

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.

---

IPR2022-01004  
Patent 9,614,943 B1

---

Record of Oral Hearing  
Held: September 15, 2023

Before HYUN J. JUNG, NATHAN A. ENGELS, and  
PAUL J. KORNICZKY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

IPR2022-01004  
Patent 9,614,943 B1

APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:

JEREMY J. MONALDO, ESQ.  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1000 Maine Ave SW  
Washington, D.C. 20024

ON BEHALF OF THE PATENT OWNER:

PHILIP J. GRAVES, ESQ.  
Graves & Shaw LLP  
355 S. Grand Ave, Suite 2450  
Los Angeles, CA 90071

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Friday, September 15, 2023, commencing at 12:58 p.m., via video teleconference.

P R O C E E D I N G S

- - - - -

JUDGE JUNG: Hello. This is Judge Jung, and with me are Judge Engels and Judge Korniczky. This is the oral hearing for IPR2022-01004. In this proceeding, Petitioners Samsung and Apple challenge Claims 1 through 9 and 12 through 20 of U.S. Patent No. 9,614,943, or the '943 Patent. The '943 Patent is owned by Smart Mobile Technologies, LLC.

Starting with Petitioner's counsel and followed by Patent Owner's counsel, please state your names for the record.

MR. MONALDO: Thank you, Your Honor. This is Jeremy Monaldo for Petitioner, Samsung. I'm joined by my colleagues Karl Renner and Sangki Park. Clint Wilkins is participating from the Haynes and Boones Firm, and Philip Lee from Samsung is joined on the public line.

JUDGE JUNG: Thank you, Mr. Monaldo.

MR. GRAVES: Philip Graves for Patent Owner, Smart Mobile Technologies, LLC. I'm joined today by my colleagues, Greer Shaw and Rex Hwang.

JUDGE JUNG: Thank you, Mr. Graves. A few quick reminders for this hearing, same as the others. First, if you encounter any technical difficulties, please let us know immediately, even if you have to interrupt. Second, if you're not speaking, please mute yourself. Third, please identify yourself each time you speak, to help make the transcript clear. Fourth, when you refer to demonstratives, papers, or exhibits, do so by slide or page number. And lastly, I have been told that there is a public connection.

As we described in the hearing order, each party has 60 minutes of total time to present its arguments, and each party may reserve time for

1 rebuttal. I will again track time, interrupt you -- and interrupt you when you  
2 only have a few minutes remaining. But also, as described in the oral  
3 hearing order, we will proceed first with 1004, and then take a short break,  
4 and then move on to 1005. With all that said, Mr. Monaldo, you may  
5 proceed when you're ready.

6 MR. MONALDO: Thank you, Your Honor. And for  
7 housekeeping, I'm hoping to reserve about 20 minutes for rebuttal.

8 JUDGE JUNG: Okay, 20 minutes. Thank you.

9 MR. MONALDO: All right. Great. Thank you, Your Honors,  
10 and may it please the Board. Unless there are any questions at the outset,  
11 my plan is to jump right into the first issue, related to the processing of data  
12 streams in the Byrne reference. Moving to our demonstrative slide 14, on  
13 slide 14 you see the only limitation in the independent claims that Patent  
14 Owner contends is missing from the prior art. As shown by the highlighting  
15 added on slide 14, that limitation recites a processor that is configured to  
16 process a first data stream and a second data stream in parallel.

17 Patent Owner makes two arguments for why it contends this  
18 limitation is missing from the Byrne reference. Patent Owner's first  
19 argument is that Byrne's microprocessor does not process data  
20 (INDISCERNIBLE). Patent Owner's second argument is that even if  
21 Byrne's microprocessor processes data, it does not process two data streams  
22 in parallel.

23 I'll start with the first argument and discuss why a person of  
24 ordinary skill in the art would have understood and found obvious that  
25 Byrne's microprocessor processes data. Moving to slide 15, at the left side  
26 of slide 15 you'll see Byrne's system depicted in figure 2. As shown, Byrne

1 describes a dual mode telephone that operates as both a cordless telephone  
2 and a cellular telephone. The cordless components of Byrne's system are  
3 shown at the left side of Byrne's figure 2, and highlighted in yellow. The  
4 cellular components of Byrne's system are shown at the right side of  
5 Byrne's figure 2, and highlighted in blue. In the center of Byrne's figure 2,  
6 and highlighted in green, you see Byrne's microprocessor.

7           Now, Patent Owner does not dispute that Byrne's phone processes  
8 a first data stream, the cordless data stream, or that Byrne's phone processes  
9 a second data stream, the cellular data stream. What Patent Owner contends  
10 is that the processing of these two data streams in Byrne is performed by  
11 some other component, not Byrne's processor. That contention does not  
12 accord with Byrne's disclosure, or how a person of ordinary skill in the art  
13 would have interpreted Byrne's figure 2.

14           As shown by the yellow highlighting, Byrne's figure 2 quite  
15 clearly depicts a double-sided arrow between the processor and the cordless  
16 transceiver. As shown by the blue highlighting, Byrne's figure 2 quite  
17 clearly depicts a similar double-sided arrow between the processor and the  
18 cellular transceiver. These arrows demonstrate that communications are  
19 flowing back and forth between the processor and the transceiver in Byrne's  
20 phone. And we know that Byrne's phone is processing data streams  
21 transmitted and received by each of these receivers.

22           As Dr. Jensen explained, the most natural and obvious place where  
23 this processing occurs is at the component in Byrne's figure 2 that is  
24 connected to the transceivers, and that is designed for processing, Byrne's  
25 processor. From this disclosure alone, a person of skill would have  
26 considered Byrne's processor as the component in Byrne's phone that

# 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.