

Filed: May 26, 2020

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,

PETITIONER,

V.

BELL NORTHERN RESEARCH, LLC,

PATENT OWNER.

---

Case No. IPR2020-00611  
U.S. Patent No. 8,416,862

---

**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 '862 PATENT .....	2
	A. Development of the Claimed Inventions.....	2
	B. Description of the '862 Patent's Inventions.....	3
	C. Challenged Claims of the '862 Patent.....	8
III.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL .....	9
IV.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	10
	A. transmitter beamforming information .....	10
V.	STANDARD FOR GRANTING INTER PARTES REVIEW .....	12
VI.	THE <i>FINTIV</i> FACTORS SUPPORT DISCRETIONARY DENIAL UNDER § 314(A).....	12
	A. Factor 1: whether the court granted a stay or evidence exists that one may be granted if a proceeding is instituted.....	14
	B. Factor 2: proximity of the court's trial date to the Board's projected statutory deadline for a final written decision.....	16
	C. Factor 3: investment in the parallel proceeding by the court and the parties .....	18
	D. Factor 4: overlap between issues raised in the petition and in the parallel proceeding .....	22
	E. Factor 5: whether the petitioner and the defendant in the parallel proceeding are the same party.....	23
	F. Factor 6: other circumstances that impact the Board's exercise of discretion, including the merits.....	24

VII. PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO SHOW A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS FOR EACH CHALLENGED CLAIM .....	26
A. Ground 1: Claims 9, 11, 12 ( <i>Roh, Maltsev, and Haykin</i> ).....	28
1. Petitioner Has Failed to Prove a Motivation to Combine <i>Roh</i> with <i>Maltsev</i> and <i>Haykin</i> .....	28
a. Petitioner Has Failed to Identify a Permissible Reason a POSA Would Be Motivated to Combine <i>Roh</i> With <i>Maltsev</i> and <i>Haykin</i> .....	29
b. Petitioner Failed to Describe How a POSA Would Combine <i>Roh</i> with <i>Maltsev</i> and <i>Haykin</i> .....	34
2. The <i>Roh-Maltsev-Haykin</i> Combination Fails to Disclose the “Estimated” Channel Response and “Estimated Transmitter Beamforming Unitary Matrix ( <i>V</i> )” .....	36
B. Ground 3: Claims 9, 11, 12 ( <i>Lin, Maltsev, and Haykin</i> ).....	40
1. The <i>Lin-Haykin-Maltsev</i> Combination Fails to Disclose the Preamble-Related Limitations (9[d] and 9[e]).....	40
C. Grounds 2 and 4: Claim 10 ( <i>Roh / Lin, Maltsev, Haykin, and        Yang</i> ).....	44
1. Standard for Analogous Art.....	47
2. <i>Yang</i> Does Not Qualify as Analogous Art Under the “Same Field of Endeavor” Test. ....	49
3. <i>Yang</i> Does Not Qualify as Analogous Art Under the “Reasonably Pertinent to the Particular Problem with Which the Inventor is Involved” Test.....	50
VIII. THE PETITION DOES NOT ESTABLISH THAT <i>HAYKIN</i> AND <i>ROH</i> ARE PRIOR ART .....	52
A. Petitioner Has Not Met Its Burden to Show <i>Haykin</i> Was Publicly Available to Qualify as Prior Art.....	54

1.	The Board Should Refuse to Consider Petitioner’s Improperly-Incorporated Arguments Regarding <i>Haykin</i> .....	54
2.	Petitioner Cannot Meet its Burden that <i>Haykin</i> Qualifies As Printed Publication From Contradictory and Speculative Information.....	55
B.	Petitioner Has Not Met Its Burden to Show <i>Roh</i> Was Publicly Available to Qualify as Prior Art .....	60
1.	The Board Should Refuse to Consider Petitioner’s Improperly-Incorporated Arguments.....	60
2.	Petitioner Cannot Establish <i>Roh</i> as Printed Publication through Outdated and Inapposite Caselaw .....	62
IX.	CONCLUSION.....	64

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Align Tech., Inc. v. ClearCorrect Operating, LLC</i> , 745 F. App'x 361 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....	36
<i>Apple Inc. v. Contentguard Holdings, LLC</i> , IPR2015-00448, Paper 9 (PTAB July 10, 2015) .....	36, 55, 61
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2020).....	passim
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 15 (PTAB May 13, 2020).....	15, 17, 23, 24
<i>Apple Inc. v. Luxembourg S.A.</i> , IPR2017-02041, Paper 10 (PTAB Mar. 8, 2018) .....	28
<i>Blue Calypso, LLC v. Groupon, Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	53
<i>Cisco Systems, Inc. v. Ramot At Tel Aviv University Ltd.</i> , IPR2020-00122, Paper 15 (PTAB May 15, 2020).....	passim
<i>Coriant (USA) Inc. v. Oyster Optics, LLC</i> , IPR2018-00258, Paper 13 (PTAB June 6, 2018).....	63
<i>Huawei Device Co., Ltd. v. Maxell, Ltd.</i> , IPR2018-00246, Paper 8 (PTAB June 29, 2019).....	27, 34
<i>Hulu, LLC v. Sound View Innovations, LLC</i> , IPR2018-01039, Paper 29 (PTAB Dec. 20, 2019) .....	53, 62
<i>In re Bigio</i> , 381 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	47, 48, 52
<i>In re Clay</i> , 966 F.2d 656 (Fed. Cir. 1992).....	47, 48, 51
<i>In re Hall</i> , 781 F.2d 897 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	53

# 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.