

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.
Petitioner,

v.

OPTIS CELLULAR TECHNOLOGY, LLC
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2020-00465
Patent No. 8,102,833

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. <i>FINTIV</i> FACTORS FAVOR DISCRETIONARY DENIAL OF INSTITUTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	6
A. <i>Fintiv</i> Factor #1: no evidence that the district court would grant a stay if a proceeding is instituted given that the institution date would be one month after the trial start date.....	7
B. <i>Fintiv</i> Factor #2: the court's trial date is one month before the Board's projected institution date and 13 months before Board's projected statutory deadline for a final written decision.....	8
C. <i>Fintiv</i> Factor #3: There has been immense "investment in the parallel proceeding by the court and parties."	10
D. <i>Fintiv</i> Factor #4: There is complete "overlap between issues raised in the petition and in the parallel proceeding."	11
E. <i>Fintiv</i> Factor #5: "The petitioner and the defendant in the parallel proceeding are the same party."	13
F. <i>Fintiv</i> Factor #6: "Other circumstances that impact the Board's exercise of discretion, including the merits" favor non-institution.	13
III. OVERVIEW OF THE '833 INVENTIONS	15
A. SUMMARY OF THE '833 PATENT	15
B. LG's 3GPPP Technical Proposals Related to the '833 Patent	20
C. Priority Date and Prosecution History	25
IV. THE PRIOR ART REFERENCES DIFFER FROM THE '833 INVENTIONS	26
A. Qualcomm-037	26

	<u>Page</u>
B. Cho	30
C. Samsung-094.....	33
D. Qualcomm-269.....	34
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	36
VI. PETITIONER FAILS TO SHOW THAT THE COMBINATION DISCLOSES ALL ELEMENTS OF CHALLENGED CLAIMS.....	36
A. Petitioner has not shown that the combination discloses element 1.1 or 8.1	36
1. Petitioner has not shown that the combination discloses "first control signals"	37
2. Petitioner has not shown that the combination discloses "serially multiplexing" first control signals and data signals	40
3. Petitioner has not shown that the combination discloses the required relative placement of control signals and data signals in the multiplexed signals	44
B. The combination does not disclose element 1.2 or 8.2.....	47
C. The combination does not disclose element 1.3 or 8.3	48
D. The combination does not disclose element 1(d).....	52
VII. PETITIONER FAILS TO ANALYZE EACH INVENTION AS A WHOLE.....	53
A. Petitioner has not shown why a POSITA would have started with Qualcomm-037's sections 5.2.2.7 and 5.2.2.8.....	56
B. Petitioner has not shown why a POSITA would have modified Qualcomm-037's principle of operation in steps (a) and (b).....	58

Page

C. Petitioner has not shown why Qualcomm-037 or Cho teaches differential treatment of ACK/NACK signals and non-ACK/NACK control signals..... 67

D. Petitioner has not provided any analysis as to why a POSITA would have applied Samsung-094 in a system that operates on a different operating principle 67

E. Petitioner has not shown why a POSITA would have modified Qualcomm-269 to match the requirements on timing and puncturing positions 70

VIII. CONCLUSION..... 73

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	63
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB, March 20, 2020)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 832 F.3d 1355(Fed. Cir. 2016)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Daiichi Sankyo Co., Ltd. v. Matrix Laboratories, Ltd.</i> , 619 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	61
<i>DSS Technology Management, Inc. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 885 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	39
<i>E-One, Inc. v. Oshkosh Corp.</i> , IPR2019-00161, Paper 16, 6-9 (PTAB May15, 2019)	9
<i>Ecolochem, Inc. v. S. California Edison Co.</i> , 227 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	56
<i>Google LLC v. Uniloc 2017 LLC</i> , IPR2020-00115, Paper 8	12
<i>Intel Corporation v. VLSI Technology LLC</i> , IPR2020-00106, Paper 17, 10-11 (PTAB May 17, 2020)	10, 12
<i>Janssen Pharmaceutica N.V. v. Mylan Pharm., Inc.</i> , 456 F. Supp. 2d 644 (D.N.J. 2006), <i>aff'd</i> by 223 Fed. Appx. 999 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	57
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	53, 58
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	44, 66

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.