

IPR2021-00990

U.S. Patent No. 7,110,444

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TCL Industries Holdings Co., Ltd., Hisense Co., Ltd., and LG Electronics Inc.,

Petitioners

v.

ParkerVision, Inc.

Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2021-00990

U.S. Patent No. 7,110,444

PATENT OWNER'S SUR-REPLY

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. “STORAGE ELEMENT.”	3
III. “NON-NEGLIGIBLE” AMOUNTS OF ENERGY.	8
IV. WHAT MR. SORRELLS ACTUALLY SAID.	10
V. PETITIONERS FAIL TO MEET THEIR BURDEN OF PROOF.....	12
VI. THE PRIOR ART DOES <i>NOT</i> DISCLOSE STORING “NON- NEGLIGIBLE” AMOUNTS OF ENERGY.....	15
A. Dr. Steer demonstrates that Tayloe capacitors store negligible energy.	15
B. Intel’s analysis in IPR2020-01265 was flawed.....	16
C. Dr. Steer’s testimony remains unrebutted.....	19
D. There is no estoppel.	20
VII. PETITIONERS’ ARGUMENT REGARDING LAM AND ENZ	23
A. A POSITA would not look to Enz to fill the gaps in Lam.	23
B. The voltage of Enz’s input is relevant.	24
C. Petitioners miss the point regard with to signal frequency.....	25
D. ParkerVision does not misconstrue claim 4.....	26
E. The operation of Enz’s op-amp is relevant.	27

Table of Authorities

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	2
<i>ParkerVision, Inc. v. Qualcomm Inc.</i> , 621 F. App’x 1009 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	10, 11, 12
<i>Parklane Hosiery Co. v. Shore</i> , 439 U.S. 322 (1979).....	22
<i>SynQor, Inc. v. Vicor Corp.</i> , 988 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2021).....	21
<i>TRUSTID, Inc. v. Next Caller Inc.</i> , 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 134010 (D. Del. July 6, 2021).....	21
<i>XY, LLC v. Trans Ova Genetics</i> , 890 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	21
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 318	21

I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioners have no evidence demonstrating that the cited references actually include capacitors that store “non-negligible” amounts of energy.¹ Instead, Petitioners engage in a handwaving exercise to distract from their fatal lack of evidence. Simply put, Petitioners do not meet their burden of proof.

The Petition has no discussion (implied or otherwise) as to whether capacitors in the cited references store “non-negligible” amounts of energy. On the other hand, ParkerVision’s Response provides an expert declaration explaining why the capacitors in the cited references hold only *negligible* amounts of energy. Tellingly, in their Reply, instead of providing expert rebuttal, Petitioners chose to rely on out-of-context testimony by one inventor of the ’444 patent and *attorney* interpretation of the cited references in view of that testimony. *This is not evidence.* Effectively, Petitioners are attempting to shift the burden to ParkerVision to prove that capacitors in the cited prior art do not store non-negligible amounts of energy.

¹ For Tayloe, Petitioners rely on the Board’s decision in IPR2020-01265, which only considered Intel’s conclusory and flawed position regarding “non-negligible” amounts of energy. But Petitioners have a burden on the record here in *this* proceeding and they cannot meet it by looking elsewhere to fill their evidentiary lapses.

This is improper. *See Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.*, 800 F.3d 1375, 1378 (Fed. Cir. 2015) (holding that the burden of proof never shifts to the patent owner.).

In particular, without any actual evidence to rely upon, Petitioners focus on an inventor’s prior statements, take these statements out-of-context, and try to apply them to the cited references.

At bottom, Petitioners seek a results-oriented approach – for the Board to simply adopt its prior decision regarding the ’444 patent from IPR2020-01265. But there is a *different* record before the Board here – issues that the Board did not consider or resolve in IPR2020-01265.

First, on June 21, 2022, the U.S. District Court for Western District of Texas (“Texas Court”) issued its Claim Construction Order in *ParkerVision Inc. v., LG Electronics, Inc.* *See* Ex.-2040.² Unlike the record before the Board in IPR2020-01265, the Texas Court has now provided a detailed analysis/explanation for its construction of “storage element.” *See id.* In doing so, the Texas Court specifically addresses the Board’s construction of “storage element” and explains why the language “energy transfer system” should be included in the construction.

² On June 27, 2022, the Board authorized the filing of Exhibit 2040.

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.