Filed: October 11, 2019

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD
HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES CO., LTD.,
PETITIONER,
V.
BELL NORTHERN RESEARCH, LLC,
PATENT OWNER.
Case No. IPR2019-01186
U.S. Patent No. 7,039,435

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 313 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.107

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	OVERVIEW OF THE '435 INVENTION	3
III.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL	5
IV.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	5
A	. "position to a communications tower"	5
	1. First Proposed Construction	6
	2. Petitioner's Alternative Proposed Construction for "position to a communications tower"	13
V.	PROSECUTION HISTORY OF THE '435 PATENT	15
VI.	OVERVIEW OF PRIMARY PRIOR ART REFERENCES	19
A	. Baiker	19
В	. Werling	19
C	. Irvin	21
D	. Myllymäki	22
E.	Bodin	23
VII.	STANDARD FOR GRANTING INTER PARTES REVIEW	24
VIII	. INTER PARTES REVIEW SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED	24
A	. Institution Should Be Denied Because The District Court Litigation Is Advanced Stages	
В	. Ground 1: Baiker Does Not Anticipate Any Challenged Claim	28



1.	Baiker Fails to Disclose the Claimed "Power Circuit that Provides a Network Adjusted Transmit Power Level" Limitation	.28
2.	Baiker Fails to Disclose the Claimed "Power Governing Subsystem thatDetermines A Transmit Power LevelBased on" the Network Adjusted Transmit Power Level and the Proximity Transmit Power Level	.31
	Ground 2: The Addition of <i>Werling</i> does not Cure <i>Baiker's</i> Deficiencies Regarding Claim 1	.32
1.	Werling does not supply the limitations missing from Baiker	.32
2.	Petitioner fails to establish a motivation to combine Baiker and Werling	.33
D.	Ground 3: Irvin Does Not Anticipate the Challenged Claims	.36
1.	The Examiner Considered <i>Irvin</i> During Prosecution and the Board Should Deny Institution under 325(d)	.36
2.	Petitioner Failed to Show that <i>Irvin</i> is Entitled to Any Date Prior to its Filing Date of June 20, 2001	.41
3.	Irvin Fails to Disclose the Claimed "Power Circuit that Provides a Network Adjusted Transmit Power Level" Limitation.	.43
4.	Irvin Fails to Disclose "A Transmit PowerBased on [the] Network Adjusted Power Level and [the] Proximity Transmit Power Level."	.45
E.	Ground 4	.45
1.	The Examiner Considered <i>Irvin</i> and Art Cumulative of <i>Myllymäki</i> During Prosecution and the Board Should Deny Institution under 325(d)	45
2.	Petitioner Has Failed to Show that <i>Irvin</i> Is Entitled to Any Date Prior to Its Filing Date	.46
3.	The Combination of <i>Irvin</i> and <i>Myllymäki</i> Fails to Remedy the Deficiencies of <i>Irvin</i>	.46
4.	Petitioner Provides No Reasonable Motivation to Combine <i>Irvin</i> and <i>Myllymaki</i>	47



F. Ground 5: Petitioner Fails to Show the Combination of <i>Bodin</i> and <i>Irvin</i> Teaches Every Element of the Challenged Claims and Does Not Show Sufficient Motivation to Combine
1. The Examiner Considered <i>Irvin</i> and Art Cumulative of <i>Bodin</i> During Prosecution and the Board Should Deny Institution under 325(d)50
2. The Combination of <i>Irvin</i> and <i>Bodin</i> Does Not Supply the Missing Disclosures of <i>Irvin</i>
3. Petitioner Presents No Reasonable Evidence that a POSITA Would Be Motivated to Combine <i>Irvin</i> with <i>Bodin</i>
G. The Invention of the '435 Patent Antedates the <i>Baiker and Irvin</i> References
<ol> <li>The Invention Disclosure Statement and its Associated Metadata Corroborate that the Inventors Conceived of the Claimed Invention by, or shortly after, February 27, 2001</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Corroborated Evidence and Testimony Establish the Inventors to the '435 Patent Diligently Constructively Reduced to Practice their Invention between Conception and their September 28, 2001 Filing Date 61</li> </ol>
IX. CONCLUSION63



## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

## **Cases**

Align Tech., Inc. v. ClearCorrect Operating, LLC, 745 F. App'x 361 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	35
Becton, Dickinson and Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG, IPR2017-01586, Paper 8 (PTAB Dec. 15, 2017)	38
Belden Inc. v. Berk–Tek LLC, 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	55
Bell Atl. Network Servs., Inc. v. Covad Commc'ns Group, Inc., 262 F.3d 1258 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	10
<i>Brown v. Barbacid</i> , 436 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	61
CaptionCall, L.L.C. v. UltratecInc., IPR2013-00544, Paper 74 (PTAB Mar. 3, 2015)	42
Coleman v. Dines, 754 F.2d 353 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	60
Cox Comms., Inc. v. AT&T Intell. Prop. I, L.P., IPR2015-01227, Paper No. 70 (PTAB May 19, 2015)	42
Deeper, UAB v. Vexilar, Inc., IPR2018-01310, Paper 7 (PTAB Jan. 24, 2019)	40
Dynamic Drinkware, LLC, v. National Graphics, Inc., 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	42
Edge Endo, LLC v. Michael Scianamblo, IPR2018-01320, Paper 15 (PTAB Jan. 14, 2019)	24
EiKO Global, LLC, v. Blackbird Tech LLC D/B/A Blackbird Technologies, IPR 2017-00980 Paper 16 (PTAB Sept. 1, 2017)	32.



# DOCKET A L A R M

# 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.

