

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 10,193,600

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,  
Petitioner

v.

TELEFONAKTIEBOLAGET LM ERICSSON,  
Patent Owner

**U.S. PATENT NO. 10,193,600**

Case IPR2021-TBD

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW  
UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 312 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.104**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	MANDATORY NOTICES .....	1
	A. Real Party-In-Interest .....	1
	B. Related Matters.....	1
	C. Counsel and Service Information.....	2
	D. 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4): Service Information.....	3
III.	PAYMENT OF FEES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.103 .....	3
IV.	CERTIFICATION OF GROUNDS FOR STANDING .....	3
V.	OVERVIEW OF CHALLENGE AND RELIEF REQUESTED.....	4
	A. Prior Art.....	4
	B. Relief Requested.....	5
VI.	OVERVIEW OF THE TECHNOLOGY .....	5
VII.	THE '600 PATENT.....	13
	A. Claims.....	13
	B. Summary of the Specification .....	13
	C. Summary of the Prosecution History .....	16
	D. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art .....	17
VIII.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	17
IX.	OVERVIEW OF THE PRIOR ART .....	17
	A. Novlan .....	17
	B. 36.213 .....	20
X.	SPECIFIC GROUNDS FOR PETITION.....	22

A.	Novlan, Or Alternatively Novlan In View Of 36.213, Renders Obvious All Challenged Claims.....	22
1.	Independent Claim 1 .....	22
2.	Dependent Claim 2.....	34
3.	Dependent Claim 3.....	35
4.	Dependent Claim 4.....	35
5.	Dependent Claim 5.....	39
6.	Dependent Claim 6.....	40
7.	Dependent Claim 7.....	43
8.	Independent Claim 8 .....	46
9.	Dependent Claim 9.....	49
10.	Dependent Claim 10 .....	49
11.	Dependent Claim 11 .....	49
12.	Dependent Claim 12 .....	50
13.	Dependent Claim 13 .....	50
14.	Dependent Claim 14 .....	51
15.	Independent Claim 15.....	51
16.	Dependent Claim 16 .....	53
17.	Dependent Claim 17 .....	54
18.	Dependent Claim 18 .....	54
19.	Dependent Claim 19 .....	54
20.	Dependent Claim 20 .....	55
21.	Dependent Claim 21 .....	55
22.	Independent Claim 22.....	56
23.	Dependent Claim 23 .....	58
24.	Dependent Claim 24 .....	58
25.	Dependent Claim 25 .....	58
26.	Dependent Claim 26 .....	59
27.	Dependent Claim 27 .....	59
28.	Dependent Claim 28 .....	60
XI.	SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS .....	60
XII.	PTAB DISCRETION SHOULD NOT PRECLUDE INSTITUTION.....	61
A.	The Advanced Bionics Test Favors Institution—§ 325(d).....	61
B.	The Fintiv Factors Favor Institution—§ 314(a).....	62

1.	The Petition’s Grounds Are Materially Different From Any That Might Possibly Be Raised In District Court.....	63
2.	Institution Will Enable Stay.....	63
3.	The Board’s Final Written Decision May Issue In Advance Of Trial .....	64
4.	Samsung’s Diligence And Investment In IPR Outweighs The Parties’ Investment In Litigation To Date .....	65
5.	The Petition Enables The Board To Resolve Invalidity Of Claims That Might Otherwise Be Reasserted.....	66
6.	Other Circumstances Support Institution.....	66
XIII. CONCLUSION.....		67

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Advanced Bionics, LLC v. Med-El Elektromedizinische Gerate GMBH,</i> IPR2019-01469, Paper 6 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 13, 2020).....	61, 62
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.,</i> IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 20, 2020).....	62, 63, 64, 66
<i>Apple Inc. v. Seven Networks, LLC,</i> IPR2020-00156, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. June 15, 2020) .....	65
<i>Ericsson Inc., et al. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., et al,</i> Case No. 2:20-cv-00380-JRG (E.D. Tex.) .....	2, 69
<i>Intuitive Surgical, Inc. v. Ethicon LLC,</i> IPR2018-01703, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 19, 2019).....	66
<i>Juniper Networks, Inc. et al. v. Packet Intelligence LLC,</i> IPR2020-00338, Paper 22 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 9, 2020).....	64
<i>NFC Tech. LLC v. HTC Am., Inc.,</i> No. 2:13-CV-1058-WCB, 2015 WL 1069111 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 11, 2015) .....	64
<i>Ormco Corp. v. Align Tech., Inc.,</i> 463 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	60
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.,</i> 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc) .....	17
<i>Sand Revolution II, LLC v. Continental Intermodal Group–Trucking LLC,</i> IPR2019-01393, Paper 24 (P.T.A.B. Jun. 16, 2020) .....	63, 64
<i>Snap, Inc. v. SRK Tech. LLC,</i> IPR2020-00820, Paper 15 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 21, 2020).....	63, 65, 66

# 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.