

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 IPR2022-01248
Patent 8,842,653

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. AS THE BOARD HAS THRICE FOUND, PETITIONER FAILS TO PROVE ITS COMBINATIONS DISCLOSE OR RENDER OBVIOUS “MULTIPLEXED” “SIGNALS” (CLAIMS 1-13, 27-30; GROUNDS 1B, 1D).	1
A. The Board Correctly Found That Petitioner’s Grounds Do Not Disclose Or Render Obvious “Multiplexed” “Signals” In Three Separate Cases.	2
B. Petitioner Fails To Show That Yegoshin Discloses Or Renders Obvious The Claimed “Multiplexed” “Signals.”	3
1. As The Board Correctly Found, Petitioner Fails To Meet Its Burden To Show Inherency Or Single Reference Obviousness.	5
2. As The Board Correctly Found, Yegoshin Does Not Teach “Simultaneously” Using Cellular And WLAN Signals Or Otherwise Disclose “Multiplexing.”	8
3. Petitioner Does Not Demonstrate That Yegoshin Multiplexes Under Any Construction, Including Petitioner’s District Court Construction.	12
C. Petitioner Fails To Show That The Combination Of Yegoshin And Bernard Renders Obvious The Claimed “Multiplexed” Signals.	16
1. Petitioner Does Not Prove That Bernard Discloses The Claimed “Multiplexing.”	17
2. Petitioner Fails To Prove A POSITA Would Be Motivated To Modify Yegoshin/Johnston/ Billström In View Of Bernard To Satisfy The Claimed “Multiplexing.”	27

a.	A POSITA Would Not Be Motivated To Connect Yegoshin’s Cell Phone To Bernard’s Cradle To Disclose The Claims.....	27
b.	A POSITA Would Not Be Motivated To Add An Artificial Bottleneck Inside Yegoshin’s Mobile Phone.	32
III.	PETITIONER FAILS TO PROVE ITS COMBINATION DISCLOSES “COMBIN[ING] DATA PATHS INTO A SINGLE TRANSMISSION INTERFACE TO ONE OR MORE APPLICATIONS” (CLAIMS 17-21, 23-26; GROUND 1B).....	37
IV.	PETITIONER FAILS TO PROVE ITS COMBINATIONS DISCLOSE OR RENDER OBVIOUS MULTIPLE IP ADDRESSES OR INTERFACES (CLAIMS 1-13, 14-16; GROUNDS 1A, 1B, 1C).....	47
A.	Petitioner Fails To Explain How Yegoshin’s Device Would Use Two IP Addresses.....	50
B.	Modifying Yegoshin To Implement Billström’s Cellular Network Would Have Been Beyond The Skill Of A POSITA.....	54
V.	PETITIONER FAILS TO SHOW “TWO NETWORK PATHS” CONNECTED TO THE SAME “SERVER” (CLAIMS 27-30; GROUND 1E).	60
VI.	PETITIONER ADDITIONALLY FAILS TO SHOW THAT MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIMS ARE DISCLOSED OR RENDERED OBVIOUS (CLAIMS 2, 9, 10, 21, AND 26; GROUNDS 1B AND 1D).....	63
A.	Claim 2	63
B.	Claim 9	64
C.	Claim 10	65
D.	Claims 21, 26.....	66
VII.	CONCLUSION	66

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

COURT DECISIONS

Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple, Inc.,
832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016)7

ATD Corp. v. Lydall, Inc.,
159 F.3d 534 (Fed. Cir. 1998)37

Cheese Sys. v. Tetra Pak Cheese & Powder Sys.,
725 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2013)37

DSS Tech. Mgm't v. Apple Inc.,
885 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2018)7

Ecolochem, Inc. v. S. Cal. Edison Co.,
227 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2000)36

Eli Lilly & Co. v. Teva Pharms. Int'l GmbH,
8 F.4th 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2021)56

Intelligent Bio-Sys, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge, Ltd.,
821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016)3

K/S HIMPP v. Hear-Wear Techs., LLC,
751 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2014)7

Monarch Knitting Mach. Corp. v. Sulzer Morat GmbH,
139 F.3d 877 (Fed. Cir. 1998)37

PAR Pharm. v. TWi Pharms., Inc.,
773 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2014)5

Southwire Co. v. Cerro Wire LLC,
870 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2017)5

Trintec Indus., Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.,
295 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2002)5

TriVascular, Inc. v. Samuels,
812 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2016)3

AGENCY DECISIONS

Acclarent, Inc. v. Albritton,
IPR2018-00268, Paper 12 (Jan. 31, 2019).....53

Alcon Inc. v. AMO Dev., LLC,
IPR2021-00853, Paper 48 (Dec. 2, 2022)53

Broadcom Ltd. v. Tessera Advanced Techs., Inc.,
IPR2017-00736, Paper 8 (July 27, 2017)6

Canon, Inc. v. WSOU Invests., LLC,
IPR2022-01532, Paper 14 (Apr. 14, 2023).....53

IBM Corp. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC,
IPR2014-00682, Paper 11 (Oct. 30, 2014)6

Norman Int’l, Inc. v. Hunter Douglas, Inc.,
IPR2014-00282, Paper 8, (June 20, 2014).....31

R.J. Reynolds Vapor Co. v. Fontem Holdings I B.V.,
IPR2016-01692, Paper 45 (Mar. 2, 2018)31

Samsung Elecs. Co. Ltd. v. KAIST IP US LLC,
IPR2017-01046, Paper 12 (Oct. 2, 2017)53

Samsung Elecs. Co. Ltd. v. KAIST IP US LLC,
IPR2017-01046, Paper 14 (Jan. 22, 2018).....53

Xerox Corp. v. Bytemark, Inc.,
IPR2022-00624, Paper 9 (Aug. 24, 2022)
(precedential)14

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.