

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ERICSSON INC.

Petitioner

v.

UNILOC 2017 LLC

Patent Owner

IPR2020-00420

PATENT 6,868,079

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE '079 PATENT	2
A.	PROSECUTION HISTORY OF THE '079 PATENT	4
III.	RELATED PROCEEDINGS	7
IV.	CLAIM 17 OF THE '079 PATENT IS ALREADY THE SUBJECT OF TWO INTER PARTES REVIEWS, AND THIS ADDITIONAL PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED INSTITUTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 314 OR 35 U.S.C. § 325(D)	8
V.	PETITIONER DOES NOT PROVE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF UNPATENTABILITY FOR ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM	14
A.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	15
B.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	16
1.	Claim Construction Standard	16
2.	“acknowledgment”	16
C.	Merakos in view of Kay Does Not Render Obvious “wherein the at least one of the plurality of respective secondary stations re[-] transmits the same respective request in consecutive allocated time slots without waiting for an acknowledgement until said acknowledgement is received from the primary station” (Ground 1, Claims 1, 5, 7, and 17)	17
D.	The Petition Fails to Render Obvious “wherein the primary station determines whether a request has been transmitted by the at least one respective secondary station from a combination of the received signals in a plurality of successive time slots allocated to the at least one respective secondary station.” (Grounds 1 and 2- Claim 1)	22
1.	The Petition fails to establish that a POSA Would	

Be Likely to Combine Merakos and Kay with Alamouti (Ground 1).....	22
E. The Petition Fails to Render Obvious “wherein the primary station determines whether a request for services has been transmitted by the at least one of the plurality of respective secondary stations by determining whether a signal strength of the respective transmitted request of the at least one of the plurality of respective secondary stations exceeds a threshold value.” (Claim 17 - Grounds 1 and 2)	24
1. The Petition fails to establish that a POSA Would Be Likely to Combine Merakos and Kay with Alamouti (Ground 1).....	24
F. No Prima Facie Obviousness for Dependent Claims 3, 4 (Ground 2)	27
G. No Prima Facie Obviousness for Dependent Claim 2 (Ground 3)	27
VI. CONCLUSION.....	28
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.....	29
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	30

I. INTRODUCTION

Uniloc 2017 LLC (the “Uniloc” or “Patent Owner”) submits this Preliminary Response to Petition IPR2020-00420 for *Inter Partes* Review (“Pet.” or “Petition”) of United States Patent No. 6,868,079 (“the ’079 patent” or “EX1001”) filed by Ericsson Inc. (“Petitioner”). The instant Petition is procedurally and substantively defective for at least the reasons set forth herein.

As discussed in detail below in Section V.A-C, the challenged claims provide for an improvement in wireless communication between a base station and secondary stations, and in particular in connection with requests from secondary stations for allocation of slots to send data to the base station. In the method of claims 1 and 17, a secondary station, after sending to the base station a request for service, rather than waiting for an acknowledgment, re-transmits the same request in consecutive allocated time slots without waiting for an acknowledgement and continues the re-transmitting in consecutive allocated time slots until the acknowledgement is received. The Petitioner relies, as to all of Grounds 1, 2, and 3, on the Kay reference for this teaching, while omitting Kay’s explicit teaching of only repeating the request after “a suitable time out,” if an acknowledgment or assignment is not received. Thus, the prior art relied upon by the Petitioner, rather than repeating the requests in consecutive allocated time slots without waiting for an acknowledgment, as recited in claims 1 and 17, waits for a suitable time out period to determine if an acknowledgment has been received. Accordingly, the prior art cited by the Petitioner fails to provide a basis for institution of Inter Partes Review here, and for this reason, as well as the other reasons set forth below, institution should be denied.

II. THE '079 PATENT

The '079 patent is titled “Radio communication system with request re-transmission until acknowledged.” The '079 patent issued March 15, 2005, from U.S. Patent Application No. 09/455,124 filed December 6, 1999, which claims priority to United Kingdom Patent Application No. GB9827182, filed December 10, 1998.

The inventors of the '079 patent observed that in radio communication systems at the time, it was generally required to be able to exchange signaling messages between a Mobile Station (MS) and a Base Station (BS). Downlink signaling (from BS to MS) was usually realized by using a physical broadcast channel of the BS to address any MS in its coverage area. Since only one transmitter (the BS) uses this broadcast channel, there is no access problem. EX1001, 1:17-23.

However, uplink signaling (from MS to BS) required more detailed considerations. If the MS already had an uplink channel assigned to it, for voice or data services, this signaling could be achieved by piggybacking, in which the signaling messages are attached to data packets being sent from the MS to the BS. But if there was no uplink channel assigned to the MS, piggybacking is not possible. In this case it would be desirable to have a fast uplink signaling mechanism be available for the establishment, or re-establishment, of a new uplink channel. EX1001, 1: 24-33.

In conventional systems at the time, for example those operating in accordance with the Global System for Mobile communication (GSM) standard, fast uplink signaling was enabled by the provision of a random-access channel using a slotted

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.