

Filed: May 12, 2020

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ZTE (USA), INC.,

PETITIONER,

V.

BELL NORTHERN RESEARCH, LLC,

PATENT OWNER.

Case No. IPR2019-01365

U.S. Patent No. 7,039,435

**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.120**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. OVERVIEW OF THE '435 INVENTION.....1

III. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL1

IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION1

 A. “position to a communications tower”1

 1. The Claim Language and the Specification Support
 Patent Owner’s Construction2

 2. Petitioner’s Admissions and the District Court’s Analysis
 Support Patent Owner’s Construction5

 3. Institution Decision7

V. '435 PATENT PROSECUTION HISTORY.....9

VI. OVERVIEW OF PRIMARY PRIOR ART REFERENCES12

 A. Baiker12

 B. Werling.....13

 C. Irvin14

 D. Myllymäki15

 E. Bodin16

VII. GROUND 1: *BAIKER* DOES NOT ANTICIPATE ANY
CHALLENGED CLAIM17

 A. The Invention Date of the '435 Patent Antedates Baiker17

 1. The Invention Disclosure Statement and its Associated
 Metadata Corroborate that the Inventors Conceived of the
 Claimed Invention by, or shortly after, February 27, 200117

PUBLIC VERSION - REDACTED

2. 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 Date25

B. Baiker Fails to Disclose the Claimed “Power Circuit that Provides a Network Adjusted Transmit Power Level as a Function of a Position to a Communication Tower” Limitation.27

1. *Baiker’s* RF amplifier is not the claimed power circuit.....29

2. *Baiker* contains no teaching of producing a power level adjusted by the network.32

3. Patent Owner’s argument aligns with the prosecution history.....33

4. Petitioner impermissibly mixes components34

C. Baiker Fails to Disclose the Claimed “Power Governing Subsystem that...Determines A Transmit Power Level...Based on” the Network Adjusted Transmit Power Level and the Proximity Transmit Power Level.35

D. Baiker Does Not Anticipate Dependent Claims 2 and 3.....37

VIII. GROUND 2: THE ADDITION OF *WERLING* DOES NOT CURE *BAIKER’S* DEFICIENCIES REGARDING CLAIM 1.....38

A. Werling Does Not Supply the Limitations Missing from Baiker.38

B. Petitioner fails to establish a motivation to combine Baiker and Werling.....40

IX. GROUND 3: IRVIN DOES NOT ANTICIPATE THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS47

A. Irvin Fails to Disclose the Claimed “Power Circuit that Provides a Network Adjusted Transmit Power Level...” Limitation.47

PUBLIC VERSION - REDACTED

B. Irvin Fails to Disclose “A Transmit Power...Based on [the] Network Adjusted Power Level and [the] Proximity Transmit Power Level.”50

X. GROUND 451

A. The Combination of Irvin and Myllymäki Fails to Remedy the Deficiencies of Irvin.....51

B. Petitioner Provides No Reasonable Motivation to Combine Irvin and Myllymäki.....52

XI. GROUND 5: PETITIONER FAILS TO SHOW THE COMBINATION OF *BODIN* AND *IRVIN* TEACHES EVERY ELEMENT OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS AND DOES NOT SHOW SUFFICIENT MOTIVATION TO COMBINE56

A. The Combination of Irvin and Bodin Does Not Supply the Missing Disclosures of Irvin57

B. Petitioner Presents No Reasonable Evidence that a POSITA Would Be Motivated to Combine Irvin with Bodin58

XII. GROUND 6 FAILS FOR THE SAME REASONS AS GROUND 662

XIII. SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS CONFIRM THAT THE '435 PATENT IS NOT OBVIOUS62

A. Widespread Industry Adoption63

B. Licenses64

XIV. CONCLUSION.....66

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Comm’ns, Inc.,
694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....41

Align Tech., Inc. v. ClearCorrect Operating, LLC,
745 F. App’x 361 (Fed. Cir. 2018)46

Apple Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n,
725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....63

Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Grp., LP,
616 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....51

Belden Inc. v. Berk–Tek LLC,
805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....61

Brown v. Barbacid,
436 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....25

Cisco Systems Inc. v. Egenera, Inc.,
IPR2017-01342, Paper 10 (PTAB Nov. 10, 2017)51

Coleman v. Dines,
754 F.2d 353 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....24

Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.,
722 F.2d 1542 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....35

Eibel Process Co. v. Minn. & Ont. Paper Co.,
261 U.S. 45 (1923)64

Felix v. Am. Honda Motor Co.,
562 F.3d 1167 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....8

Hologic, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.,
884 F.3d 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....21

In re Fritch,
972 F.2d 1260 (Fed. Cir. 1992).....49

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.