

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
HTC CORPORATION AND HTC AMERICA, INC.,
ZTE (USA) INC.,
Petitioners

v.

INVT SPE LLC,
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2018-01473
U.S. Patent No. 6,611,676

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Preliminary Statement	1
II. Factual Background of the '676 Patent	3
A. <i>State of the art at the time of invention</i>	3
B. <i>Overview of the '676 Patent</i>	8
III. Claim Construction	12
IV. Only Ground 1, Relating to Remaining Claims 1-3, 5-9, and 11, is Reviewable in this Proceeding.	13
V. The Petition's Asserted Ground 1.....	15
A. <i>Overview of Keskitalo (Ex. 1004)</i>.....	15
B. <i>Overview of Lindell (Ex. 1005)</i>	18
C. <i>The Petition fails to show obviousness of the Challenged Claims based on Ground 1, which relies on Keskitalo and Lindell.</i>.....	19
1. Keskitalo and Lindell, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose all elements of the Challenged Claims.....	21
i. All Challenged Claims requires a “rate changing means for changing a transmission rate according to the comparison result.”	
22	
ii. Keskitalo does not teach a “rate change circuitry that changes a transmission rate.”	23
iii. Lindell does not remedy Keskitalo's shortcomings.	26
a. Lindell's power disabling circuitry is a switch or “fuse,” not a “rate change circuitry.”	26
b. Lindell teaches limiting the transmission power, not changing the transmission rate.....	29
2. The Petition fails to provide an “articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning” for why a POSITA would have been motivated to combine Keskitalo with Lindell.	30
i. Keskitalo teaches away from using Lindell for comparing average value with the allowable transmission power value.....	31
ii. The Petition has not shown that a POSITA would expect success	

..

in making the combination.	32
iii. The Petition has not shown that combining Keskitalo and Lindell would further the references' objectives.	35
iv. The Petition's proposed combination does not achieve the claimed invention.	37
v. The Petition's motivation to combine arguments contain unsupported and conclusory statements.	38
VI. Conclusion	41

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Abbott Labs. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 544 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	20
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	41
<i>Allergan, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 754 F.3d 952 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	40
<i>Cardiac Pacemakers, Inc. v. St. Jude Med., Inc.</i> , 381 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	20, 39
<i>CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Int'l Corp.</i> , 349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	2, 20, 21
<i>Facebook, Inc. v. SKKY, LLC</i> , CBM2016-00091, Paper 12 (PTAB Sept. 28, 2017)	13
<i>Gambro Lundia AB v. Baxter Healthcare Corp.</i> , 110 F.3d 1573, 1578-79 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	20
<i>Gen. Elec. Co. v. TAS Energy Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00163, Paper 11 (PTAB May 13, 2014)	39
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City</i> , 383 U.S. 1, 17 (1966)	20
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	37, 39
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F. 3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	20
<i>In re Rambus, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 42 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	12, 13

IPR2018-01473
Patent 6,611,676

<i>In re Royka</i> , 490 F.2d 981, 985 (CCPA 1974)	20
<i>Intuitive Surgical, Inc., v. Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00938, Paper 8 (PTAB Dec. 8, 2018)	14
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007)	20
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	37, 39
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Enfish, LLC</i> , 662 F. App’x 981 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	39
<i>Nidec Motor Corp. v. Zhongshan Broad Ocean Motor Co. Ltd.</i> , 868 F.3d 1013 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	13
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	12, 13
<i>Princeton Biochemicals, Inc. v. Coulter, Inc.</i> , 411 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	40
<i>Ruiz v. A.B. Chance Co.</i> , 357 F.3d 1270 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	3, 40
<i>SAS Inst., Inc. v. Iancu</i> . 138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018)	14
<i>Sensonics, Inc. v. Aerosonic Corp.</i> , 81 F.3d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	40
<i>Star Sci., Inc. v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.</i> , 655 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	20
<i>Vectra Fitness, Inc. v. TNWK Corp.</i> , 162 F.3d 1379, 1383 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	13
Other Authorities	
37 C.F.R. § 42.120	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.