTel Petition</i> does not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations of independent Claims 1 and 3. ....   | 26 |
|     | 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. ....   | 26 |
|     | 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. ....  | 31 |
|     | 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>B.</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 |
| <b>1.</b>    | 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 |
| <b>2.</b>    | 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 |
| <b>VII.</b>  | <b>GROUND 3 – CLAIM 5 IS NOT OBVIOUS OVER <i>PETROVIC</i> IN VIEW OF <i>MTEL PETITION</i>.</b> .....   | 50 |
| <b>A.</b>    | 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>B.</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 |
| <b>1.</b>    | 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 |
| <b>2.</b>    | 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. ....                                      | 57 |
| <b>VIII.</b> | <b>CONCLUSION</b> .....  | 62 |

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

### CASES

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <i>Ex parte Frye</i> , 94 USPQ 2d 1072, 1076 (BPAI 2010) .....                                   | 25, 40, 51 |
| <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, 51 |
| <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, 51 |
| <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.