

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 IPR2021-00428
Patent No. 8,624,550

**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	3
A. USB Hubs.....	4
B. USB Signal and Power Connections.....	5
C. Power Supply to USB Devices and Hubs	6
D. Enumeration to Establish Communication Between Host and Device.....	7
E. Single Ended 1 (“SE1”) Line State	8
III. Summary of the ’550 Patent	10
IV. Summary of the Asserted Prior Art.....	12
A. Morita	12
B. SE1 References.....	17
V. Skill Level of a POSITA	20
VI. The Board Should Deny the Petition under § 325(d).....	20
A. The Same or Substantially the Same Art and Arguments were Previously Presented to the Board.....	20
1. Theobald (for the theory based on allegedly supplying more than 500mA of current)	21
2. Dougherty and Rogers (for theories based on supplying more than 100mA of current without enumeration or using SE1 to indicate abnormal conditions).....	24
(a) Rogers-based petitions.....	25

(b)	Dougherty-based petitions	28
B.	Petitioner Does Not Assert that the Office Erred in a Manner Material to the Patentability of Challenged Claims	33
VII.	The Board Should Decline to Consider Incorporated-By-Reference Expert Testimony.....	34
VIII.	The Petition’s Translation of Morita Does Not Comply With Patent Office Rules	34
IX.	Ground 2 Is Moot.....	35
X.	There Is No Showing Of A Reasonable Likelihood Of Success To Prevail On At Least One Challenged Claims On Ground 1	35
A.	Petitioner Provides No Competent Evidence That the Proposed Combination Discloses All The Limitations.....	39
1.	Petitioner presents no competent evidence that Morita’s charger supplies more than the amount of current permitted by the USB specification.....	39
2.	Petitioner presents no competent evidence that Morita’s charger supplies more than 100mA of current without enumeration without regard to the USB specification	46
3.	Analysis of the other claims does not cure the above deficiencies.....	51
B.	Petitioner Provides No Competent Evidence That a POSITA Would Have Used SE1 In Morita’s System.....	52
1.	Petitioner’s Proposed Combination Would Render Morita Inoperable for Its Intended Purpose.....	52
2.	SE1 Does Not Afford A Predictable Solution	61
XI.	Conclusion	64

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, 33
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC,</i> IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (PTAB, Aug. 29, 2014).....	34
<i>In re Gordon,</i> 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	60
<i>Halliburton Energy Servs., Inc. v. Schlumberger Tech. Corp.,</i> IPR2017-01777, Paper 13, 3 (PTAB Jan. 31, 2018)	35
<i>Huawei Device Co., Ltd., Inc. v. Fundamental Innovation Systems Int’l LLC,</i> IPR2018-00472, Paper 12 (PTAB Aug. 3, 2018).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Huawei Device Co., Ltd. v. Fundamental Innovation Systems International LLC,</i> IPR2018-00465, Paper 11 (PTAB Aug. 20, 2018).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Huawei Device Co., Ltd. v. Fundamental Innovation Systems International LLC,</i> IPR2021-00485, Paper 8 (PTAB, Sept. 4, 2018).....	63
<i>LG Electronics, Inc. v. Fundamental Innovation Systems Int’l LLC,</i> IPR2018-00493, Paper 10 (PTAB Aug. 30, 2018).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>In re Ratti,</i> 270 F.2d 810 (CCPA 1959).....	54
<i>Systems Int’l, Inc.,</i> IPR2018-00495, Paper 10 (PTAB Aug. 9, 2018).....	62
<i>ZTE (USA) Inc. v. Fundamental Innovation Sys. Int’l LLC.</i> IPR2018-00111, Paper 62 (May 3, 2019).....	<i>passim</i>

Statutes

18 U.S.C. 100134
28 U.S.C. §174634
35 U.S.C. §253(a)35
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)20, 33, 35

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. §1.6834
37 C.F.R. §1.321(a).....35
37 C.F.R. §42.63(b)34
37 CFR 1.321(a).....35

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.