

IPR2020-01265  
U.S. Patent No. 7,110,444  
PO's Preliminary Response

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

Intel Corporation  
Petitioner

v.

ParkerVision, Inc.  
Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 7,110,444  
Issue Date: September 19, 2006  
Title: WIRELESS LOCAL AREA NETWORK (WLAN) USING  
UNIVERSAL FREQUENCY TRANSLATION TECHNOLOGY  
INCLUDING MULTI-PHASE EMBODIMENTS AND  
CIRCUIT IMPLEMENTATIONS

---

*Inter Partes* Review No. IPR2020-01265

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR  
*INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF UNITED STATES PATENT NO. 7,110,444**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ..... iii

PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBIT LIST ..... iv

I. Introduction.....1

II. The Board Should Exercise its Discretion and Deny Institution Under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.108(b).....2

    A. Factor 1—The District Court Has Not Granted A Stay, And There Is No Evidence That The District Court Will Grant A Stay Even If A Proceeding Is Instituted .....4

    B. Factor 2—Because The Texas Cases Will Be Tried *Before* The Board's Projected Statutory Deadline For A Final Written Decision, The Board Should Deny Institution .....7

    C. Factor 3—The Parties And The Court Have Invested Significant Resources In The Texas Cases, Favoring Discretionary Denial.....8

    D. Factor 4—Significant Overlap Between Issues Raised In The Petition And In The Texas Cases Supports Denial.....12

    E. Factor 5—The Petitioner And The Defendant In The Parallel Proceeding Are The Same Party, Supporting Denial.....14

    F. Factor 6—Other Circumstances That Impact The Board's Exercise Of Discretion Show That Denial Is Appropriate At This Time .....15

III. Additional Grounds For Denying Institution .....16

    A. *Inter Partes* Review Should Not Be Instituted Because Of Constitutional Issues Under The Appointments Clause Of Article II 16

IV. Conclusion .....17

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 20, 2020) .....	1, 3, 11, 14
<i>Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith &amp; Nephew, Inc.</i> , 941 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2019) .....	17
<i>Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith &amp; Nephew, Inc.</i> , S.Ct. No. 19-1458 .....	16
<i>E-One, Inc. v. Oshkosh Corp.</i> , IPR2019-00161, Paper 16 (P.T.A.B. May 15, 2019) .....	8
<i>E-One</i> , IPR2019-00162, Paper 16 .....	11
<i>Fintiv</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 15 (March 20, 2020) .....	11, 13
<i>Google LLC v. Personalized Media Commc'ns, LLC</i> , IPR2020-00720, Paper 16 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 31, 2020) .....	3
<i>Google LLC, v. Uniloc 2017</i> , IPR2020-00115, Paper 8 .....	4, 11
<i>Intel Corp. v. VLSI Tech. LLC</i> , IPR2020-00106, Paper 17 (P.T.A.B. May 5, 2020) .....	8
<i>Intercollegiate Broad. Sys, Inc. v. Copyright Royalty Bd.</i> , 684 F.3d 1332 (D.C. Cir. 2012) .....	17
<i>Kerr Machine Co. d/b/a Kerr Pumps v. Vulcan Industrial Holdings, LLC</i> 6-20-cv-00200 (W.D. Tex. Aug. 2, 2020) .....	6, 7

IPR2020-1265 (Patent No. 7,110,444)  
PO's Preliminary Response

<i>Multimedia Content Mgmt. LLC v. Dish Network Corp.</i> , No. 6:18-CV-00207-ADA, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 198875 (W.D. Tex. Jan. 10, 2019).....	6, 7
<i>NetApp, Inc. v. Realtime Data LLC</i> , IPR2017-01195, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 12, 2017).....	7
<i>Next Caller, Inc. v. TrustID, Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00961, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 16, 2019).....	8, 13
<i>NHK Spring Co. v. Intri-Plex Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00752, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 12, 2018).....	3, 4
<i>Polaris Innovations Ltd. v. Kingston Tech. Co.</i> , S.Ct. No. 19-1459 ( <i>certiorari</i> granted October 13, 2020).....	16
<i>Smith &amp; Nephew, Inc. v. Arthrex, Inc.</i> , S.Ct. No. 19-1452 .....	15, 16
<i>Supercell Oy v. Gree, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00513, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. June 24, 2020) .....	12, 14
<i>Vizio, Inc. v. Polaris PowerLED Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2020-00043, Paper 30 (P.T.A.B. May 4, 2020) .....	13

## **Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 313 .....	1
35 U.S.C. § 314(a) .....	1, 2, 4
35 U.S.C. § 316(b) .....	4

IPR2020-1265 (Patent No. 7,110,444)  
PO's Preliminary Response

**PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBIT LIST**

<b>Exhibit No.</b>	<b>Description</b>
2001	Complaint, <i>ParkerVision Printing LLC v. Intel Corp.</i> , No. 1-20-cv-00108-ADA
2002	Complaint, <i>ParkerVision Printing LLC v. Intel Corp.</i> , No. 1-20-cv-00562-ADA
2003	Scheduling Order, <i>ParkerVision Printing LLC v. Intel Corp.</i> , No. 1-20-cv-00108-ADA
2004	Published Interview of Judge Albright, <i>IAM</i> (Apr. 7, 2020)
2005	Docket Order, <i>Kerr Machine Co. d/b/a Kerr Pumps v. Vulcan Industrial Holdings, LLC</i> , No. 6-20-cv-00200 (W.D. Tex. Aug. 2, 2020)
2006	Relevant Excerpts of Plaintiff's Preliminary Invalidation Contentions, filed in <i>ParkerVision Printing LLC v. Intel Corp.</i> , No. 1-20-cv-00108-ADA

# 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.