Trials@uspto.gov 571-272-7822

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO. LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC, and SAMSUNG AUSTIN SEMICONDUCTOR, LLC,

Petitioner,

v.

REMBRANDT WIRELESS TECHNOLOGIES, LP, Patent Owner.

> Case IPR2015-00555 Patent 8,457,228 B2

Before JAMESON LEE, HOWARD B. BLANKENSHIP, and JUSTIN BUSCH, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

BLANKENSHIP, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION Denial of Institution of *Inter Partes* Review 37 C.F.R. § 42.108 Denial of Motion for Joinder 37 C.F.R. § 42.122

Rembrandt Wireless



LARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

I. BACKGROUND

Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd., Samsung Electronics America, Inc., Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC, and Samsung Austin Semiconductor, LLC (collectively, "Petitioner") filed a petition requesting *inter partes* review of claim 21 of U.S. Patent No. 8,457,228 B2 ("the '228 patent") (Ex. 1301) under 35 U.S.C. §§ 311–319. *See* Paper 1 (Petition, or "Pet."). With the Petition, Petitioner filed a motion for joinder (Paper 3, "Mot. Join."), seeking to join with *Samsung Electronics Co.* v. *Rembrandt Wireless Technologies, LP,* Case IPR2014-00892 ("IPR '892"). Patent Owner Rembrandt Wireless Technologies, LP filed an opposition to the motion for joinder (Paper 9, "Opp.") and a preliminary response (*see* Paper 19, "Prelim. Resp."). Petitioner filed a reply to Patent Owner's opposition to the motion for joinder. Paper 10 ("Reply"). We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 314.

For the reasons that follow, we deny the motion for joinder and do not institute an *inter partes* review as to the challenged claim of the '228 patent.

A. Related Proceedings

According to Petitioner, the '228 patent is involved in the lawsuit Rembrandt Wireless Technologies, LP v. Samsung Electronics Co, No. 2:13cv-00213 (E.D. Tex. 2013). Pet. 1. The '228 patent also has been challenged in the following cases: Samsung Electronics Co. v. Rembrandt Wireless Technologies, LP, IPR2014-00889; Samsung Electronics Co. v. Rembrandt Wireless Technologies, LP , IPR2014-00890; Samsung Electronics Co. v. Rembrandt Wireless Technologies, LP , IPR2014-00891; Samsung Electronics Co. v. Rembrandt Wireless Technologies, LP ,

2

Rembrandt Wireless

IPR2015-00555 Patent 8,457,228 B2

IPR2014-00892; Samsung Electronics Co. v. Rembrandt Wireless Technologies, LP, IPR2014-00893; and Samsung Electronics Co. v. Rembrandt Wireless Technologies, LP, IPR2014-00895.

B. The '228 Patent

The '228 Patent issued from an application filed August 4, 2011, which claimed priority under 35 U.S.C. § 120 through a chain of intervening applications to an application filed December 4, 1998, and which further claimed priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 to a provisional application filed December 5, 1997.

The technical field of the patent relates to data communications and modulators/demodulators (modems), and in particular to a data communications system in which a plurality of modems use different types of modulation in a network. Ex. 1301, col. 1, ll. 21–25; col. 1, l. 58 – col. 2, l. 23.

C. Challenged Claim

Claim 21, the sole claim that is challenged, is reproduced below along with base claim 1.

1. A master communication device configured to communicate with one or more slave transceivers according to a master/slave relationship in which a slave communication from a slave device to the master communication device occurs in response to a master communication from the master communication device to the slave device, the master communication device comprising:

a master transceiver configured to transmit a first message over a communication medium from the master

Rembrandt Wireless

3

DOCKE

transceiver to the one or more slave transceivers, wherein the first message comprises:

first information modulated according to a first modulation method,

second information, including a payload portion, modulated according to the first modulation method, wherein the second information comprises data intended for one of the one or more slave transceivers and

first message address information that is indicative of the one of the one or more slave transceivers being an intended destination of the second information; and

said master transceiver configured to transmit a second message over the communication medium from the master transceiver to the one or more slave transceivers wherein the second message comprises:

third information modulated according to the first modulation method, wherein the third information comprises information that is indicative of an impending change in modulation to a second modulation method, and

fourth information, including a payload portion, transmitted after transmission of the third information, the fourth information being modulated according to the second modulation method, the second modulation method being of a different type than the first modulation method, wherein the fourth information comprises data intended for a single slave transceiver of the one or more slave transceivers, and

second message address information that is indicative of the single slave transceiver being an intended destination of the fourth information; and

wherein the second modulation method results in a higher data rate than the first modulation method.

Δ

21. The master communication device as in claim 1, wherein the first information that is included in the first message comprises the first message address data.

D. Prior Art

Boer	US 5,706,428	Jan. 6, 1998	(Ex. 1304)
Siwiak	US 5,537,398	July 16, 1996	(Ex. 1324)

E. Asserted Ground of Unpatentability

Petitioner asserts the following ground of unpatentability as to claim 21 (Pet. 3): obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Admitted Prior Art ("APA")¹, Boer, and Siwiak.

II. ANALYSIS

A. Background

RM

In IPR '892, Petitioner asserted that claims 1–3, 5, and 10–21 of the '228 patent were unpatentable over APA and Boer. IPR '892, Paper 2 at 20–70. We did not institute an *inter partes* review of claim 21 based on that ground in IPR '892. We explained as follows:

Claim 21, which depends directly from claim 1, recites that the first information that is included in the first message "comprises the first message address data." Petitioner maps the claimed "first information" as corresponding to header 218 of message 200 depicted in Figure 4 of Boer. Petitioner admits that Boer does not teach placing its address information in header 218 (Ex. 1304, Fig. 4). Boer teaches that DATA field

5

Rembrandt Wireless

¹ Petitioner asserts that Patent Owner made admissions in the '228 patent disclosure and in the prosecution history of a parent application regarding prior art. Pet. 12–14.

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.