

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MICROSOFT CORPORATION

Petitioner

v.

UNILOC 2017 LLC

Patent Owner

IPR2019-01116

PATENT 7,016,676

PATENT OWNER SUR-REPLY TO PETITION

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. PETITIONER FAILS TO PROVE UNPATENTABILITY OF ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM 1

A. The Petition is impermissibly keyed to erroneous claim constructions 1

1. “stations which operate in accordance with a first radio interface standard and/or a second radio interface standard” 2

2. Petitioner at least fails to defend the erroneous interpretation that the “if” statement in the “wherein” clause of claim 1 is not entitled to patentable weight..... 6

B. Petitioner at least fails to prove any of the cited HomeRF references discloses “stations which operate in accordance with a first radio interface standard and/or a second radio interface standard” (Claim 1) (Grounds 1-3) 9

C. Petitioner at least fails to prove any of the cited HomeRF references discloses “a control station which controls the alternate use of the frequency band” / “wherein the control station controls the access to the common frequency band for stations working in accordance with the first radio interface standard if stations working in accordance with the first radio interface standard do not request a control station which controls the alternate use of the frequency band” (Claim 1) (Grounds 1-3) 13

D. Petitioner at last fails to prove the HomeRF Tutorial and HomeRF Liaison Report Constitute Prior Art (Grounds 2 and 3). 14

E. Petitioner at least fails to prove Lansford discloses “a

control station which controls the alternate use of the frequency band” or “wherein the control station ...renders the frequency band available for access by the stations working in accordance with the second radio interface standard if stations working in accordance with the first radio interface standard do not request a control station which controls the alternate use of the frequency band” (Claim 1) (Ground 4) 15

III. CONCLUSION 16

EXHIBITS

Exhibit 2001	U.S. Patent No. 8,929,259
Exhibit 2002	U.S. Patent No. 7,023,833
Exhibit 2003	U.S. Patent No. 7,796,573
Exhibit 2004	U.S. Patent No. 7,197,326

I. INTRODUCTION

Uniloc 2017 LLC (“Patent Owner”) submits this Sur-Reply to the Petition for *Inter Partes* Review (“Pet.” or “Petition”) of United States Patent No. 7,016,676 (“the ’676 Patent” or “EX1001”) filed by Microsoft Corporation (“Petitioner”) in IPR2019-01116. For the reasons given in Uniloc’s Response (Paper 11, “POR”) and herein, Petitioner fails to carry its burden of proving unpatentability of the challenged claims of the ’676 patent based on the grounds presented in the Petition.

II. PETITIONER FAILS TO PROVE UNPATENTABILITY OF ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM

While Petitioner has the burden of proof with respect to each element of every challenged claim, and this burden never shifts to Patent Owner, Patent Owner had nevertheless explained in its Response why the Petition is substantially deficient at least with respect to certain example claim language. Petitioner’s Reply either mischaracterizes or ignores the deficiencies Patent Owner had identified.

A. The Petition is impermissibly keyed to erroneous claim constructions

As explained in Patent Owner’s Response, the Petition should be denied as being impermissibly keyed to incorrect claim constructions for multiple terms. As shown by way of example below, Petitioner fails in its Reply to address, or in certain instances even mention, the multiple points of error Patent Owner had identified in the Petition and in a claim construction advanced, *sua ponte*, by the Board.¹

¹ While Patent Owner’s Sur-Reply provides a high-level summary of certain points

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.