

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

MERCEDES-BENZ USA, LLC,  
Petitioner,

v.

NEO WIRELESS, LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2023-00079  
Patent 10,965,512

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. THE PETITION FAILS TO ADDRESS INCONSISTENT DISTRICT COURT CLAIM CONSTRUCTION POSITIONS. ....	6
A. In The Co-Pending Court Proceedings, The Accused Infringers, Including Petitioner, Agreed To A Joint Construction Process. ....	7
B. Proposed Constructions.....	8
III. PETITIONER FAILS TO SHOW GROUND 1 RENDERS THE CLAIMS OBVIOUS.....	9
A. Petitioner Fails To Show Ground 1 Discloses “Cell-Specific Pilots.” .....	10
B. Petitioner Fails To Show That At Least Some Of The Claimed Subcarriers Are “Beam-Formed.” .....	18
IV. PETITIONER FAILS TO SHOW GROUND 2 RENDERS THE CLAIMS OBVIOUS.....	24
A. Petitioner Fails To Show Ground 2 Discloses “Cell-Specific Pilots.” .....	26
1. Petitioner Fails To Show That Ketchum Alone Discloses “Cell-Specific Pilots.” .....	26
2. Petitioner Fails To Show That Combination Of Ketchum And Li Discloses “Cell-Specific Pilots.” .....	30
B. Petitioner Fails To Show That The Plurality Of First And Second Claimed Subcarriers Are Both Transmitted “In At Least One Of The Time Slots.”.....	36
V. CONCLUSION.....	46

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
<b>COURT DECISIONS</b>	
<i>Comcast Cable Communs., LLC v. Promptu Sys. Corp.</i> , 838 F. App'x 551 (Fed. Cir. 2021) .....	34
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat'l Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	40
<i>Innova/Pure Water, Inc. v. Safari Water Filtration Sys.</i> , 381 F.3d 1111 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	29, 37
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith &amp; Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	32
<i>In re Kotzab</i> , 217 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	35
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	40
<i>Medrad, Inc. v. MRI Devices Corp.</i> , 401 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	37
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Enfish, LLC</i> , 662 F. App'x 981 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	34
<i>Northern Telecom Ltd. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 215 F.3d 1281 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	36
<i>Polaris Indus., Inc. v. Arctic Cat, Inc.</i> , 882 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2018) .....	35
<i>Suprema, Inc. v. ITC</i> , 742 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2013) <i>vacated</i> , 796 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2015) ( <i>en banc</i> ), <i>and reinstated in pertinent part</i> , 626 Fed. Appx. 273 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	31
<i>Tech. Licensing Corp. v. Videotek, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	40
<i>Vivid Techs., Inc. v. American Science &amp; Eng'g, Inc.</i> , 200 F.3d 795 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....	9

**AGENCY DECISIONS**

*Celltrion, Inc. v. Biogen, Inc.*,  
IPR2016-016141, Paper 65 (PTAB Feb. 21, 2018).....35

*Cisco Sys., Inc. et al. v. Oyster Optics, LLC*,  
IPR2017-01719, Paper 31 (PTAB Jan. 24, 2019) ..... 18, 38, 45

*Facebook, Inc. v. Uniloc USA, Inc.*,  
IPR2017-01524, Paper 7 (Dec. 4, 2017).....39

*Heart Failure Techs., LLC v. Cardiokinetix, Inc.*,  
IPR2013-00183, Paper 12 (Jul. 31, 2013) .....34

*Paypal, Inc. v. IOENGINE, LLC*,  
IPR2019-00906, Paper 16 (Oct. 29, 2019) .....32

*Samsung Elecs. Co. Ltd. v. KAIST IP US LLC*,  
IPR2017-01046, Paper 12 (Oct. 2, 2017) ..... 24, 35

*Samsung Elecs. Co. Ltd. v. KAIST IP US LLC*,  
IPR2017-01046, Paper 14 (Jan. 22, 2018).....24

*William Wesley Carnes, Sr., Inc. v. Seabord Int’l Inc.*,  
IPR2019-00133, Paper 10 (May 8, 2019).....34

**REGULATIONS**

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) .....6

37 C.F.R. §42.104 ..... 17, 38, 39, 45

## EXHIBIT LIST

2001	Declaration of William P. Alberth, Jr. [Alberth-Decl.]
2002	William P. Alberth, Jr. Curriculum Vitae [Alberth-CV]
2003	In re Neo Wireless, LLC Patent Litigation, 2:22-MD-03034-TGB, Joint Claim Construction Statement [Joint-CC-Statement]
2004	In re Neo Wireless, LLC Patent Litigation, 2:22-MD-03034-TGB, Exhibit A - Agreed Litigation Terms [Agreed-Lit.-Terms]
2005	In re Neo Wireless, LLC Patent Litigation, 2:22-MD-03034-TGB, Exhibit B - Disputed Litigation Terms [Disputed-Lit.-Terms]
2006	Reserved
2007	Reserved
2008	Reserved
2009	In re Neo Wireless, LLC Patent Litigation, 2:22-MD-03034-TGB, ECF No. 84 [Dkt. 84]
2010-2014	Reserved

# 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.