

DOCKET NO.: 0107131-00573US5

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 IPR2019-00129  
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 IS INCORRECT AND OVERLY NARROW.....2

A. “Carrier Aggregation” Should be Construed in Accordance With its Broadest Reasonable Interpretation .....2

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..... 4

1. The Intrinsic Evidence Does Not Support Patent Owner’s Construction .....4

2. Prosecution Disclaimer Does Not Limit the Broadest Reasonable Interpretation Here .....8

3. Patent Owner’s Citation to Extrinsic Evidence Is Inapposite..... 11

4. Petitioner’s Proposed BRI Construction Does Not Read Out “Aggregation”..... 12

III. GROUND I: PATENT OWNER’S ARGUMENTS FAIL TO REFUTE THE EVIDENCE SET FORTH IN THE PETITION..... 13

A. Applying the Correct Claim Construction, Lee Anticipates Claim 1 ..... 13

B. Claims 2-6 are Anticipated by Lee..... 15

IV. GROUND II: THE PETITION DEMONSTRATES THAT LEE AND YOUSSEF RENDER CLAIM 10 OBVIOUS..... 18

V. GROUND III: THE PETITION DEMONSTRATES THAT CLAIMS 2-6 ARE OBVIOUS OVER LEE AND FEASIBILITY STUDY.....20

A. The Petition Establishes that the Feasibility Study is Analogous Art .....21

B. The Petition Establishes the Reasons to Combine Lee and the Feasibility Study .....22

C. Patent Owner’s Additional Arguments are Without Merit .....24

VI. GROUND IV: THE PETITION DEMONSTRATES THAT CLAIM 10 IS OBVIOUS OVER LEE, FEASIBILITY STUDY, AND YOUSSEF .....25

VII. CONCLUSION .....26

## I. INTRODUCTION

The primary argument Patent Owner raises is one of claim construction, and specifically, what the proper construction of the term “carrier aggregation” is. The text of the '356 patent provides the answer, stating that carrier aggregation “is simultaneous operation on multiple carriers.” Ex. 1401, 1:32-33; *see id.*, 2:53-54. The patent's written description is expansive in its description of technologies to which the alleged invention applies and it describes LTE carriers as just one example. *Id.*, 2:38-67. Especially under the broadest reasonable interpretation standard that applies to claim construction in this trial, “carrier aggregation” is properly understood as meaning exactly what the patent says it means: “simultaneous operation on multiple carriers.” Under that claim construction, Patent Owner raises no argument against anticipation by the Lee reference for at least some claims of the '356 patent. *See* POR, 34-37.

Seeking to avoid that outcome of unpatentability, Patent Owner proposes an odd – and narrow – tripartite claim construction of “carrier aggregation.” Specifically, Patent Owner argues that “carrier aggregation” requires “[1] simultaneous operation on multiple carriers [2] that are combined as a single virtual channel [3] to provide higher bandwidth.” Parts [2] and [3] of that construction come from outside the '356 patent, and they are not supported by the intrinsic evidence at all, let alone the broadest reasonable interpretation in light of that

evidence. The Board should reject this post-hoc attempt to rewrite the '356 patent and its claims.

But even if the Board were to adopt Patent Owner's proposed construction, the challenged claims are still invalid as obvious in view of Lee (Ex. 1435) and the Feasibility Study (Ex. 1404), which Patent Owner does not dispute discloses "[1] simultaneous operation on multiple carriers [2] that are combined as a single virtual channel [3] to provide higher bandwidth." Patent Owner fails to rebut Petitioner's evidence regarding why a person of ordinary skill in the art ("POSITA") would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Lee with Feasibility Study. Patent Owner's attack on positions never advanced by Petitioner fails to rebut Petitioner's expressly stated reasons to combine, which largely come from the text of the references themselves.

## **II. PATENT OWNER'S PROPOSED CLAIM CONSTRUCTION IS INCORRECT AND OVERLY NARROW**

### **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. 1401, 1:32-33 ("A wireless device may support *carrier aggregation, which is simultaneous operation on*

# 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.