

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

VOLKSWAGEN GROUP OF AMERICA, INC.,
Petitioners,

v.

NEO WIRELESS, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2022-01539
Patent 10,965,512

PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE PETITION FAILS BECAUSE PETITIONER RELIES ON AN OVERSTATED LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART.	1
III. PETITIONER FAILS TO SHOW GROUND 1 RENDERS THE CLAIMS OBVIOUS (ALL CLAIMS).	5
A. Petitioner Fails To Show Ground 1 Discloses “Cell-Specific Pilots.”	5
1. “Cell-Specific Pilots” Require More Than The Prior Art Cell- Specific Pilot Patterns The Invention Improved Upon.....	6
2. Petitioner Fails To Show That Ground 1 Discloses “Cell- Specific Pilots.”	16
B. Petitioner Fails To Show That At Least Some Of The Claimed Subcarriers Are “Beam-Formed.”	22
1. Tong Discloses Adaptive Beamforming, Which Requires Advance Knowledge Of User’s Channel Condition.	23
2. Petitioner Fails To Show How Kim’s Initial Synchronization And Cell Search Pilots Can Implement Adaptive Beamforming.	27
IV. PETITIONER FAILS TO SHOW GROUND 2 RENDERS THE CLAIMS OBVIOUS (ALL CLAIMS).	32
A. Petitioner Fails To Show Ground 2 Discloses “Cell-Specific Pilots.”	33
1. Petitioner Fails To Show That Ketchum Discloses “Cell- Specific Pilots.”	33
2. Petitioner Fails To Show That Combination Of Ketchum And Li Discloses “Cell-Specific Pilots.”	41
B. Petitioner Fails To Show That The First And Second Claimed Subcarriers Are Transmitted “In At Least One Of The Time Slots.”	46

1.	The Claims Require At Least “One Of The Time Slots” That Contains “The First Plurality Of Subcarriers And The Second Plurality Of Subcarriers.”	48
2.	Petitioner Fails To Show That Its Ground 2 Discloses Transmitting The First And Second Subcarriers “In At Least One The Time Slot.”	51
V.	PETITIONER FAILS TO SHOW OBVIOUSNESS OF DEPENDENT CLAIMS FOR FURTHER REASONS.	59
A.	Petitioner Fails To Show Obviousness Of Claims 3, 10, 17, And 25 (Ground 1).	59
B.	Petitioner Fails To Show Obviousness Of Claim 5, 12, 21, And 29 (Ground 3).	60
VI.	CONCLUSION	62

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
COURT DECISIONS	
<i>In Re Abbott Diabetes Care Inc. ,</i> 696 F.3d 1142 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	14
<i>Choon's Design, LLC v. IdeaVillage Prods. Corp.,</i> 776 Fed App'x 691 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	15
<i>Comcast Cable Communs., LLC v. Promptu Sys. Corp.,</i> 838 Fed. Appx. 555 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	46
<i>Daiichi Sankyo Co., Ltd. v. Apotex, Inc.,</i> 501 F.3d 1254 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	3
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat'l Graphics, Inc.,</i> 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	59
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.,</i> 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	61
<i>Innova/Pure Water, Inc. v. Safari Water Filtration Sys.,</i> 381 F.3d 1111 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	51
<i>Irdeto Access, Inc. v. Echostar Satellite Corp.,</i> 383 F.3d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	15
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Blue Sky Med. Grp., Inc.,</i> 554 F.3d 1010 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	15
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.,</i> 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	44
<i>In Re Kotzab,</i> 217 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	47
<i>In Re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.,</i> 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	59
<i>Medrad, Inc. v. MRI Devices Corp.,</i> 401 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	52
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Enfish, LLC,</i> 662 Fed. Appx. 981 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	46

<i>Northern Telecom Ltd. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 215 F.3d 1281 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	49
<i>Polaris Indus., Inc. v. Arctic Cat, Inc.</i> , 882 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	47
<i>Suprema, Inc. v. ITC</i> , 742 F.3d 1350, 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2013) <i>vacated</i> , 796 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2015) (<i>en banc</i>), <i>reinstated in pertinent part</i> , 626 Fed. Appx. 273 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	43
<i>Tech. Licensing Corp. v. Videotek, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	59
<i>Wasica Finance GmbH v. Continental Automotive Sys., Inc.</i> , 853 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	59
<i>Wi-LAN, Inc. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 811 F.3d 455 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	13
<i>Wisconsin Alumni Res. Found. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 905 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	15

AGENCY DECISIONS

<i>Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. v. LG Elecs. Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01409, Paper 30 (PTAB Feb. 2, 2017)	59
<i>Celltrion, Inc. v. Biogen, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-016141, Paper 65 (PTAB Feb. 21, 2018)	47
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. et al. v. Oyster Optics, LLC</i> , IPR2017-01719, Paper 31 (PTAB Jan. 24, 2019).....	20, 48
<i>Dell Inc. v. NEO Wireless, LLC</i> , IPR2021-01468, Paper 12 (March 14, 2022)	2
<i>Dell Inc. v. NEO Wireless, LLC</i> , IPR2021-01480, Paper 11 (March 16, 2022)	2
<i>Dell Inc. v. NEO Wireless, LLC</i> , IPR2021-01486, Paper 10 (March 16, 2022)	2
<i>Dexcom, Inc. v. WaveForm Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2017-01051, Paper 48 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2018)	59
<i>Dionne v. Liotta</i> , Int. 104,333, Paper 119 (PTAB Oct. 31, 2001) (<i>per curiam</i>) (informative).....	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.