

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Hytera Communications Corp. Ltd.,

Petitioner,

v.

Motorola Solutions, Inc.

Patent Owner.

Patent No. 7,369,869 B2
Filing Date: July 26, 2004
Issue Date: May 6, 2008

Title: Method and System of Scanning a TDMA Channel

Case No. IPR2017-02179

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR
INTER PARTES REVIEW**

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION4

II. BACKGROUND6

 A. The '869 Patent.....6

 B. Overview of the Claims of the '869 Patent8

 C. The Petition Proposes One Anticipatory Challenge and Two Obviousness Challenges.....9

III. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL.....9

IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....10

V. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY HYTERA'S PETITION IN ITS ENTIRETY BECAUSE HYTERA HAS NOT MET ITS BURDEN TO SHOW HOW IT CAN PREVAIL ON ANY OF ITS ASSERTED GROUNDS11

 A. Grounds 1 and 2: Petitions Fails To Show That WAN Anticipates Claims 1-3, 6-8, 17-18 And 21-22, And/OR Renders Obvious Claims 1-4, 6-9, 17-18, AND 21-22.11

 1. Overview of *Wan* and its Inapplicability to the '869 Patent11

 2. Petitioner fails to show that *Wan* discloses all of the elements of the challenged independent claims.....16

 3. Petitioner fails to show that *Wan* discloses claim 2.....29

 4. Petitioner fails to show that *Wan* discloses claim 3.....31

 5. Petitioner fails to show that *Wan* discloses claim 4.....33

 6. Petitioner fails to show that *Wan* discloses claim 6.....35

 7. Petitioner fails to show that *Wan* discloses claim 7.....36

8.	Petitioner fails to show that <i>Wan</i> discloses claims 8, 18, 22.....	37
9.	Petitioner fails to show that <i>Wan</i> discloses claim 9.....	37
B.	Ground 3: Petitioner Fails To Show That <i>WAN</i> In Combination With <i>BRENNAN</i> Renders Claims 1-4, 6-9, 17-18, AND 21-22 Obvious.....	39
1.	Overview of <i>Brennan</i>	39
2.	Petitioner fails to show that the combination of <i>Wan</i> and <i>Brennan</i> renders “wherein a subset of the plurality of channels is preprogrammed” (1[a], 21[a]) obvious.....	40
3.	Petitioner fails to show that the combination of <i>Wan</i> and <i>Brennan</i> renders claim 2 Obvious.....	43
4.	Petitioner fails to show that the combination of <i>Wan</i> and <i>Brennan</i> renders claim 6 and claim element 17[e] obvious.....	45
5.	Petitioner fails to show that the combination of <i>Wan</i> and <i>Brennan</i> renders claims 3-4, 7-9, 18, and 22 obvious.....	47

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Gubelmann v. Gang</i> , 408 F.2d 758 (C.C.P.A. 1969)	24, 28
<i>InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGO Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	25, 27, 29, 31
<i>LifeScan Scotland, Ltd. v. Shasta Techs., LLC</i> , No. 11-CV-04494-WHO, 2016 WL 7732710 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 8, 2016)	25, 27, 29, 31
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxycorr, Inc.</i> , 289 F.3d 1292, 1298 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	7
<i>In re Oelrich</i> , 666 F.2d 578 (C.C.P.A. 1981)	24, 28
<i>In re Skvorecz</i> , 580 F.3d 1262 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	7
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 311(b)	7
Other Authorities	
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)	7

I. INTRODUCTION

This petition was filed by Hytera Communication Co. Ltd. (“Hytera” or “Petitioner”) against Motorola Solutions, Inc. (“Motorola”)’s U.S. Patent 7,369,869 (Ex. 1001, “the ’869 patent”) six months after Motorola sued Hytera in district court and the U.S. International Trade Commission for infringing this patent, and seven months after Motorola sued Hytera for misappropriating its trade secrets through hiring of multiple Motorola engineers who surreptitiously downloaded thousands of confidential Motorola documents to take with them to Hytera to build a competing digital mobile radio (“DMR”) product. Motorola’s ’869 patent generally involves scanning in a two-way radio system that uses a control message on the channel where activity is present. The Board should deny institution of Hytera’s petition because Hytera has not shown a reasonable likelihood that it would prevail with respect to any challenged claim of the ’869 patent.

Hytera has raised three Grounds in its petition, based on two references: (1) Anticipation by *Wan*; (2) obviousness due to *Wan*, and (3) obviousness due to a combination of the *Wan* and *Brennan* references. There are significant differences between the prior art on which Hytera relies and the challenged claims of the ’869 Patent. *Wan* is directed to improvements to a *paging* system, which is a wholly different type of system the technology of which is inapplicable to the *scanning* system inventions of the ’869 patent. Based on the manifest differences in these

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.