

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

HTC Corporation, and
HTC America, Inc.,
Petitioners

v.

INVT SPE, LLC
Patent Owner

Case: IPR2018-01581
Patent No. 7,848,439

**PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 313 AND 37 C.F.R. §42.107**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents i

List of Patent Owner’s Exhibitsv

I. Introduction.....1

II. The Challenged Patent.....3

 A. State of the Art at the Time of the Patented Invention.....3

 B. Challenged Claim.....8

 C. Overview of U.S. Patent No. 7,848,439.....9

 D. Relevant Prosecution History.....13

III. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....14

IV. Claim Construction.....14

V. Overview of the Alleged Prior Art References16

 A. U.S. Patent No. 6,904,283 to Li *et al.* (“Li”).....16

 B. U.S. Patent No. 7,221,680 to Vijayan *et al.* (“Vijayan”)19

 C. U.S. Patent No. 6,721,569 to Hashem *et al.* (“Hashem”)22

 D. U.S. Patent No. 5,596,604 to Cioffi *et al.* (“Cioffi”).....23

VI. Legal Standards24

VII. The Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood the Challenged Claim Is Obvious.26

 A. The Petition Fails to Demonstrate that the Proposed Combination Discloses “Assigning a Weight *Per Subband Group* to a Sum of Information Bits that Are Able to Be Assigned to All of the Subbands Within the Subband Group.”26

 B. The Petition Fails to Establish that a POSITA Would Combine *Cioffi* with Other References in the Proposed Combination.31

 1. The Petition fails to offer a reason to combine each and every reference in the Proposed Combination.....32

 2. A POSITA would not combine Cioffi with Li, Vijayan, or Hashem.....34

3.	The Petition relies on unsupported, conclusory expert testimony for the alleged motivation to combine Cioffi with Li and Vijayan.	37
4.	The Petition relies on improper hindsight for the alleged motivation to combine.	40
C.	A POSITA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine the <i>Li</i> and <i>Vijayan</i> References.	42
VIII.	Conclusion	46
	Word Count Certification	47
	Certificate of Service	48

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	41
<i>Apple Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00441, Paper 11 (PTAB July 13, 2015)	41
<i>Apple Inc. v. Uniloc Luxembourg S.A.</i> , IPR2017-02041, Paper 10 (PTAB Mar. 8, 2018)	38
<i>Apple Inc. v. Valencell, Inc.</i> , IPR2017-00316, Paper 9 (PTAB Jul. 20, 2017)	38
<i>CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Int'l Corp.</i> , 349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	24
<i>Gen. Elec. Co. v. TAS Energy Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00163, Paper 11 (PTAB May 13, 2014)	41
<i>Heart Failure Techs., LLC v. CardioKinetix, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00183, Paper 12 (PTAB July 13, 2013)	30, 35
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	25, 26, 40
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F. 3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	25
<i>Initiative for Medicines, Access & Knowledge (I-MAK), Inc. v. Gilead Pharmasset LLC</i> , Case No. IPR2018-00390, Paper 7 (Jul. 19, 2018).....	26
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342, 1367- 79 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	32
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	24, 25, 30, 40

IPR2018-01581
Patent 7,848,439

<i>Nidec Motor Corp. v. Zhongshan Broad Ocean Motor Co. Ltd.</i> , 868 F.3d 1013 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	15
<i>Nikon Corp. v. ASML Netherlands B.V.</i> , Case No. IPR2018-00227, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Sep. 10, 2018).....	40
<i>Nokia of Am. Corp. v. Blackberry Ltd.</i> , IPR2018-00652, Paper 10 (PTAB Oct. 1, 2018).....	45
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (<i>en banc</i>).....	14
<i>Purdue Pharma L.P. v. Depomed, Inc.</i> , 643 F. App'x 960 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	40
<i>Schott Gemtron Corp. v. SSW Holding Co., Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00367, Paper 62 (PTAB May 26, 2015)	33
<i>Star Sci., Inc. v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.</i> , 655 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	25
<i>Trivascular, Inc. v. Samuels</i> , 812 F.3d 1056, 1066 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	32
<i>Yamaha Golf Car Co. v. Club Car, LLC</i> , IPR2017-02141, Paper 17 (PTAB Apr. 3, 2018)	41
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 103.....	1
Other Authorities	
37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a).....	25, 31, 38, 39
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)	14

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.