

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ericsson Inc.
("Ericsson"),

Petitioner,

v.

UNILOC 2017 LLC ("Uniloc"),

Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 7,016,676

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 312 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.104**

I. TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	MANDATORY NOTICES	4
	A. Real Party-in-Interest	4
	B. Related Matters.....	4
	C. Lead and Back-up Counsel and Service Information	6
III.	GROUND FOR STANDING.....	6
IV.	THE '676 PATENT AND PROSECUTION HISTORY	7
	A. Summary of the '676 Patent.....	7
	B. Prosecution and Priority Date of the '676 Patent.....	9
V.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART.....	10
VI.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	11
VII.	REQUESTED RELIEF	11
VIII.	IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE.....	11
	A. Challenged Claims and Statutory Grounds	11
	B. Status as Prior Art.....	12
IX.	IDENTIFICATION OF HOW THE CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE....	16
	A. Ground 1: Claims 1-2 are unpatentable as obvious over Shellhammer	16
	1. Summary of Shellhammer	16
	2. Claim 1	17
	3. Claim 2	25
	B. Ground 2: Claim 8 is unpatentable as obvious over the combination of Shellhammer and Haartsen.....	26
	1. Summary of Haartsen	26
	2. Reasons to Combine Shellhammer and Haartsen	28
	3. Claim 8	31
	C. Ground 3: Claim 8 is unpatentable as obvious over the combination of Shellhammer and Panasik	38

1.	Summary of Panasik	38
2.	Reasons to Combine Shellhammer and Panasik.....	41
3.	Claim 8	44
D.	Ground 4: Claims 1 and 2 are unpatentable as obvious over Lansford	52
1.	Summary of Lansford	52
2.	Claim 1	53
3.	Claim 2	63
X.	THE BOARD SHOULD NOT EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 314 OR 325(D)	68
A.	None of the <i>General Plastic</i> factors weigh in favor of denying institution.....	68
B.	The Office has not previously considered the challenges, so the <i>Becton Dickinson</i> factors weigh against denying institution	73
XI.	CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT	78

PETITIONER'S EXHIBIT LIST

August 29, 2019

Ex. 1001	U.S. Patent No. 7,016,676 to Walke <i>et al.</i> (the "'676 Patent")
Ex. 1002	Prosecution File History of the '676 Patent
Ex. 1003	Declaration of Jeffrey Fischer
Ex. 1004	CV of Jeffrey Fischer
Ex. 1005	U.S. Patent No. 6,937,158 to Lansford <i>et al.</i> ("Lansford")
Ex. 1006	U.S. Patent No. 7,039,358 to Shellhammer <i>et al.</i> ("Shellhammer")
Ex. 1007	U.S. Patent Provisional Application No. 60/196979 to Shellhammer <i>et al.</i> ("Shellhammer Provisional")
Ex. 1008	U.S. Patent No. 7,280,580 to Haartsen ("Haartsen")
Ex. 1009	U.S. Patent No. 6,643,278 to Panasik <i>et al.</i> ("Panasik")
Ex. 1010	U.S. Patent No. 6,751,455 to Acampora ("Acampora")
Ex. 1011	U.S. Patent No. 6,643,522 to Young ("Young")
Ex. 1012	G. Bianchi, "IEEE 802.11—Saturation Throughput Analysis," IEEE COMMUNICATIONS LETTERS, Vol. 2. No. 12 (Dec. 1998)
Ex. 1013	U.S. Patent No. 6,002,918 to Heiman <i>et al.</i> ("Heiman")
Ex. 1014	U.S. Patent No. Jaszewski to 5,933,420 <i>et al.</i> ("Jaszewski")
Ex. 1015	U.S. Patent No. Chuah to 6,469,991 ("Chuah")
Ex. 1016	U.S. Patent No. 6,345,043 to Hsu ("Hsu")
Ex. 1017	ANSI/IEEE Std 802.11, "Part 11: Wireless LAN Medium Access Control (MAC) and Physical Layer (PHY) Specifications" (1999 Edition) ("802.11 Std")
Ex. 1018	U.S. Patent No. 6,748,444 to Nagashima ("Nagashima")
Ex. 1019	TXED Case No. 2:18-cv-00513, Order Granting Ericsson's Intervention in Verizon case (Dkt. 35)
Ex. 1020	TXED Case No. 2:18-cv-00514, Order Granting Ericsson's Intervention in AT&T case (Dkt. 42)
Ex. 1021	TXED Case No. 2:18-cv-00513, Uniloc's Opposition to Ericsson's

	Intervention (Dkt. 19) Verizon Case
Ex. 1022	TXED Case No. 2:18-cv-00513, Ericsson's Answer to the Complaint (Dkt. 38) Verizon Case
Ex. 1023	TXED Case No. 2:18-cv-00514, Ericsson's Answer to the Complaint (Dkt. 44) AT&T Case
Ex. 1024	TXED Case No. 2:18-cv-00514, Uniloc's Opposition to Ericsson's Intervention (Dkt. 24) AT&T Case
Ex. 1025	U.S. Patent No. 6,965,942 to Young <i>et al.</i> ("Young")

Note that the following analysis will cite to the page numbers of the exhibits themselves, as opposed to the page numbers provided within the exhibit (since not all exhibits have such original page numbers). Also, the following analysis may bold, underline and/or italicize quotations and add color or annotations to the figures from these exhibits for the sake of emphasis, unless otherwise indicated.

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.