

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

TELEFONAKTIEBOLAGET LM ERICSSON,
Patent Owner

IPR2022-00337
U.S. Patent No. 10,454,655

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Summary of Arguments3

II. Summary of the '655 Patent.....5

III. Definition of POSITA.....8

IV. Claim Construction.....8

V. Petitioner’s Grounds 1A and 1B Fail Because Bao Alone (Ground 1A), and Combined with Feuersanger (Ground 1B), Do Not Render Obvious Claims 1-40...9

 A. Summary of Bao.....9

 B. Summary of Feuersanger.....10

 C. Bao Alone (Ground 1A), and Combined with Feuersanger (Ground 1B), Do Not Render Obvious Claims 21-40.12

 1. Bao alone does not render obvious the claimed requirement for first and second LCIDs associated with first and second MAC CE formats with first and second bit map sizes, respectively (claim elements [21b], [26d], [31b], and [36d]).....12

 a. Bao is consistent across all embodiments that there is one specific LCID associated with the activation/deactivation MAC CE.....13

 b. The cited portion of Bao already teaches a solution to indicate the length of a MAC CE – that does not involve using different LCIDs.....14

 c. It would not have been obvious to use different LCIDs for different length MAC CEs of the component carrier “activation/deactivation” type..16

 d. The cited portion of Bao does not disclose using “activation/deactivation” MAC CEs with bit maps of different sizes.18

 2. Feuersanger does not overcome the deficiencies of Bao with respect to rendering obvious first and second LCIDs associated with first and second MAC CE formats with first and second bit map sizes, respectively (claim elements [21b], [26d], [31b], and [36d]).....20

 3. For similar reasons, neither Bao alone, nor Bao combined with Feuersanger, renders obvious claim elements [21e] and [26g].23

 D. Petitioner’s Alleged Motivation to Combine Bao and Feuersanger is Misleading and Irrelevant to Any Claim Limitation.....24

 E. Petitioner’s Analysis of Independent Claims 1, 7, 13, and 17 Lacks Particularity and is Defective.26

F. Summary28

VI. Petitioner’s Ground 2 Fails Because Kwon Does Not Render Obvious
Claims 1-40.29

A. Summary of Kwon29

B. Kwon Fails to Render Obvious Claims 21-40.....31

1. Kwon does not disclose or render obvious the claimed requirement for
first and second LCIDs associated with first and second MAC CE formats with
first and second bit map sizes, respectively (claim elements [21b], [26d],
[31b], and [36d]).31

a. LCID is used in Kwon only to identify a MAC CE as an
activation/deactivation indicator MAC CE, not to indicate a bit map length.
33

b. Petitioner’s focus on other types of LCIDs contradicts its position.36

c. Kwon consistently teaches that a wireless communication system uses
a fixed-size bit map based on a maximum number of component carriers...37

d. Summary – Kwon does not disclose or render obvious first and second
LCIDs associated with first and second MAC CE formats with first and
second bit map sizes, respectively39

2. For similar reasons, Kwon does not render obvious claim elements [21e],
[26g]40

C. Petitioner’s Analysis of Claims 1, 7, 13, and 17 Lacks Particularity and Is
Defective.....43

VII. Even Setting Aside the Merits, The Board Should Use Discretion to Deny
Ground 2 Based on 35 U.S.C. 325(d).45

VIII. Conclusions46

PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBIT LIST

Ex. 2001	Declaration of Dr. Zygmunt Haas, Ph.D.
Ex. 2002	Curriculum Vitae of Dr. Zygmunt Haas

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Advanced Bionics, LLC v. MED-EL Elektromedizinische Geräte GmbH, IPR2019-01469, Paper 645
Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC, 805 F.3d 1064 17, 24
Cisco Systems, Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC, IPR2014-00454, Paper 1227
DeSilva v. DiLeonardi, 181 F.3d 865 27, 28, 43
Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat'l Graphics, Inc., 800 F.3d 1375.....13
Grain Processing Corp. v. American Maize-Products, 840 F. 2d 902.....40
In re Hedges, 783 F.2d 1038.....16
Unified Patents, LLC v. Ikorongo Tech. LLC et al., IPR2020-01379, Paper 2127
Vivid Techs., Inc. v. Am. Sci. & Eng'g, Inc., 200 F.3d 795, 803 (Fed. Cir. 1999)9

Statutes

§ 314(a)4
 37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a).....36

Other Authorities

H.R. Rep. No. 112–98, pt. 1, at 40 (2011).....4

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.