

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

NOKIA OF AMERICA CORPORATION
Petitioner

v.

INTELLECTUAL VENTURES II LLC
Patent Owner

Case IPR2018-01641
Patent 8,897,828

**PATENT OWNER INTELLECTUAL VENTURES II LLC'S
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION**

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"

Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	The '828 Patent Presents a Novel Approach to Transmit Power Control In a Wireless Network.....	2
A.	The Existing Approaches Did Not Provide a Particular Manner For Combining an Open Loop Scheme With a Closed Loop Scheme.	4
B.	The '828 Patent Describes a Combination of an Open Loop and Closed Loop Scheme with Control Dependent on Whether Accumulation Has Been Enabled.....	5
C.	The Prosecution History and Resulting Allowance Confirmed the Patentability of the '828 Patent Claims.....	9
III.	Claim Construction.....	12
IV.	The Board Should Deny Institution Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) Because the Petition Cites to Substantially the Same References Considered During Prosecution in Substantially the Same Way.....	13
A.	The Board is Authorized to Exercise its Discretion and Deny Institution Under § 325(d) When the Petition Cites to the Same References Considered During Prosecution and Fails to Present Any New Arguments.....	15
B.	The Primary Reference, Zeira Was Extensively Considered During Prosecution and Deemed to Not Render Obvious Several Elements of the Independent Claims.....	17
C.	Despite Including Whinnett in Each Ground, the Petition Relies Solely on Zeira For the Same Claim Elements Deemed Allowable During Prosecution and Fails to Present any New Arguments or Indicate That any Error Occurred During the Examination of the '828 Patent.....	19
V.	Zeira Does Not Teach or Otherwise Render Obvious “receiving...by the UE if accumulation is enabled, an allocation of a scheduled uplink resource and a TPC command, wherein the TPC command is accumulated with other received TPC commands” and “receiving... by the UE if accumulation is not enabled, an allocation of a scheduled	

uplink resource to transmit data at a power level calculated by the UE based on the path loss.”	22
A. Overview of Zeira.	23
B. Overview of Whinnett.	24
C. The Petition Does Not Establish That the Combination of Zeira, and Whinnett Renders Obvious Independent Claims 1, 8, 15, 22, 29, or 36.....	25
1. The Petition Fails to Establish That the Combination of Zeira, and Whinnett Renders Obvious “receiving...by the UE if accumulation is enabled, an allocation of a scheduled uplink resource and a TPC command, wherein the TPC command is accumulated with other received TPC commands” and “receiving... by the UE if accumulation is not enabled, an allocation of a scheduled uplink resource to transmit data at a power level calculated by the UE based on the path loss.”	25
2. Zeira Does Not Teach the Specific Control Process Recited in the Claims That Depends on Whether Accumulation Has Been Enabled.	26
3. The Petition Does Not Rely on Any Secondary References to Teach the Specific Control Process Dependent on Whether Accumulation Has Been Enabled as Recited in the Claims.....	29
4. The Petition Fails to Explain Why the Combination of Zeira and Whinnett Would Disclose an Allocation of a Scheduled Uplink Resource and a TPC Command Being Received on a “single physical channel.”	29
5. Zeira Does Not Teach “receiving, by the UE,” or “sending, by the wireless network” “an indication of whether accumulation of transmit power control (TPC) commands is enabled” as recited in Claim 1 and Claim 15 respectively.	31
VI. Conclusion.	33

I. Introduction.

The Board should deny institution of this proceeding because Petitioners do not come close to meeting their burden. The Petition does not establish by a preponderance of the evidence that claims 1-2, 5-6, 8-9, 12-13, 15-16, 19-20, 22-23, 26-27, 29-30, 33-34, 36-37, or 40-41 of U.S. Patent 8,897,828 (“the ’828 patent”) are obvious over the proposed Grounds. Rather than presenting new art and arguments not previously considered during prosecution, the Petition relies on the exact same reference—Zeira—and rehashes arguments that the Examiner and Board have already heavily considered for the independent claims. Because the Petition presents arguments that are duplicative of those considered during prosecution of the ’828 patent, the Board should deny institution under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d).

The Petition fails for the exact same reasons the claims of the ’828 patent were found allowable—the prior art does not render obvious the claimed power control process that depends on whether accumulation has been enabled for user equipment (UE) transmission power. Simply put, the prior art does not describe performing particular actions in response to whether or not accumulation has been enabled. Nor has the Petition established that a “single physical channel” carrying “an allocation of a scheduled uplink resource and a TPC command” or “receiving, by the UE,” or “sending, by the wireless network” “an indication of whether

accumulation of transmit power control (TPC) commands is enabled” are obvious in view of the art presented in the Petition. Thus, in view of the redundant and flawed arguments presented in Petition, the Board should deny institution of an *inter partes* review against the ’828 patent.

II. The ’828 Patent Presents a Novel Approach to Transmit Power Control In a Wireless Network.

Wireless communication networks require a balancing of signal power to avoid several problems. For example, “radio signals transmitted with increased power result in fewer errors when received than signals transmitted with decreased power. Unfortunately, signals transmitted with excessive power may interfere with the reception of other signals sharing the radio link.” (’828 patent, Ex. 1001, 1:18-22.) In particular, this balancing is important for user equipment (UE) such as a mobile device to communicate with a base station. (*See id.* at 1:43-49.)

One metric for determining a desired transmit power is to determine a target signal to noise-plus-interference ratio (SNIR). (*Id.* at 1:50-51.) Using the target SNIR, a UE may adjust its transmission power level depending on various factors, such as the path loss detected on a communication channel. In this manner, the UE may increase or decrease the transmit power to compensate for the path loss and to achieve a target SNIR. (*See id.* at 2:5-32.)

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.