

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

DELL TECHNOLOGIES INC. AND DELL INC.,

Petitioners,

v.

XR COMMUNICATIONS LLC,

Patent Owner.

---

Case: IPR2022-01398

U.S. Patent No. 10,715,235

---

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW  
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. §42**

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
US Patent and Trademark Office  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**I. MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8.....1**

A. Real Party in Interest (37 C.F.R. §42.8(b)(1)) .....1

B. Related Matters (37 C.F.R. §42.8(b)(2)).....2

C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel (37 C.F.R. §42.8(b)(3)).....3

D. Service Information (37 C.F.R. §42.8(b)(4)) .....3

**II. Fees (37 C.F.R. §42.103).....3**

**III. REQUIREMENTS FOR IPR UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104 .....4**

A. Grounds for Standing .....4

B. Challenge and Relief Requested.....4

C. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art .....5

D. Claim Construction.....6

**IV. THE '235 PATENT .....6**

A. Brief Description .....6

B. Relevant History of the '235 Patent .....11

    1. Applicant’s Arguments During Prosecution .....11

    2. Applicant Failed to Establish a February 2002 Invention Date  
        .....13

    3. The Effective Filing Date is After November 4, 2002 .....17

**V. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE.....22**

A. GROUND 1: Claims 8–12 are obvious over Burke.....22

    1. Overview of Burke .....22

    2. Manner in which Burke Renders Claims 8–12 Obvious.....28

|             |  |           |
|-------------|--|-----------|
| B.          | GROUND 2: Claims 13 and 14 are obvious over Burke in view of Shull   | 50        |
| 1.          | Overview of Shull  | 50        |
| 2.          | Combination of Burke and Shull   | 51        |
| 3.          | Manner in which the Prior Art Renders Claims 13 and 14 Obvious   | 53        |
| <b>VI.</b>  | <b>PTAB DISCRETION SHOULD NOT PRECLUDE INSTITUTION</b>   | <b>61</b> |
| 1.          | Factor 1: Dell’s Requested Stay of the District Court Case   | 62        |
| 2.          | Factor 2: The FWD will likely issue before the Trial   | 62        |
| 3.          | Factor 3: Petitioners’ Diligence and Investment in IPR Outweighs the Parties’ Minimal Investment in Litigation | 64        |
| 4.          | Factor 4: The Petition’s Grounds are Materially Different from any that Might be Raised in Litigation          | 65        |
| 5.          | Factor 5: Parties  | 66        |
| 6.          | Factor 6: The Merits of this Petition Strongly Favor Institution   | 66        |
| <b>VII.</b> | <b>CONCLUSION</b>  | <b>67</b> |

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

|  | <b>Page(s)</b> |
|--|----------------|
| <b>Cases</b>   |                |
| <i>Aparator Miitors ApS v. Kamstrup A/S</i> ,<br>887 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....  | 13, 14         |
| <i>Apple Inc. and HP Inc. v. XR Communications LLC</i> ,<br>IPR2022-00367, Paper No. 10 (PTAB Jul. 14, 2022) .....                     | 61, 63, 65     |
| <i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> ,<br>IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2020) .....  | 61             |
| <i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> ,<br>IPR2020-00019, Paper 15 (PTAB May 13, 2020) .....   | 62             |
| <i>Chewey, Inc. v. Int’l Bus. Machs.</i> ,<br>IPR2021-00757, Paper 9, 14 (PTAB Oct. 12, 2021) .....                                    | 67             |
| <i>Cooper v. Goldfarb</i> ,<br>154 F. 3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....   | 13, 14         |
| <i>Dynamic Drinkware v. National Graphics</i> ,<br>800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....  | 4              |
| <i>Garmin Int’l v. Phillips North America LLC</i> ,<br>IPR2020-00910, Paper 8 (PTAB Nov. 19, 2020) .....                               | 66             |
| <i>Intuitive Surgical, Inc. v. Ethicon LLC</i> ,<br>IPR2018-01703, Paper 7 (PTAB. Feb. 19, 2019) .....                                 | 66             |
| <i>Mahurkar v. C.R. Bard, Inc.</i> ,<br>79 F.3d 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1996) .....  | 13             |
| <i>Perfect Surgical Techniques, Inc. v. Olympus Am., Inc.</i> ,<br>841 F.3d 1004 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....                                | 13             |
| <i>Sand Revolution II, LLC v. Continental Intermodal Group – Trucking<br/>LLC</i> , IPR2019-01393, Paper 24 (PTAB June 16, 2020) ..... | 65, 66         |
| <i>UMC Elecs. Co. v. United States</i> ,<br>816 F.2d 647, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1465 (Fed.Cir.1987) .....                                       | 16             |

*Wellman, Inc. v. Eastman Chem. Co.*,  
642 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....5

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) .....4  
35 U.S.C. § 102(e) .....4  
35 U.S.C. § 103 .....4, 12

**Other Authorities**

37 C.F.R. § 42.8 .....1  
37 C.F.R. § 42.104 .....3  
37 C.F.R. § 42.122 .....3

# 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.