

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ZTE (USA) INC., LG ELECTRONICS, INC., LG ELECTRONICS U.S.A. INC.,
LG ELECTRONICS MOBILECOMM U.S.A. INC.,
LG ELECTRONICS MOBILE RESEARCH U.S.A. LLC, and
LG ELECTRONICS ALABAMA, INC.

Petitioner,

v.

Fundamental Innovation Systems International LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-00111¹
Patent No. 8,624,550

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

¹ LG Electronics, Inc., LG Electronics U.S.A. Inc., LG Electronics Mobilecomm U.S.A. Inc., LG Electronics Mobile Research U.S.A. LLC, and LG Electronics Alabama, Inc. were joined as parties to this proceeding via a Motion for Joinder in IPR2018-00461.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction	1
II. USB Technology	3
A. Power Distribution	3
B. Device-Specific Communication Requires Enumeration	3
C. Single Ended 1 ("SE1") Line State	5
III. The Prior Art References Differ From The '550 Inventions	7
A. Rogers Overview.....	7
B. Shiga Overview	10
IV. Level of Ordinary Skill.....	11
V. Claim Construction.....	12
A. "To Supply Current . . . Without Regard To At Least One Associated Condition Specified In A USB Specification"	12
B. "Supply Current . . . Without Regard To At Least One USB Specification Imposed Limit"	16
VI. The Proceeding Should Terminate Because ZTE Has Failed To Name All RPIs.....	17
VII. Improper Expert Conduct During Deposition	19
VIII. Ground 1: Claims 1-3, 9-12, and 18 Are Not Rendered Obvious By Rogers	20
A. Rogers Does Not Disclose Or Render Obvious An Adapter "Configured To Supply Current On The VBUS Line Without Regard To A At Least One Associated Condition Specified In A USB Specification" (Claim 1)	20
1. Supplying 48VDC (Voltage) Does Not Satisfy The Limitation "Supply Current Without Regard To At	

	<u>Page</u>
Least One Associated Condition Specified In A USB Specification"	20
2. Rogers Does Not Teach Or Make Obvious Supplying Current In Excess Of 500mA	22
a) Rogers Increases Power By Adjusting Voltage And Not Current	23
b) Petitioner Conflates the Current Consumption Internal to the Accessory Shown in Figure 7(b) with Current Supplied at VBUS pin in Figure 7(a)	26
c) The Board Should Disregard Petitioner's New Invalidity Theories	28
3. Rogers Does Not Teach Or Make Obvious Supply Current In Excess Of 100mA Before Configuration	33
4. Rogers Does Not Teach Or Make Obvious Supplying Current Without Enumeration	34
B. Rogers Does Not Disclose Or Render Obvious An Adapter "Configured To Supply Current On The VBUS Line Without Regard To At Least One USB Specification Imposed Limit" (Claim 10)	39
C. Rogers Does Not Disclose Or Make Obvious Challenged Claims 2 Or 11	39
D. Rogers Does Not Disclose Or Render Obvious The Adapter Of Claims 2 Or 11, "Wherein Said Current Limit Is 500 mA" (Claims 9, 18)	39
E. Rogers Does Not Disclose Or Render Obvious The Adapter Of Claims 1 Or 10, "Wherein Said Current Is Supplied Without USB Enumeration" (Claims 3, 12)	40
IX. Ground 2: There Is No Motivation To Implement The Proposed Rogers/Shiga Combination, And Doing So Would Result In An Inoperable System	40

A.	A POSA Would Not Look To Shiga To Find A Way To Indicate To The Base Unit That A Connected Device Is 48VDC Capable	48
1.	Petitioner Provides No Reason Why A POSA Would Have Used SE1 In Response To Standard USB Communication.....	49
2.	SE1 Signal Disrupts Normal USB Communication Used By Rogers System	51
3.	SE1 Provides No Advantage Over Rogers' USB Communication Protocol That Already Conveys 48VDC Configuration	53
B.	There Is No Reasonable Expectation Of Success Of Applying SE1 In Rogers	57
1.	Prior Art Does Not Teach Use Of SE1 Where USB Communication Is Desired	57
2.	Use Of SE1 in Rogers Requires Ability To Distinguish Intentional SE1 Signal From Unintentional SE1 Error	58
a)	Scenario 1: A POSA Would Believe That Assuming SE1 As Coming From A 48VDC Device Would Electrically Damage Low Voltage Devices And Lead To Errors That Are Difficult To Isolate	59
b)	Scenario 2: A POSA Would Believe That Responding To SE1 In Accordance With The USB Specification Interrupts USB Communication	60
C.	Shiga Is Not Analogous Art	63
D.	Petitioner's Other Obviousness Arguments Lack Specificity to The Inventions At Issue.....	64
X.	Conclusion.....	65

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Comm'ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	47, 64
<i>Applications in Internet Time, LLC v. RPX Corp.</i> , Appeal Nos. 2017-1698, -1699 & -1701 (Fed. Cir. July 9, 2018)	17
<i>In re Clay</i> , 966 F.2d 656 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	63
<i>Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , 821 F. 3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	14
<i>In re Klein</i> , 647 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	63
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	11
<i>Meiresonne v. Google, Inc.</i> , 849 F.3d 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	47
<i>In re Stepan Co.</i> , 868 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	58
<i>Tec Air, Inc. v. Denso Mfg. Michigan Inc.</i> , 192 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	62
<i>In re Van Os</i> , 844 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	33, 65
<i>Wasica Fin. GmbH v. Continental Automotive Sys., Inc.</i> , 853 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	29
Regulations	
37 C.F.R § 42.23	14
37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a)	57

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.