

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

HUAWEI DEVICE CO., LTD.,
Petitioner

v.

FUNDAMENTAL INNOVATION SYSTEMS INTERNATIONAL LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-00465
Patent No. 8,624,550

**FUNDAMENTAL INNOVATION SYSTEMS INTERNATIONAL LLC'S
PATENT OWNER 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

I. INTRODUCTION 9

II. SUMMARY OF THE '550 PATENT 10

 A. Need For Enumeration Limits Power Sources Suitable For
 Charging A USB Device 10

 B. Parts Of The '550 Patent Solution..... 11

III. THE PRIOR ART REFERENCES DIFFER FROM THE '550
 INVENTIONS 13

 A. USB 2.0 13

 1. Enumeration 14

 2. SE1 14

 B. Theobald..... 17

 C. Matsumoto..... 19

 D. Shiga..... 20

 E. Dougherty..... 21

IV. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL 23

V. GROUND 1: CLAIMS 1, 2, 9-11 AND 18 ARE NOT RENDERED
 OBVIOUS BY USB 2.0 AND THEOBALD..... 23

 A. Petitioner Fails To Establish The Existence Of A “USB
 communication path” Contained Within An Adapter (All
 Claims) 23

 B. The Petition Fails To Establish That Either Theobald Or
 USB 2.0 Discloses “supply[ing] current without regard to”
 Any Limit Specified In A USB Specification..... 27

C.	Petitioner Fails To Present Competent Evidence That It Would Have Been Obvious To Combine Theobald With USB 2.0	32
1.	Petitioner Fails To Explain Why A USB Connector Is A Suitable Connector Given That The Proposed Combination Cannot Perform Basic Functions Of Theobald’s J3 Connector	33
2.	The Petition Does Not Explain How The Proposed 4-pin USB Connector Could Transmit Identification Information While Remaining Backwards Compatible	34
VI.	GROUND 2: CLAIMS 3 AND 12 ARE NOT RENDERED OBVIOUS BY USB 2.0, THEOBALD AND MATSUMOTO.....	35
VII.	GROUND 3: CLAIMS 4-8 AND 13-17 ARE NOT RENDERED OBVIOUS BY USB 2.0, THEOBALD AND SHIGA	36
A.	Shiga Does Not Cure The Defects In Ground 1 (All Ground 3 Claims)	36
B.	The Petition Does Not Attempt To Lay A Proper Foundation That The References Disclose Exceeding Current Draw Limits In Response To “Abnormal” Data Conditions (All Ground 3 Claims)	36
C.	Petitioner Fails To Present Competent Evidence That It Would Have Been Obvious To Combine Theobald, USB 2.0, And Shiga.....	39
1.	Petitioner Fails To Address Why A POSITA Would Have Used Abnormal Data Conditions In Light Of Theobald’s Explicit Teaching Of Using Standard Communication Protocol	39
2.	Petitioner Fails To Address Why A POSITA Desiring The Improvement And Compatibility Offered By USB Specification Would Ignore Existing USB Algorithms For Identifying Accessories	43

3.	Petitioner Fails To Present Any Competent Evidence That A POSITA Would Have Had A Reasonable Expectation Of Success When Using SE1 As Proposed By Petitioner	46
4.	Petitioner Fails To Address Why A POSITA Would Have Used D+ and D- Lines For Transmitting Identification Signals	49
VIII.	GROUND 4: CLAIMS 1-3, 9-12 AND 18 ARE NOT RENDERED OBVIOUS BY DOUGHERTY	54
A.	Petitioner Fails To Present Competent Evidence That Dougherty Discloses “An Adapter Comprising . . . A USB Communication Path” (All Claims)	54
IX.	GROUND 5: CLAIMS 4-8 AND 13-17 ARE NOT RENDERED OBVIOUS BY DOUGHERTY AND SHIGA	57
A.	The Proposed Combination Suffers From The Same Defect As The Analysis Presented In Ground 4	57
B.	The Petition Fails To Provide Any Competent Factual Basis For Its Assertion Of A Motivation To Combine Dougherty And Shiga	58
1.	Petitioner Fails To Present Competent Evidence That A POSITA Would Recognize SE1 As An Appropriate Signal When Normal USB Communication Is Involved	59
2.	The Petition Does Not Present Any Competent Evidence As To Whether A POSITA Would Conclude That The Proposed Combination Had A Reasonable Expectation of Success	62
(a)	A POSITA Would Believe That Dougherty’s Laptop Would Not Be Able To Send SE1 Signaling Under Normal USB Protocol	62

(b)	A POSITA Would Conclude That The Petition’s Proposed Combinations Are Still Inoperative If The Laptop Is Programed To Respond To An SE1 Signal	64
3.	Petitioner Fails to Provide A Reasoned Explanation As To Why A POSITA Would Have Chosen SE1 Over Other Alternatives In The Dougherty System	67
4.	A POSITA Would Believe That Making The Suggested Modifications Would Disable The Dougherty Docking Station’s Primary Functionality	69
(a)	Dougherty’s Docking Station Expands Ports And Requires Normal USB Communication With The Laptop.....	69
(b)	Dougherty’s Handshaking Process Is Necessary To Establish Communication	71
X.	CONCLUSION.....	72

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.