

Filed: November 12, 2019

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 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
B.	Petitioner’s First Proposed Construction is Correct.....	6
1.	The Claim Language and the Specification Support Patent Owner’s Construction	6
2.	Petitioner’s Admissions and the District Court’s Analysis Support Patent Owner’s Construction	10
3.	Petitioner’s First Construction is Consistent with the Meaning to a POSA	13
C.	Petitioner’s Alternative Proposed Construction for “position to a communications tower”	14
V.	PROSECUTION HISTORY OF THE '435 PATENT	16
VI.	OVERVIEW OF PRIMARY PRIOR ART REFERENCES	20
A.	Baiker	20
B.	Werling	20
C.	Irvin	22
D.	Myllymäki	23
E.	Bodin	24
VII.	STANDARD FOR GRANTING <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW.....	25

VIII.	<i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED	25
A.	Institution Should Be Denied Because The District Court Litigation Is In Advanced Stages	26
B.	Ground 1: <i>Baiker</i> Does Not Anticipate Any Challenged Claim.....	29
1.	<i>Baiker</i> Fails to Disclose the Claimed “Power Circuit that Provides a Network Adjusted Transmit Power Level...” Limitation.	29
2.	<i>Baiker</i> 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.....	32
C.	Ground 2: The Addition of <i>Werling</i> does not Cure <i>Baiker’s</i> Deficiencies Regarding Claim 1.....	33
1.	<i>Werling</i> Does Not Supply the Limitations Missing from <i>Baiker</i>	33
2.	Petitioner fails to establish a motivation to combine <i>Baiker</i> and <i>Werling</i> .	34
D.	Ground 3: <i>Irvin</i> Does Not Anticipate the Challenged Claims	38
1.	The Examiner Considered <i>Irvin</i> During Prosecution and the Board Should Deny Institution under 325(d)	38
2.	Petitioner Failed to Show that <i>Irvin</i> is Entitled to Any Date Prior to its Filing Date of June 20, 2001	43
3.	<i>Irvin</i> Fails to Disclose the Claimed “Power Circuit that Provides a Network Adjusted Transmit Power Level...” Limitation.	45
4.	<i>Irvin</i> Fails to Disclose “A Transmit Power...Based on [the] Network Adjusted Power Level and [the] Proximity Transmit Power Level.”	47
E.	Ground 4.....	48
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)	48
2.	Petitioner Has Failed to Show that <i>Irvin</i> Is Entitled to Any Date Prior to Its Filing Date.....	49

3. The Combination of <i>Irvin</i> and <i>Myllymäki</i> Fails to Remedy the Deficiencies of <i>Irvin</i>	49
4. Petitioner Provides No Reasonable Motivation to Combine <i>Irvin</i> and <i>Myllymäki</i>	50
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.....	52
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).....	53
2. The Combination of <i>Irvin</i> and <i>Bodin</i> Does Not Supply the Missing Disclosures of <i>Irvin</i>	54
3. Petitioner Presents No Reasonable Evidence that a POSITA Would Be Motivated to Combine <i>Irvin</i> with <i>Bodin</i>	55
G. The Invention of the '435 Patent Antedates the <i>Baiker and Irvin</i> References.	60
1. The Invention Disclosure Statement and its Associated Metadata Corroborate that the Inventors Conceived of the Claimed Invention by, or shortly after, February 27, 2001	60
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 Date	64
IX. CONCLUSION	67

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Align Tech., Inc. v. ClearCorrect Operating, LLC</i> , 745 F. App'x 361 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	37
<i>Becton, Dickinson and Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG</i> , IPR2017-01586, Paper 8 (PTAB Dec. 15, 2017)	40
<i>Belden Inc. v. Berk–Tek LLC</i> , 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	58
<i>Bell Atl. Network Servs., Inc. v. Covad Commc'ns Group, Inc.</i> , 262 F.3d 1258 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	10
<i>Brown v. Barbacid</i> , 436 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	64
<i>CaptionCall, L.L.C. v. UltratecInc.</i> , IPR2013-00544, Paper 74 (PTAB Mar. 3, 2015)	44
<i>Cisco Systems Inc. v. Egenera, Inc.</i> , IPR2017-01342, Paper 10 (PTAB Nov. 10, 2017)	48
<i>Coleman v. Dines</i> , 754 F.2d 353 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	64
<i>Cox Comms., Inc. v. AT&T Intell. Prop. I, L.P.</i> , IPR2015-01227, Paper No. 70 (PTAB May 19, 2015).....	44
<i>Deeper, UAB v. Vexilar, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-01310, Paper 7 (PTAB Jan. 24, 2019).....	42
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC, v. National Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	44
<i>Edge Endo, LLC v. Michael Scianamblo</i> , IPR2018-01320, Paper 15 (PTAB Jan. 14, 2019).....	25

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.