

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SIRIUS XM RADIO INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

FRAUNHOFER-GESELLSCHAFT ZUR FÖRDERUNG DER
ANGEWANDTEN FORSCHUNG E.V.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-00690
Patent No. 6,314,289

PATENT OWNER 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. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE '289 PATENT	3
III. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL	7
IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	8
A. Preambles are Limiting for Claims 10, 13, 27 and 31	8
B. “delay means for delaying the second portion of output bits transmitted via the second channel” (Claims 1 and 5).....	10
C. “delay means for delaying the portion of bits received via one channel to compensate for a delay imposed on the portion of bits received via the other channel” (Claim 11).....	11
D. “means for transmitting the output bits of the first portion via a first channel and the output bits of the second portion via a second channel” (Claim 2)	11
E. “receiving means for receiving the first portion of bits via a first channel and the second portion of bits via a second channel” (Claims 10 and 13).....	12
F. “depuncturing means for compensating for a puncturing operation in a transmitter” (Claim 13)	12
V. THE PETITION’S PROPOSED GROUNDS DO NOT RENDER OBVIOUS THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS.....	13
A. Description of the Prior Art.....	13
1. Chen (Ex. 1004)	13
2. Campanella (Ex. 1005)	16

	<u>Page</u>
B. GROUND 1: PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO DEMONSTRATE OBVIOUSNESS BASED ON CHEN IN VIEW OF CAMPANELLA	18
1. Campanella Is Not Prior Art	18
2. Neither Chen Nor Campanella Discloses the Claimed “Partitioner”	25
3. Combining Chen and Campanella Would Not Yield Two Signals Coded In A “Different Way”	29
4. Dependent Claims 7 and 24	44
C. GROUNDS 2 & 3: PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO DEMONSTRATE ANTICIPATION OR OBVIOUSNESS BASED ON SMALLCOMB.....	48
VI. FORMAL DEFICIENCIES OF THE PETITION.....	49
A. SXM Holdings is a Real Party-In-Interest	49
B. Failure To Name All Real Parties-In-Interest	56
C. Failure To File Within The Statutory Bar Period	63
VII. CONSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGES	66
VIII. CONCLUSION.....	69

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
Cases	
<i>Adello Biologics LLC v. Amgen Inc.</i> , PGR2019-00001, Paper 11 (Feb. 14, 2019)	57, 61, 62
<i>Applications in Internet Time, LLC v. RPX Corp.</i> , 897 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	60
<i>Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , No. 2018-2140, slip op. (Fed. Cir. Oct. 31, 2019).....	67
<i>In re Baird</i> , 16 F.3d 380 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	47
<i>Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.</i> , 732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	42
<i>Catalina Marketing International, Inc. v. Coolsavings.com, Inc.</i> , 289 F.3d 801 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	10
<i>Cultec, Inc. v. Stormtech LLC</i> , IPR2017-00526, Paper 14 (Jul. 17, 2017)	65, 66
<i>Dynamic Drinkware LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	49
<i>Eaton Corp. v. Rockwell Int’l Corp.</i> , 323 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	8
<i>Edmond v. United States</i> , 520 U.S. 651 (1997).....	67
<i>Galderma S.A. v. Allergan Industrie, SAS</i> , IPR2014-01422, Paper No. 14.....	53, 54
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	42

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<i>Koninklijke Philips Elecs. N.V. v. Cardiac Operating Co.</i> , 590 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	61
<i>In re Kubin</i> , 561 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	46
<i>Landgraf v. USI Film Prods.</i> , 511 U.S. 244 (1994).....	69
<i>Lucia v. SEC</i> , 138 S. Ct. 2044 (2018).....	67
<i>Marrin v. Griffin</i> , 599 F.3d 1290 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	9
<i>Masterimage 3D, Inc. v. RealD Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00035, Paper 79 (Apr. 20, 2016).....	48
<i>McClurg v. Kingsland</i> , 42 U.S. (1 How.) 202 (1843)	68
<i>Metalcraft of Mayville, Inc. v. The Toro Co.</i> , 848 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	46
<i>In re Nuvasive, Inc.</i> , 842 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	43
<i>Oil States Energy Servs., LLC v. Greene’s Energy Grp., LLC</i> , 138 S. Ct. 1365 (2018).....	68
<i>Pitney Bowes, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , 182 F.3d 1298 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	8
<i>Plas-Pak Indus., Inc. v. Sulzer Mixpac AG</i> , 600 Fed.Appx. 755 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	41, 47
<i>Polaris Industries, Inc. v. Arctic Cat, Inc.</i> , 882 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	42

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.