

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TCT MOBILE (US), INC.; TCT MOBILE (US) HOLDINGS, INC.;
HUIZHOU TCL MOBILE COMMUNICATION CO. LTD.; AND
TCL COMMUNICATION, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

FUNDAMENTAL INNOVATION SYSTEMS INTERNATIONAL LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2021-00395
Patent No. 7,239,111

**FUNDAMENTAL INNOVATION SYSTEMS INTERNATIONAL LLC's
PATENT OWNER 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. Background on the USB Communication Protocol	2
A. USB Hubs.....	3
B. USB Signal and Power Connections.....	4
C. Power Supply to USB Devices and Hubs	5
D. Single Ended 1 (“SE1”) Line State	6
III. Summary of the ’111 Patent	9
IV. Summary of the Asserted Prior Art.....	10
A. Morita	10
B. SE1 References.....	15
V. Skill Level of a POSITA	18
VI. Claim Construction.....	18
VII. The Board Should Deny the Petition under §325(d).....	20
A. Prosecution History Justifies Discretionary Denial Under §325(d)	20
B. The Prior IPR Proceedings Justify Discretionary Denial Under §325(d)	23
1. The Same or Substantially the Same Art and Arguments were Previously Presented to the Board	23
2. Petitioner Fails to Demonstrate that the Office Erred in a Manner Material to the Patentability of Challenged Claims	28

	<u>Page</u>
VIII. The Board Should Decline to Consider Incorporated-By-Reference Expert Testimony.....	28
IX. The Petition’s Translation of Morita Does Not Comply With Patent Office Rules.....	29
X. Petitioner Has Not Shown A Reasonable Likelihood Of Success To Prevail On At Least One Challenged Claims.....	30
A. Petitioner Provides No Competent Evidence That the Proposed Combination Discloses A Claimed Identification Signal.....	35
1. Because Morita’s mobile phone receives energy from a USB hub-controllable charger, any identification signal generated by the charger would indicate to the mobile phone that it is connected to a USB hub or host.....	35
2. The prior art does not teach using SE1 as a recited “identification signal” for identifying a power source type to a USB device.....	41
B. Petitioner Provides No Competent Evidence That a POSITA Would Have Used SE1 In Morita’s System.....	46
1. Petitioner’s Proposed Combination Would Render Morita Inoperable for Its Intended Purpose.....	46
2. Contrary to Petitioner’s assumption, Morita’s USB port 21 is a high-powered port even when a PC is connected and USB already has commands for identifying this capacity.....	54
3. Morita’s Hub-Controllable Charger 110 Operates As A USB Hub And Would Not Generate A Signal That Misidentifies Itself As “Not A USB Host Or Hub”.....	60
4. Petitioner Does Not Explain Why A POSITA Would Use The Forbidden SE1 Signal In A USB System Or	

Page

How Problems Arising From Its Use Could Be
Addressed..... 62

XI. Conclusion 65

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Advanced Bionics, LLC v. MED-EL Elektromedizinische Gerate GmbH,</i> Case No. IPR2019-01469, Paper 6 (February 13, 2020).....	20, 28
<i>Arendi SARL v. Apple Inc.,</i> 832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	43
<i>Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC,</i> 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	54
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC,</i> IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (PTAB, Aug. 29, 2014).....	29
<i>In re Gordon,</i> 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	53
<i>Huawei Device Co., Ltd. v. Fundamental Innovation Systems International LLC,</i> IPR2021-00485, Paper 8 (PTAB, Sept. 4, 2018).....	64
<i>LG Electronics, Inc. v. Fundamental Innovation Systems Int’l LLC,</i> IPR2018-00495, Paper 10 (PTAB Aug. 9, 2018).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>LG Electronics, Inc. v. Fundamental Innovation Systems Int’l LLC,</i> IPR2018-00508, Paper 10 (PTAB Sept. 5, 2018).....	26, 53
<i>South-Tek Sys., LLC v. Engineered Corrosion Solutions, LLC,</i> 748 Fed. Appx. 1003 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	59
<i>W. L. Gore & Assocs., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.,</i> 721 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	45, 62
Statutes	
18 U.S.C. 1001	29
28 U.S.C. §1746.....	29

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.