

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. IPR2018-01476
U.S. Patent No. 7,764,711

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW OF ARGUMENT	1
II.	RELATED PROCEEDINGS BEARING ON THIS PROCEEDING	1
III.	OVERVIEW OF THE ’711 PATENT.....	2
	A. Challenged Claims.....	4
	B. Simultaneous Implementation of Spatial Multiplexing and Transmit Diversity	7
IV.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART.....	10
V.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	10
VI.	SUMMARY OF ALLEGED PRIOR ART CITED IN GROUNDS	11
	A. U.S. Patent No. 6,067,290 to Paulraj et al. (“Paulraj”) (Ex. 1005)	11
	B. “Achieving High Data Rates in CDMA Systems Using BLAST Techniques” by Howard Huang, Harish Viswanathan, and G.J. Foschini (“Huang”) (Ex. 1006).....	14
	C. U.S. Patent No. 7,095,709 to Walton et al. (“Walton”) (Ex. 1008)	18
	D. U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0193146A1 to Wallace et al. (“Wallace”) (Ex. 1009).....	19
VII.	LEGAL STANDARD FOR OBVIOUSNESS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103	22
VIII.	GROUND 1: THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE IT FAILS TO SHOW BY A PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE THAT ANY OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE FOR BEING OBVIOUS OVER PAULRAJ IN VIEW OF HUANG AND IN FURTHER VIEW OF WALTON.....	24
	A. Neither Paulraj, Nor Huang, Nor Walton Disclose or Suggest Every Element of the Challenged Claims	24
	1. Paulraj does not disclose “maps the plurality of data items . . . such that the specific data item and the replica data item are transmitted from different antennas at a same time” as claimed.....	25
	2. Walton does not disclose “maps the plurality of data items . . . such that the specific data item and the replica data item are transmitted from different antennas at a same time” as claimed.....	30

3. Huang does not disclose “maps the plurality of data items . . . such that the specific data item and the replica data item are transmitted from different antennas at a same time” as claimed.....33

B. Petitioners Provide Insufficient Rationale to Modify Paulraj in View of Walton and Huang35

1. Modifying Paulraj to include the symbol repetition unit of Walton would result in a less efficient design counter to Paulraj’s objective of improving data transfer speed within the constraints of available bandwidth.....36

2. A PHOSITA would not be motivated by Huang to modify Paulraj and Walton to result in the invention of the challenged claims.38

3. There is no support to conclude that modifying Paulraj and Walton in view of Huang would yield predictable results.42

IX. GROUND 2: THE PETITION FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER WALLACE IN VIEW OF WALTON.....43

A. Combining Wallace With Walton Would Not Result In the Invention of the Challenged Claims43

X. OBJECTIVE INDICIA OF NONOBVIOUSNESS SUPPORT A FINDING OF PATENTABILITY46

A. Nexus – The Objective Indicia of Non-Obviousness are Directly Attributable to the Inventions of the Challenged Claims47

B. Adoption of the Inventions of the ’711 Patent as a Standard.....47

C. Licensing of the Inventions of the ’711 Patent50

XI. CONCLUSION51

...

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'ns. Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	23
<i>Alcon Research, Ltd. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 687 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	42
<i>Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.</i> , 732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	23
<i>Cardiac Pacemakers, Inc. v. St. Jude Med., Inc.</i> , 381 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	50
<i>Crocs, Inc. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 598 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	46
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat'l Graphic, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	1
<i>Hamilton Beach Brands, Inc. v. f'real Foods, LLC</i> , 908 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	38
<i>In re Dow Chem. Co.</i> , 837 F.2d 469 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	24
<i>In re Hayes Microcomputer Prod., Inc. Patent Lit.</i> , 982 F.2d 1527 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	50
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	23
<i>In re Vaidyanathan</i> , 381 F. App'x 985 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	35
<i>InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGO Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	40

<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	22, 23
<i>Nidec Motor Corp. v. Zhongshan Broad Ocean Motor Co. Ltd.</i> , 868 F.3d 1013 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	11
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (<i>en banc</i>)	10
<i>Polaris Industries, Inc. v. Arctic Cat, Inc.</i> , 882 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	40, 41
<i>SAS Inst., Inc. v. Iancu</i> , 138 S.Ct. 1348 (2018).....	11
<i>WBIP, LLC v. Kohler Co.</i> , 829 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	46
<i>WMS Gaming Inc. v. Int’l Game Tech.</i> , 184 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	51
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 103	22
35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	22
Other Authorities	
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)	10
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4))	23, 27
<i>Office Practice Guide</i> , 77 Fed. Reg. 48,756 at 48,763 (Aug. 14, 2012).....	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.