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 IPR2018-00485
Patent No. 7,834,586

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

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. Introduction 1

II. Summary Of The '586 Patent 2

III. The Prior Art References Differ From The '586 Inventions 4

A. Theobald Overview 5

B. Dougherty Overview 6

C. Shiga Overview 8

IV. Claim Construction: "The Mobile Device Configurable For Use In A Wireless Telecommunications Network" Is Limiting. 9

V. Skill Level Of A POSITA 11

VI. The Petition Should Be Denied Because Its Combinations Rely On Shiga's SE1 Signal In Exactly The Same Manner Rejected In IPR2018-00111. 11

A. This Petition Presents Substantially The Same Theory and Evidence Regarding The Shiga Combinations As In IPR2018-00111. 12

B. Petitioner's Evidence Fails To Demonstrate That A POSA Would Have Had A Reasonable Expectation of Success In Using The SE1 Signaling. 17

C. The Board's Finding In IPR2018-00111 Is Based On Petitioner's Failure to Present Competent Evidence On The Use Of SE1 Signals 23

VII. The Petition Fails To Establish That Shiga Is Analogous Art To The '586 Patent. 25

VIII. Ground 1: The Claims Are Not Rendered Obvious By The Theobald/USB 2.0 Specification/Shiga Combination 27

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Page

A. Petitioner Fails To Establish That The Proposed Combination Renders Obvious The Claims Having An "Identification Signal Being Different Than USB Enumeration" (Claims 1-2, 8-9) 27

B. The Theobald/Shiga Combination Does Not Render Obvious The Claims Using "A Microprocessor And Memory To Process The Signals Received On The USB Interface Lines" (Claims 11-12). 29

C. Petitioner Fails To Present Competent Evidence Of Either A Motivation For A POSITA To Combine Theobald With The USB 2.0 Specification & Shiga Or A Likelihood Of Success (All Claims). 31

1. The Board Should Reject The Reliance On SE1 Signal For The Same Reason As Stated In IPR2018-00111, Paper 16. 33

2. The Petition Should Be Rejected Because The Petition Fails To Establish That Shiga Is Analogous Art. 34

3. SE1 Is Incompatible With Theobald's Teaching To Use A "Suitable High Speed Data Communications Protocol." 34

4. Petitioner Ignores Other Methods For Identifying Accessories That Would Allow For Identification Without Violating The USB Specification. 36

(a) Petitioners Offer No Reason Why Enumeration Would Be Ignored. 36

(b) Identification Could Alternatively Have Been Accomplished Through An Identification Pin. 38

5. Petitioner Fails To Address Why Shiga's SE1 Signal on D+ and D- Would Be Preferable To Other Non-Standard Identification Signals. 39

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Page

(a) Petitioner Provides No Competent Evidence That Modified Theobald Would Have Used Both Data Lines 40

(b) Petitioner Also Ignores Other Options For Transmitting Identification Information Without Using Data Lines. 41

6. Theobald Would Not Consider A USB Interface To Be A "Suitable" Replacement Under Its Teachings Because It Is Not Backwards Compatible. 42

IX. Ground 2: Claims 1-2, 8-9, And 11-12 Are Not Obvious Over Dougherty In View Of Shiga. 44

A. Petitioner Has Failed To Prove That Dougherty And Shiga Teach "A Mobile Device Configurable For Use In A Wireless Telecommunications Network." (All Claims). 44

B. Petitioner Fails To Establish That The Proposed Combination Renders Obvious The Claims Having An "Identification Signal Being Different Than USB Enumeration" (Claims 1-2, 8-9) 45

C. The Combination of Dougherty And Shiga Fail To Disclose "A Plurality Of Charging Modes" (Claims 11 & 12). 46

D. The Dougherty/Shiga Combination Would Not Use A Microprocessor And Memory To Process" … "An Identification Signal Received At The D+ And D- Lines" (Claims 11 & 12). 48

E. Petitioner Fails To Provide Any Competent Factual Basis For Its Assertion Of A Motivation To Combine Dougherty and Shiga 49

1. The Petition's Reliance On The SE1 Signal Has Already Been Rejected By the Board And That Rejection Should Resolve The Issues Here. 51

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Page

2. The Petition Should Be Rejected Because The Petition Fails To Establish That Shiga Is Analogous Art. 51

3. The Prior Art Does Not Teach Using An SE1 Signal As An "Identification Signal" 51

4. A POSA Would Conclude That Petitioner's Proposed Combination Had No Reasonable Expectation of Success 53

(a) A POSA Would Believe That Dougherty's Laptop Would Not Be Able To Receive SE1 Signals While Maintaining Normal USB Communications 54

(b) Even If The Laptop Were Programmed To Respond To An SE1 Identification Signal, The Proposed Combination Is Still Inoperative. 55

5. A POSA Would Believe That Making The Suggested Modifications Would Disable The Dougherty Docking Station's Primary Functionality..... 57

(a) Dougherty's Docking Station Expands Ports And Requires Normal USB Communication With The Laptop..... 57

(b) Dougherty's Handshaking Process Is Necessary To Establish Communication. 58

6. Petitioner Fails to Provide A Reasoned Explanation As To Why A POSA Would Have Chosen SE1 Over Other Alternatives In The Dougherty System 59

7. A POSA Could Not Use Petitioner's Proposed Modification In Dougherty's "Dead Battery" Scenario 60

F. Ground 3..... 61

X. The Board Should Deny The Petition Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d)..... 61

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.