

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Intel Corporation
Petitioner

v.

Qualcomm Incorporated
Patent Owner

Case IPR2019-00129
Patent 9,154,356

PATENT OWNER'S SUR-REPLY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Patent Owner’s Proposed Claim Construction Is Correct.....	2
A. Petitioner Fails To Establish That The Patentee Acted As A Lexicographer.....	2
B. Patent Owner Established That “Carrier Aggregation” Has A Well Understood Meaning In the Art.....	6
1. Intrinsic Evidence	7
2. Extrinsic Evidence	11
C. Petitioner’s Proposed Construction Cannot Be Correct.....	12
1. Petitioner’s Construction Violates The Doctrine Of Prosecution History Disclaimer	12
2. Petitioner’s Construction Is Incorrect Because It Reads Out The Word “Aggregation.”.....	15
3. Petitioner’s Arguments And Criticisms Of Patent Owner’s Proposed Constructions Are Based On The Flawed Premise That The Patentee Acted As A Lexicographer	16
D. The Term Carrier Aggregation Requires An Increased Bandwidth	18
III. Ground I – Petitioner Fails To Establish That Lee Anticipates The Claims	18
A. Lee Fails To Disclose “Carrier Aggregation.”.....	18
B. Lee Does Not Anticipate Claims 2 Through 6 For An Additional Reason	20
IV. Ground II – Petitioner Fails To Establish That Claim 10 Is Obvious Over Lee And Youssef	22
V. Ground III – Petitioner Fails To Establish That Claims 2 Through 6 Are Obvious Over Lee And The Feasibility Study	22
A. No Motivation To Select And Combine Lee And The Feasibility Study.....	22

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
B. Petitioner Failed to Establish That The Feasibility Study Is Analogous Art	23
VI. GROUND IV – LEE, THE FEASIBILITY STUDY, AND YOUSSEF DO NOT RENDER OBVIOUS CLAIM 10	26
VII. CONCLUSION.....	26

..

I. Introduction

Patent Owner's response identified two fatal defects in Petitioner's challenge to the patentability of the '356 Patent. Petitioner's reply fails to refute these points.

First, the petition is based on a flawed construction of the term "carrier aggregation." Patent Owner established that the term has an established and well understood meaning to skilled artisans. That meaning, which is set forth as Patent Owner's proposed construction, is supported by the intrinsic evidence, and it is further supported by extrinsic evidence.

But Petitioner argues that the patentee acted as a lexicographer to assign the term a special definition different than its plain and ordinary meaning. The petition fails, however, to establish that the patentee expressed the necessary intent to redefine the term.

Furthermore, Petitioner's proposed construction cannot be correct because: (1) the proposed construction violates the doctrine of prosecution disclaimer, and (2) the proposed construction reads out the term "aggregation." Petitioner's reply is unsuccessful in rebutting either point.

Properly construed, the Lee prior art reference fails to disclose the "carrier aggregation" limitation. Lee is the sole reference supporting petitioner's first and second ground and thus, Lee fails to establish unpatentability.

Second, Petitioner fails to sufficiently articulate a motivation to select and combine the Feasibility Study reference (as a means of supplying the missing “carrier aggregation” limitation) with Lee to support its third ground of unpatentability. No reasoned explanation is offered to explain why a skilled artisan would have been motivated to select and combine these two distinctly different references—Lee is directed to Bluetooth and WiFi communications equipment, whereas the Feasibility Study is directed to LTE cellular communications equipment. Absent such an explanation, Petitioner’s alleged obviousness combination amounts to impermissible hindsight reconstruction of the claimed invention. Accordingly, the remaining third ground also fails to establish unpatentability.

II. Patent Owner’s Proposed Claim Construction Is Correct.

A. Petitioner Fails To Establish That The Patentee Acted As A Lexicographer.

Petitioner does not propose construing the term “carrier aggregation” according to its plain and ordinary meaning. Instead, Petitioner and its expert argue that the patentee acted as a lexicographer to assign the term a special definition different than its plain and ordinary meaning. Reply at 2 (“defines the term”); *id.* at 4 (“the ’356 patent expressly defines”); Ex. 2029, 128:15–21 (concluding the specification’s disclosure in column 1 at lines 32–33 “is their definition of carrier aggregation acting as their own lexicographer”).

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.