

Filed on behalf of: Optis Cellular Technology, LLC

By: Brent N. Bumgardner  
Registration No. 48,476  
NELSON BUMGARDNER ALBRITTON P.C.  
3131 W. 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 300  
Fort Worth, Texas 76107  
Telephone: (817)-377-3490  
Email: brent@nelbum.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

Huawei Device Co., Ltd.

Petitioner

v.

OPTIS CELLULAR TECHNOLOGY, LLC

Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2018-00807

Patent 8,102,833

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	ii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iv
TABLE OF EXHIBITS .....	vii
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. THE '833 PATENT AND CHALLENGED CLAIMS .....	2
A. Overview of the '833 Patent .....	2
B. LG's Contributions Related to the '833 Patent.....	12
C. Priority Date .....	18
III. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS .....	28
IV. APPLICABLE LEGAL STANDARDS.....	29
A. Standard for Instituting Review .....	29
B. 35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....	30
C. Obviousness.....	31
D. 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).....	33
V. OVERVIEW OF THE ALLEGED PRIOR ART .....	34
A. <i>Papasakellariou</i> .....	34
i. Overview .....	35
ii. Two Embodiments.....	42

iii.	Priority Claim .....	45
B.	<i>Cho and Motorola</i> .....	46
VI.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	47
VII.	THE BOARD SHOULD DECLINE TO INSTITUTE REVIEW BECAUSE PETITIONER CANNOT SHOW A LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS ON THE MERITS.....	50
A.	Papasakellariou Is Not Prior Art .....	51
i.	Test.....	51
ii.	Petitioner’s reliance on <i>Papasakellariou</i> .....	52
iii.	The <i>Papasakellariou Provisional</i> does not teach the subject matter Petitioner relies upon .....	53
B.	<i>Papasakellariou’s</i> Publication Was Already Considered During Prosecution .....	64
C.	Final Comments.....	66
VIII.	CONCLUSION .....	67
	CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH WORD COUNT .....	68
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.....	69

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Altiris, Inc. v. Symantec Corp.</i> 318 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	48
<i>CFMT, Inc. v. YieldUP Int’l Corp.</i> 349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	32
<i>Conopco, Inc. v. The Procter &amp; Gamble Co.</i> Case No. IPR2014-00628, Paper No. 21 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 20, 2014).....	30
<i>Dynamic Drinkware v. Nat’l Graphics</i> 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	33, 51
<i>Ex Parte Mann et al.</i> Appeal 2015-003571, 2016 Pat. App. LEXIS 12592 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 23, 2016) .....	33
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	31
<i>Heart Failure Techs., LLC v. Cardiokinetix, Inc.</i> Case No. IPR2013-00183, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. July 31, 2013) .....	32
<i>In re Giacomini</i> 612 F.3d 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	33
<i>In re Royka</i> 490 F.2d 981 (C.C.P.A. 1974).....	32
<i>In re Translogic Tech., Inc.</i> 504 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	47
<i>Insite Vision Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> 783 F.3d 853 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	32

<i>Loral Fairchild Corp. v. Sony Elecs. Corp.</i> 181 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	48
<i>Mantech Envtl. Corp. v. Hudson Envtl. Servs.</i> 152 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	48
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Parallel Networks Licensing, LLC</i> Case No. IPR2015-00483, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. July 15, 2015) .....	65, 66
<i>Mintz v. Dietz &amp; Watson, Inc.</i> 679 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	31–32
<i>Monarch Knitting Mach. Corp. v. Sulzer Morat GmbH</i> 139 F.3d 877 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	32
<i>NEC Corp. of Am., et al. v. Cellular Commc’ns Equip. LLC</i> Case No. IPR2014-01136, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 28, 2015).....	63
<i>Procter &amp; Gamble Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.</i> 566 F.3d 989 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	31
<i>Source Techs., LLC v. LendingTree</i> 588 F.3d 1063, 1069 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	31
<b><u>Statutes &amp; Rules</u></b>	
35 U.S.C. § 102 .....	64
35 U.S.C. § 102(e) .....	<i>passim</i>
35 U.S.C. § 103 .....	<i>passim</i>
35 U.S.C. § 314(a).....	30
35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....	30, 64, 66
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) .....	47
37 C.F.R. § 42.107.....	1

# 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.