PATENT OWNER CELLULAR COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT LLC'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Intro	oduction1				
II.	Sum	Summary of Preliminary Response				
III.	Technical Background					
	A.	3GP	P standard setting for LTE and LTE-Advanced	5		
	В.	Carr	ier aggregation and LTE terminology	7		
	C.	Response to the Petition's Description of the Technical Background.				
IV.	The '590 Patent and related patents					
	A.	Tecl	nnical problem and disclosed solutions	16		
	В.	'590 Patent Claims				
	C.	Related patents and previous IPRs19				
V.	Claim Construction					
	A.	Legal standards for claim construction				
	B.	B. '590 Patent claim terms				
		1.	"cell" (claims 1, 5, 9) and "serving cells" (claims 3, 7, 11))23		
		2.	"processing the received power headroom report control element based on the configuration of the user equipment (claims 1, 5 and 9)			



		3.	Other claim terms proposed by Petitioner – "bitmap" terms and "type 1'/'type 2' power headroom report"27		
VI.	The Petition should be denied because Petitioner has not met its burden to show a reasonable probability of prevailing on one or more grounds of unpatentability as to any of the challenged claims.				
	A.	Legal	Standards for the Board's Institution Decision28		
	B.	Petitioner has not shown that Mr. Lanning is a qualified expert32			
	C.	oner has not met its burden to prove that the prior art discloses ements of any challenged claim			
		1.	Grounds 1 and 2 should be denied because Petitioner has not shown that Heo discloses "processing the received power headroom report control element based on the configuration of the user equipment"		
		2.	Grounds 3 and 4 should be denied because Petitioner has not shown that Zhang discloses "processing the received power headroom report control element based on the configuration of the user equipment"		
VII.	The a	asserte	d grounds are redundant		
VIII	Cono	lucion	40		



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases:

Apple, Inc. v. Parthenon Unified Memory Architecture, LLC, Case No. IPR2016-00924, Paper 10 (PTAB Aug. 23, 2016)	39-40
Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd., 2016 U.S. App. LEXIS 18225 (Fed. Cir. Oct. 7, 2016) (en banc)	29
Bourjaily v. United States, 483 U.S. 171 (1987)	34
CFMT, Inc. v. YieldUp Int'l Corp., 349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	29
Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. National Graphics, Inc., 800 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	29
Fontaine Engineered Products, Inc. v. Raildecks, Inc., Case No. IPR2013-00360, Paper 9 (PTAB Dec. 13, 2013)	31
Goldberg v. Kelly, 397 U.S. 254 (1970)	30
Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City, 383 U.S. 1 (1966)	28-29
Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc., 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	39
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	29-30
KSR In'tl co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	28-30



LG Electronics, Inc. v. Cellular Communications Equipment LLC, Case No. IPR2016-00197, Paper 7 (PTAB April 29, 2016)	20
Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc., 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	21
PPC Broadband, Inc. v. Corning Optical Commc'ns. RF, LLC, 815 F.3d 747 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	22
SAS Institute, Inc. v. ComplementSoft, LLC, 825 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	22
Sony Mobile Communications (USA) Inc. v. Cellular Communications Equipment LLC, Case No. IPR2015-01716, Paper 11 (PTAB Feb. 4, 2016)	19-20
Sony Mobile Communications (USA) Inc. v. Cellular Communications Equipment LLC, Case No. IPR2015-01716, Paper 15 (PTAB March 28, 2016)	20
Sundance, Inc. v. Demonte Fabricating, Ltd., 550 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	34
Tietex International, Ltd. v. Precision Fabrics Group, Inc., Case No. IPR2014-01248, Paper No. 39 (PTAB Jan. 27, 2016)	29
TriVascular, Inc. v. Samuels, 812 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	22
Unified Patents v. Custom Media, Case No. IPR2015-00516, Paper 9 (PTAB June 15, 2015)	31
Rules and Statutes:	
5 U.S.C. §554(b)	30-31
5 U.S.C. 8556(d)	30-31



DOCKET

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.

