

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MARVELL SEMICONDUCTOR, INC.
Petitioner,

v.

UNILOC 2017 LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2019-01349
U.S. Patent 7,016,676

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION

PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §42.107(a)

Table of Contents

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	The '676 Patent	1
III.	RELATED PROCEEDINGS	7
IV.	THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED UNDER THE BOARD'S DISCRETION.....	8
V.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	10
VI.	PETITIONER DOES NOT PROVE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF UNPATENTABILITY FOR ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM	10
A.	Claim Construction Standard	11
1.	“Stations Which Operate In Accordance With A First Radio Interface Standard And/Or A Second Radio Interface Standard”	12
2.	“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 access to the frequency band”	12
3.	“the control station also carries out functions which cause radio systems in accordance with the first radio interface standard to interpret the radio channel as interfered and to seize another radio channel for its own operation”	14
B.	The Petition does not establish that Sherman (Ex. 1004) teaches “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 access to the frequency band” as recited in Claim 1. (Ground 1).....	15
C.	The Petition does not establish that Sherman (Ex. 1004) in view of Trompower (Ex. 1006) renders Claim 5 obvious. (Ground 2)	19
D.	The Petition does not establish that Ex. 1005 teaches “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 access to the frequency band” as recited in Claim 1. (Ground 3)	22

E. The Petition does not establish that Shellhammer in view of Trompower renders Claim 5 obvious. (Ground 4)25

F. The Petition does not establish that Shellhammer (Ex. 1005) in view of Panasik (Ex. 1015) renders Claim 5 obvious. (Ground 5)26

VII. CONCLUSION.....31

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §313 and 37 C.F.R. §42.107(a), Uniloc 2017 LLC (the “Patent Owner” or “Uniloc”) submits Uniloc’s Preliminary Response to the Petition for *Inter Partes* Review (“Pet.” or “Petition”) of United States Patent No. 7,016,676 (“the ‘676 Patent” or “Ex. 1001”) filed by Marvell Semiconductor, Incorporated (“Petitioner”) in IPR2019-01349.

In view of the reasons presented herein, the Petition should be denied in its entirety as failing to meet the threshold burden of proving there is a reasonable likelihood that at least one challenged claim is unpatentable.

Uniloc addresses each ground and provides specific examples of how Petitioner failed to establish that it is more likely than not that it would prevail with respect to at least one of the challenged ‘676 Patent claims. As a non-limiting example described in more detail below, the Petition fails the all-elements-rule in not addressing every feature of any of the challenged claims.

Accordingly, Uniloc respectfully requests that the Board decline institution of trial on Claims 1-9 of the ‘676 Patent.

II. The ‘676 Patent

The ‘676 patent is titled “Method, network and control station for the two-way alternate control of radio systems of different standards in the same frequency band.” The ‘676 patent issued March 21, 2006, from U.S. Patent Application No. 10/089,959 filed April 4, 2002, which was a National Stage Entry of PCT No. PCT/EP01/09258 filed August 8, 2001 and published as W002/13457, which in turn claims priority to German Application No. DE10039532.5 filed August 8, 2000.

The inventors of the '676 patent observed that at the time of the invention, a radio system for wireless transmission of information was allowed to use transmission power only in accordance with standards by the national regulation authority. The national regulation authority determined on what frequencies with what transmission power and in accordance with what radio interface standard a radio system is allowed to transmit. There was also provided so-called ISM frequency bands (Industrial Scientific Medical) where radio systems transmitted in the same frequency band but in accordance with different radio interface standards. EX1001, 1:10-23. And in the event of interference, methods were standardized for an active switching to another frequency within the permitted frequency band, for controlling transmission power and for the adaptive coding and modulation to reduce interference. However, despite operating in the same frequency band, different radio systems have different Medium Access Controls (MAC), and despite the utilization of methods such as Transmitter Power Control (TPC) and Dynamic Frequency Selection (DFS), those methods did not make optimum use of spreading radio channels over the stations which operate under different radio standards. EX1001, 1:24-2:10.

According to the invention of the '676 Patent, there is provided a method, a wireless network and a control station which make efficient use of radio transmission channels possible by an interface control protocol method for a radio system, which system comprises at least a frequency band provided for the alternate use of a first and a second radio interface standard, the radio system comprising stations which operate in accordance with a first radio interface standard and/or a second radio

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.