

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

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.,  
Petitioners,

v.

FUNDAMENTAL INNOVATION SYSTEMS INTERNATIONAL LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2018-00493  
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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. SUMMARY OF THE '586 PATENT.....	6
III. THE PRIOR ART REFERENCES DIFFER FROM THE '586 INVENTIONS .....	8
A. Dougherty Overview .....	8
1. Dougherty's Docking Station .....	8
2. Dougherty's Alleged Improvement Over Prior Art .....	10
3. Dougherty's Docking Station Logic.....	11
(a) Docking When Laptop Is Operational.....	12
(b) Docking When Laptop Is Non-Operational (Dead Battery Or No Battery) .....	13
B. Shiga Overview .....	14
IV. SKILL LEVEL OF A POSA.....	15
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	16
VI. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION BECAUSE LG HAS FAILED TO NAME ALL REAL PARTIES-IN-INTEREST .....	16
VII. GROUNDS 1&3: CLAIMS 8-9, AND 11-12 ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER DOUGHERTY IN VIEW OF SHIGA, DEJACO AND/OR KALOGEROPOULOS.....	23
A. The Petition Should Be Denied Because, As In IPR2018- 00111, It Fails To Present Any Competent Evidence That A POSA Would Have Had a Reasonable Expectation of Success In Using SE1 In The Manner Proposed.....	23

**Page(s)**

1.	This Petition Presents the Same Theory and Evidence Regarding the Shiga Combinations As in IPR2018-00111.....	24
2.	Petitioner's Evidence Fails To Demonstrate That A POSA Would Have Had A Reasonable Expectation of Success In Using SE1 Signaling.....	28
3.	The Board's Finding in IPR2018-00111 Is Based On Petitioner's Failure to Present Competent Evidence on the Use of SE1 Signals.....	34
B.	Petition Fails To Establish That Its References Are Analogous Art To The '586 Patent.....	36
C.	Petitioner Fails To Present Any Competent Evidence That The Dougherty/Shiga Combination Renders Obvious Detecting "An Identification Signal" That Is "Different Than USB enumeration" (Claims 8 & 9) .....	40
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).....	42
E.	Petitioner Fails To Provide Any Competent Factual Basis For Its Assertion Of A Motivation To Combine Dougherty and Shiga .....	43
1.	The Petition's Reliance On The SE1 Signal Has Already Been Rejected By the Board.....	45
2.	The Petition Fails To Establish That Shiga Is Analogous Art.....	45
3.	The Prior Art Does Not Teach Using An SE1 Signal As An "Identification Signal." .....	45

**Page(s)**

4.	A POSA Would Conclude That Petitioner's Proposed Combination Had No Reasonable Expectation of Success .....	47
(a)	A POSA Would Believe That Dougherty's Laptop Would Not Be Able To Receive SE1 Signals While Maintaining Normal USB Communications .....	48
(b)	Even If The Laptop Were Programmed To Respond To An SE1 Identification Signal, The Proposed Combination Is Still Inoperative. ....	49
5.	A POSA Would Believe The Suggested Modifications Would Disable Dougherty's Primary Functionality.....	50
(a)	Dougherty's Docking Station Expands Ports And Requires Normal USB Communication. ....	50
(b)	Dougherty's Handshaking Process Is Necessary To Establish Communication. ....	51
6.	Petitioner Ignores Other Methods For Identification Without Violating The USB Standard.....	52
(a)	Petitioners Fail To Explain Why A POSA Would Have Ignored Identification Via Well-Established Enumeration Procedure.....	53
(b)	Petitioner Fail To Explain Why A POSA Would Have Ignored Identification Via Non-Data Lines. ....	54
7.	A POSA Could Not Use Petitioner's Proposed Modification In Dougherty's "Dead Battery" Scenario .....	56
VIII.	THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER §§ 325(d) and 315(d).....	57
IX.	CONCLUSION.....	60

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	41
<i>Atlanta Gas Light Co. v. Bennett Regulatory Guards, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00453, Paper 88, 8 (PTAB Jan. 6, 2015) .....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.</i> , 732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	48, 50
<i>In re Clay</i> , 866 F.2d 656 (Fed. Cir. 1992) .....	37, 39
<i>DSS Tech. Mgmt. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 885 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....	41
<i>Fox Factory, Inc. v. SRAM, LLC</i> , IPR2017-01439, Paper 7 (PTAB Dec. 8, 2017) .....	59
<i>Google, LLC v. Uniloc Luxembourg S.A.</i> , IPR2017-01665, Paper 10 (PTAB Jan. 11, 2018) .....	58, 59
<i>Halliburton Energy Servs., Inc. v. Schlumberger Tech. Corp.</i> , IPR2017-01777, Paper 13, 3 (PTAB Jan. 31, 2018) .....	1
<i>Initiative for Responsibility in Drug Pricing LLC v. Wyeth LLC</i> , IPR2014-01259, Paper 8 (PTAB Feb. 13, 2015).....	59
<i>In re Klein</i> , 647 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	37
<i>Parrot SA v. Drone Techs.</i> , IPR2014-00732, Paper 29, 12 (PTAB Oct. 20, 2015).....	37
<i>In re Stepan Co.</i> , 868 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	44, 48

# 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.