

DOCKET NO.: 0107131-00573US3

Filed on behalf of Intel Corporation

By: David L. Cavanaugh, Reg. No. 36,476

John V. Hobgood, Reg. No. 61,540

Benjamin S. Fernandez, Reg. No. 55,172

Gregory H. Lantier, *pro hac vice*

Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP

1875 Pennsylvania Ave., NW

Washington, DC 20006

Tel: (202) 663-6000

Email: David.Cavanaugh@wilmerhale.com

John.Hobgood@wilmerhale.com

Ben.Fernandez@wilmerhale.com

Gregory.Lantier@wilmerhale.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

INTEL CORPORATION
Petitioner

v.

QUALCOMM INCORPORATED
Patent Owner

Case IPR2019-00049
U.S. Patent No. 9,154,356

PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. PATENT OWNER’S PROPOSED CLAIM CONSTRUCTION OF “CARRIER AGGREGATION” (POR 10-31) IS INCORRECT AND OVERLY NARROW 1

 A. “Carrier Aggregation” Should be Construed in Accordance With its Broadest Reasonable Interpretation 1

 B. Patent Owner’s Proposed Construction of “Carrier Aggregation” is Far Narrower than the Broadest Reasonable Interpretation of that Term in Light of the Specification 2

 C. Petitioner’s Proposed BRI Construction Does Not Read Out “Aggregation” 6

III. GROUND I: PATENT OWNER’S ARGUMENTS FAIL TO REFUTE THE EVIDENCE SET FORTH IN THE PETITION 7

 A. Contrary to Patent Owner’s Argument (POR 35-39), Jeon in View of Xiong Includes First and Second Amplifier Stages Configured to be Independently Enabled or Disabled 7

 B. Contrary to Patent Owner’s Arguments (POR 42-44), the Petition Demonstrates Why a POSITA Would Have Combined Jeon and Xiong 14

 C. Contrary to Patent Owner’s Arguments (POR 44-45), Jeon in View of Xiong Discloses the Claimed Providing the First/Second Output RF Signals to the First/Second Load Circuits 17

 D. Contrary to Patent Owner’s Arguments (POR 46-47) Jeon in View of Xiong Discloses the Input RF Signal Employing Carrier Aggregation 18

E. Contrary to Patent Owner’s Arguments (POR 48-50),
Jeon in View of Xiong Discloses the First/Second
Amplifier Stage Further Comprising a First/Second
Inductor Coupled to the First/Second Gain Transistor of
Claim 320

F. Contrary to Patent Owner’s Arguments (POR 50-51),
Jeon in View of Xiong Discloses the Feedback Circuit of
Claims 7 and 8.....22

IV. GROUND II: THE PETITION DEMONSTRATES THAT CLAIMS 2-8
AND 11 ARE OBVIOUS OVER JEON, XIONG AND FEASIBILITY
STUDY23

A. The Petition Establishes that Feasibility Study is
Analogous Art23

B. The Petition Establishes the Reasons to Combine Jeon,
Xiong, and Feasibility Study.....24

C. Patent Owner’s Additional Arguments are Without Merit26

V. CONCLUSION27

I. INTRODUCTION

In response to the clear evidence that the prior art renders each of the challenged claims obvious, Patent Owner adopts a bird-shot approach in its Patent Owner Response, variously arguing that the Board should adopt narrowing claim constructions, selectively read the prior art references, and apply the prior art in ways that would exclude disclosed embodiments. None of Patent Owner's arguments has merit.

II. PATENT OWNER'S PROPOSED CLAIM CONSTRUCTION OF "CARRIER AGGREGATION" (POR 10-31) IS INCORRECT AND OVERLY NARROW

Patent Owner's first argument is that "carrier aggregation" should be construed to require "[1] simultaneous operation on multiple carriers [2] that are combined as a single virtual channel [3] to provide higher bandwidth." The Board should reject Patent Owner's proposed construction.

A. "Carrier Aggregation" Should be Construed in Accordance With its Broadest Reasonable Interpretation

As set forth in the Petition, "carrier aggregation" should be construed as "simultaneous operation on multiple carriers." This construction comes directly from the specification, which defines the term. *See* Ex. 1201, 1:32-33 ("A wireless device may support *carrier aggregation, which is simultaneous operation on*

multiple carriers.)¹ 2:53-54, 2:54-55 (“Carrier aggregation may also be referred to as multi-carrier operation.”). See Ex. 1202, ¶60. Given the clear guidance in the specification, “carrier aggregation” should be construed as “simultaneous operation on multiple carriers” under the broadest reasonable interpretation (“BRI”) claim construction standard. See *Apple Inc. v. Immersion Corp.*, IPR2016-01372, 2017 WL 376909, at *2-3 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 11, 2017); see also *In re Imes*, 778 F.3d 1250, 1252-53 (Fed. Cir. 2015). This meaning is consistent with the understanding of the term by a POSITA. Ex. 1202, ¶61. Paper 3, Petition (“Pet.”), 31. Ex. 1239, ¶14. See also Ex. 1136 (Inv. No. 337-ITA-1093, Order No. 38), 12, 17; see also *id.*, App’x A, at 30.

B. Patent Owner’s Proposed Construction of “Carrier Aggregation” is Far Narrower than the Broadest Reasonable Interpretation of that Term in Light of the Specification

Though the ’356 patent expressly defines “carrier aggregation” as “simultaneous operation on multiple carriers,” Patent Owner proposes a construction of carrier aggregation that is narrower than any disclosure in the ’356 specification. Patent Owner’s arguments supporting this narrowing construction fail. Ex. 1239, ¶¶16-17.

¹ Emphasis in quotations and annotations to figures added unless stated otherwise.

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.