NOTE: This disposition is nonprecedential.

United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

INTEL CORPORATION,
Appellant

v.

QUALCOMM INCORPORATED,
Appellee

2020-2092, 2020-2093

Appeals from the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Patent Trial and Appeal Board in Nos. IPR2019-00128, IPR2019-00129.

Decided: March 24, 2022

GREGORY H. LANTIER, Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP, Washington, DC, argued for appellant. Also represented by DAVID LANGDON CAVANAUGH, CLAIRE HYUNGYO CHUNG, THOMAS SAUNDERS; BENJAMIN S. FERNANDEZ, Denver, CO; JAMES M. LYONS, Boston, MA.

ISRAEL SASHA MAYERGOYZ, Jones Day, Chicago, IL, argued for appellee. Also represented by THOMAS W. RITCHIE; ROBERT BREETZ, DAVID B. COCHRAN, JOSEPH M. SAUER,

Cleveland, OH; KELLY HOLT, New York, NY; JENNIFER L. SWIZE, Washington, DC.

Before NEWMAN, REYNA, and CHEN, *Circuit Judges*.

REYNA, *Circuit Judge*.

Appellant Intel Corporation appeals two final written decisions by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board finding that Intel failed to show that certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 9,154,356 are unpatentable as anticipated or obvious. Intel contends that the Board misconstrued the claim term "carrier aggregation" and that it committed legal and factual error in finding no motivation to combine the asserted prior art. We hold that the Board's final written decisions are contrary to law and unsupported by substantial evidence. The decisions of the Board are therefore reversed.

BACKGROUND

Appellee Qualcomm Incorporated owns U.S. Patent No. 9,154,356 (the "'356 Patent"), titled "Low noise amplifiers for carrier aggregation." The '356 Patent is directed to a device and method for receiving wireless communications over multiple carrier signals. *See* '356 Patent, Abstract.

A typical wireless communication may involve combining ("multiplexing") an information signal with a carrier signal, transmitting the multiplexed signal to a wireless receiver, then removing the carrier signal ("de-multiplexing") from the information signal to arrive at the communicated message. *See generally* J.A. 11, 56, 2398–99, 2424, 5211–12. Often, a receiver will process the message signal through a low-noise amplifier ("LNA")—a component that amplifies the information signal while keeping noise to a minimum. *See* '356 Patent col. 3 ll. 60–61; J.A. 1018, 2402.

Carrier signals help ensure that communications are sent via designated frequency channels. *See* J.A. 1013–14.

Each frequency channel has a corresponding maximum data rate that limits the amount of information that can be transmitted over a certain period of time. J.A. 2397–98, 2423. One way to increase the maximum data rate of an overall communications system is to split a message into parts that are then transmitted simultaneously using multiple carrier signals over multiple frequency channels. J.A. 2398–99, 2403, 2423–24, 2427–28, 2430, 2442. If a receiver can compile the segmented pieces of a message upon receipt, the communication system is no longer limited to the bandwidth and corresponding data rate of a single channel. This process can be referred to as carrier aggregation. *Id.*

The '356 Patent discloses a receiver with a multiple-LNA structure that is equipped to receive a carrier-aggregated signal. Claim 1 is representative:

> 1. An apparatus comprising:
>
> a first amplifier stage configured to be independently enabled or disabled, the first amplifier stage further configured to receive and amplify an input radio frequency (RF) signal and provide a first output RF signal to a first load circuit when the first amplifier stage is enabled, the input RF signal employing *carrier aggregation* comprising transmissions sent on multiple carriers at different frequencies to a wireless device, the first output RF signal including at least a first carrier of the multiple carriers; and
>
> a second amplifier stage configured to be independently enabled or disabled, the second amplifier stage further configured to receive and amplify the input RF signal and provide a second output RF signal to a second load circuit when the second

> amplifier stage is enabled, the second output RF signal including at least a second carrier of the multiple carriers different than the first carrier.

'356 Patent col. 20 ll. 42–61 (emphasis added).

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On November 9, 2018, Intel filed two petitions for inter partes review ("IPR") challenging the claims of the '356 Patent. *See* J.A. 9 n.5, 54 n.6. In IPR2019-00128, Intel challenged claims 1, 7, 8, 11, 17, and 18 as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2012/0056681 ("Lee") or obvious over the combination of Lee and a technical report published by a telecommunications standard-setting body, Third Generation Partnership Project (the "Feasibility Study"). J.A. 4005–89. In IPR2019-00129, Intel challenged claims 2–6 and 10 as obvious over Lee or over the combination of Lee and the Feasibility Study. J.A. 5005–93.[1]

On May 27, 2020, the Board issued two final written decisions in which it construed the disputed claim term, "carrier aggregation."[2] J.A. 1–42, 46–89. Intel argued, citing the specification, that "carrier aggregation" should be broadly construed to mean "simultaneous operation on multiple carriers." *See* J.A. 9–10, 54–55; *see also* '356 Patent col. 1 ll. 32–33 ("A wireless device may support carrier aggregation, which is simultaneous operation on multiple carriers."). The Board rejected that construction as overly

---

[1] Although Intel asserted additional grounds for invalidation in both IPRs, we do not address those grounds as they are moot in light of our decision here.

[2] On June 4, 2020, the Board issued two Errata to the final written decisions to correct recitations of the claim language. J.A. 43–45, 90–92. The changes have been taken into account in this opinion.

broad. Instead, the Board relied on the specification, prosecution history, intrinsic record, and contemporaneous extrinsic evidence to construe "carrier aggregation" to mean "simultaneous operation on multiple carriers that are combined as a single virtual channel to provide higher bandwidth." J.A. 9–27, 54–72.

The parties agreed that the Feasibility Study discloses carrier aggregation (as construed by the Board) and that Lee discloses all other elements of claim 1. *See* Appellant's Br. 46–47; J.A. 1628, 1684. Thus, the Board's decisions turned on whether a person of ordinary skill in the art ("POSITA") would have been motivated to combine the Feasibility Study with Lee to arrive at the claimed invention. *See* J.A. 35–37, 80–81.

To establish motivation to combine, Intel proffered declaration testimony from its expert, Dr. Fay, explaining that the Feasibility Study contemplates the application of carrier aggregation to LTE technology to achieve "LTE-Advanced." *See* J.A. 1092–94 ("LTE-Advanced extends LTE release 8 with support for *Carrier Aggregation*, where two or more *component carriers* (CC) are aggregated in order to support wider transmission bandwidths up to 100MHz and for spectrum aggregation." (quoting Feasibility Study)). According to Dr. Fay, the Feasibility Study explains that the benefits of carrier aggregation can be obtained by using a receiver with "multiple RF front-ends." J.A. 1093–94. Dr. Fay testified that the Feasibility Study teaches every RF front-end contains a low-noise amplifier, so a POSITA would understand that the Feasibility Study effectively recommends the use of something like the circuit of Lee—which discloses a multi-LNA receiver. J.A. 1093–94.

Despite Dr. Fay's testimony, the Board found that Intel "d[id] not adequately address why or how [a POSITA] would have considered using the Feasibility Study's carrier aggregated signal with Lee's amplifier blocks, when Lee

DOCKET ALARM

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.