

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 PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
<b>I. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED FOR PETITIONER’S FAILURE TO DISCLOSE OR APPLY ITS DISTRICT COURT CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS (ALL CLAIMS, ALL GROUNDS).....</b>	<b>4</b>
A. Petitioner’s District Court And IPR Claim Construction Positions Are Inconsistent And Petitioner Fails To Show The Proposed District Court Constructions Are Met. ....	5
B. 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) Was Intended To Preclude A Petitioner From Taking Inconsistent Claim Constructions. ....	10
<b>III. PETITIONER FAILS TO SHOW OBVIOUSNESS OVER ITS COMBINATIONS (ALL CLAIMS, ALL GROUNDS). ....</b>	<b>17</b>
A. Petitioner Fails To Prove Its Combinations Disclose Or Render Obvious “Multiplexed” “Signals” (Claims 1, 27; Grounds 1B, 1D).....	18
1. Petitioner Misstates Yegoshin’s Teachings And Fails To Substantiate The Alleged Motivation To Combine. ....	21
2. Petitioner Fails To Show That Bernard Teaches “Multiplexed” “Signals” Under Either Its Own Or Patent Owner’s Proposed District Court Claim Constructions.....	27
3. Petitioner Fails To Prove That The POSITA Would Be Motivated To Combine Yegoshin And Bernard As Proposed.....	33
B. The Petition Fails To Prove That Its Combinations Disclose Or Render Obvious “Combin[ing] The Data Paths Into A Single Transmission Interface To One Or More Applications” (Claim 17; Grounds 1C). ....	43

- C. Petitioner Fails To Prove Its Combinations Disclose Or Render Obvious “The First Wireless Component Is Accessible On A First IP Address And The Second Wireless Transmit And Receive Component Is Accessible On A Second IP Address” Or “A Plurality Of IP Enabled Interfaces” (Claims 1, 14; Grounds 1A, 1B, 1C). .....44
  - 1. Petitioner Fails To Explain How The POSITA Would Associate A Second IP Address With Yegoshin’s Phone. ....46
  - 2. The Combination As Proposed Would Not Meet The Claims Because Only Yegoshin’s Second (IP/LAN) Communication Interface Would Be Accessible On The IP Addresses. ....50
- D. The Petition Fails To Present A Rationale For The POSITA To Combine All The References Together To Meet The Claims. ....54
- IV. CONCLUSION.....63**

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page(s)**

**COURT DECISIONS**

*In re Anova Hearing Labs, Inc.*,  
809 Fed. App'x. 840 (Fed Cir. 2020) .....55

*ATD Corp. v. Lydall, Inc.*,  
159 F.3d 534 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....42

*Cheese Sys. v. Tetra Pak Cheese & Powder Sys.*,  
725 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2013) ..... 42, 62

*In re DataTreasury Corp.*,  
669 F. App'x 574 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....59

*Ecolochem, Inc. v. S. Cal. Edison Co.*,  
227 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....42

*Fid. Fed. Sav. & Loan Ass'n v. de la Cuesta*,  
458 U.S. 141 (1982).....14

*Gen. Elec. Co. v. Raytheon Techs. Corp.*,  
983 F.3d 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2020) .....55

*Halo v. Yale Health Plan*,  
819 F.3d 42 (2nd Cir. 2016) .....14

*In re Kahn*,  
441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....23

*Kim v. ConAgra Foods, Inc.*,  
465 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....8

*KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*,  
550 U.S. 398 (2007).....23

*In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.*,  
829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....23

*In re Medicis Pharm. Corp.*,  
356 F. App'x 411 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....59

*Monarch Knitting Mach. Corp. v. Sulzer Morat GmbH*,  
139 F.3d 877 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....42

*Prime Datum, Inc. v. Baldor Elec. Co.*,  
670 Fed. App'x. 702 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....57

*Ruiz v. A.B. Chance Co.*,  
357 F.3d 1270 (Fed. Cir. 2004) ..... 42, 63

*In re Schweickert*,  
676 F. App'x 988 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....60

**AGENCY DECISIONS**

*Baldor Elec. Co. v. Prime Datum, Inc.*,  
Appeal 2014-001464, Inter Partes Reexam. 95/002,286,  
Decision On Appeal (PTAB June 29, 2015) .....57

*Belvac Prod. Mach., Inc. v. Crown Packaging Tech.*,  
IPR2019-01076, Paper 9 (Oct. 29, 2019) .....23

*Carefusion Corp. v. Baxter Int'l, Inc.*,  
IPR2016-01456, Paper 9 (Feb. 6, 2017) .....11

*Ex Parte Evans*,  
2017 Pat. App. LEXIS 7272 (PTAB Aug. 1, 2017) .....60

*Ford Motor Co. v. Mass. Inst. Tech.*,  
IPR2020-00010, Paper 9 (Mar. 26, 2020) .....16

*Google Inc. v. Koninklijke Philips N.V.*,  
IPR2017-00409, Paper 10 (June 5, 2017).....24

# 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.