

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

QUALCOMM INCORPORATED and
ZYXEL COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION¹,

Petitioner,

v.

UNM RAINFOREST INNOVATIONS,

Patent Owner.

PTAB Case No. IPR2021-00375
Patent 8,265,096 B2

**REPLY IN SUPPORT OF
PATENT OWNER'S MOTION TO AMEND**

¹ ZyXEL Communications Corporation was joined as a petitioner in this proceeding based on a petition and motion for joinder filed in IPR2021-00734, which were granted.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	MOTION TO AMEND PILOT PROGRAM.....	2
III.	A REASONABLE NUMBER OF CLAIMS ARE AMENDED	2
IV.	THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT RESPONDS TO A GROUND OF UNPATENTABILITY INVOLVED IN THIS TRIAL	3
V.	THE PROPOSED CONTINGENT AMENDED CLAIMS DO NOT BROADEN CLAIM SCOPE.....	4
VI.	THE PROPOSED CONTINGENT AMENDED CLAIMS DO NOT INTRODUCE NEW MATTER AND ARE SUPPORTED BY THE ORIGINAL SPECIFICATION	4
A.	Proposed Contingent Amended Claim 44 (replacing claim 1)	5
B.	Proposed Contingent Amended Claim 45 (replacing claim 2)	18
C.	Proposed Contingent Amended Claim 46 (replacing claim 3)	18
D.	Proposed Contingent Amended Claim 47 (replacing claim 4)	19
E.	Proposed Contingent Amended Claim 49 (replacing claim 6)	19
F.	Proposed Contingent Amended Claim 50 (replacing claim 7)	20
VII.	THE PROPOSED CONTINGENT AMENDED CLAIMS ARE PATENTABLE.....	20
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 1023
35 U.S.C. § 1031, 3

Administrative Decisions

Lectrosonics, Inc. v. Zaxcom, Inc.,
IPR2018-01129, Paper 15 at 4-5 (PTAB Feb. 25, 2019) 2, 3, 21

Regulations

37 C.F.R § 42.1212, 3

I. INTRODUCTION

Patent Owner UNM Rainforest Innovations (hereinafter “UNM” or “Patent Owner”) respectfully submits this Reply In Support Of Patent Owner’s Motion to Amend (“Reply”) to request amendment of certain claims of U.S. Patent 8,265,096 B2 (EX1001, “’096 Patent”).

Petitioner asserts that claims 1-4 and 6-8 of the ’096 Patent are unpatentable on two grounds based solely on 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Ground 1 – Claims 1-4, 6, and 7 are unpatentable as obvious over *Talukdar* and *Li*.

Ground 2 – Claim 8 is unpatentable as obvious over *Talukdar* and *Nystrom*.

Patent Owner’s Motion to Amend requests amendment of independent claim 1 to provide further limitation and clarification of its claimed invention and reflect the proper scope of this claim considering the specification. Paper 37. Petitioner filed its Opposition thereto (Paper 41), and the Board issued its Preliminary Guidance (Paper 42). Patent Owner’s Motion to Amend is contingent upon a finding in a final written decision that the challenged claims are unpatentable. Specifically, Patent Owner requests the following contingencies:

- if Claim 1 is found unpatentable, substitute Proposed Amended Claim 44, and
 - substitute Proposed Amended Claim 45 for Claim 2,
 - substitute Proposed Amended Claim 46 for Claim 4,
 - substitute Proposed Amended Claim 47 for Claim 5,
 - substitute Proposed Amended Claim 48 for Claim 6, and
 - substitute Proposed Amended Claim 50 for Claim 7.

II. MOTION TO AMEND PILOT PROGRAM

Pursuant to 84 FR 9497, Patent Owner requested that this Motion to Amend be subject to the MTA Pilot Program. This IPR was instituted on July 19, 2021, (*see* Paper 14), and, therefore, it qualifies for the MTA Pilot Program effective on March 15, 2019. Patent Owner requested preliminary guidance from the Board on this Motion to Amend and now submits this Reply in Support of its Motion considering the Board’s Preliminary Guidance.

III. A REASONABLE NUMBER OF CLAIMS ARE AMENDED

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(a)(3), a motion to amend may propose a reasonable number of substitute claims for each challenged claim. Generally, it is presumed “that only one substitute claim would be needed to replace each challenged claim,” but that challenge may be rebutted by a showing of need. 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(a)(3); *Lectrosonics, Inc. v. Zaxcom, Inc.*, IPR2018-01129, Paper 15 at 4-5 (PTAB Feb. 25, 2019). Petitioners challenge independent claims 1 and 8, and dependent claims 2-4, 6, and 7. Patent Owner’s Motion proposes only one substitute claim for challenged independent claim 1. Dependent claims 2-4, 6, and 7 are amended only by virtue of depending from proposed amended independent claim 1. The Board agreed that the proposed number of substitute claims is reasonable and found that “Petitioner does not argue otherwise.” (Paper 42 at 5).

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.