

Filed: August 25, 2023

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,  
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., and APPLE INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

SMART MOBILE TECHNOLOGIES LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2022-01004  
Patent 9,614,943

---

**PATENT OWNER'S SUR-REPLY**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	BYRNE GROUNDS .....	1
A.	Petitioner Fails to Prove Obviousness Based on Byrne .....	1
1.	Petitioner’s New Arguments Fail to Prove that Byrne Renders Obvious the Processor Limitations (Grounds 1A-1C).....	1
a.	Petitioner Fails to Prove that Byrne’s Microprocessor Processes the Alleged Data Streams.....	1
b.	Byrne’s Microprocessor Does Not Process Data Streams In Parallel.....	8
B.	Petitioner Fails To Show the Byrne-WO748 Combination Renders Obvious Claims 3-4 (Ground 1B).....	13
C.	There Is No Reasonable Expectation of Success in Combining Byrne and WO748.....	14
D.	There is No Reasonable Expectation of Success in Combining Byrne-Johnston and Pillekamp (Ground 1C).....	15
III.	GROUND II FAILS TO RENDER THE CLAIMS OBVIOUS .....	16
A.	Raleigh-Byrne Fails to Render the Processor Limitations Obvious.....	16
1.	Raleigh-Byrne Fails to Show Processing Data Streams in Parallel.....	16
2.	Raleigh’s Pre-Processor Fails to Meet the Claimed Processor Requirements.....	17
3.	Raleigh’s Signal Sequences Are Not Data Streams. ....	20
B.	There Is No Motivation to Combine Raleigh and Byrne.....	20

C.	There Is No Reasonable Expectation of Success in Combining Raleigh and Byrne .....	22
D.	The Raleigh-Byrne Combination Fails to Render Obvious Claims 6-7 (Ground 2A) .....	24
E.	There is No Reasonable Expectation of Success in Combining The Raleigh-Byrne-WO758 Combination .....	25
F.	There is No Reasonable Expectation of Success in Combining The Raleigh-Byrne-Pillekamp Combination.....	25
IV.	CONCLUSION.....	26

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### CASES

<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	22
<i>Allied Erecting &amp; Dismantling Co. v. Genesis Attachments, LLC</i> , 825 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	24
<i>Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	8
<i>Axonics, Inc. v. Medtronic, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00712, Paper 42 (PTAB Sept. 22, 2021).....	4, 9, 11, 16
<i>Eli Lilly v. Teva Pharms. Intn'l GmbH</i> , 8 F.4th 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2021).....	23, 24
<i>Elm 3DS Innovations, LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 925 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	15, 24
<i>Intelligent BioSystems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	4, 9, 11, 16
<i>Medtronic, Inc. v. Teleflex Innovations S.a.r.l.</i> , 69 F.4th 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2023) .....	22
<i>Micron Tech., Inc. v. Good Kaisha Ip Bridge 1</i> , IPR2020-01009, Paper 34 (PTAB Dec. 2, 2021) .....	25
<i>Realtime Data, LLC v. Iancu</i> , 912 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	19
<i>Salazar v. AT&amp;T Mobility LLC</i> , 64 F.4th 1311 (Fed. Cir. 2023) .....	17

### OTHER AUTHORITIES

Consolidated Trial Practice Guide (November 2019) .....	4, 9, 11, 16
---	--------------

## I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner's Reply attempts to rehabilitate the failures of its Petition with 31 new exhibits and a host of new arguments. These arguments are largely untimely and, in any event, wrong.

## II. BYRNE GROUNDS

### A. Petitioner Fails to Prove Obviousness Based on Byrne

#### 1. Petitioner's New Arguments Fail to Prove that Byrne Renders Obvious the Processor Limitations (Grounds 1A-1C)

##### a. Petitioner Fails to Prove that Byrne's Microprocessor Processes the Alleged Data Streams.

In the POR, Patent Owner showed that Byrne's microprocessor 210 controls transceivers 220/230 and audio switch 260, but does not receive or process data streams that are received by the antennas.

In its Reply, Petitioner argues that "a POSITA would have understood and found obvious that Byrne's microprocessor receives and processes data streams." Reply, 1-2. This general statement misses the point—according to Petitioner's theory as articulated in the Petition, the processor must receive and process the data streams *received by the antennas*. Petitioner then claims that its annotated version of Figure 2 "clearly shows Byrne's microprocessor receiving data from each of its cellular and cordless transceivers," but cites to nothing more than its supplemental

# 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.