

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review
U.S. Patent No. 8,897,828

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

T-MOBILE USA, INC., T-MOBILE US, INC.,
SPRINT SPECTRUM L.P., and SPRINTCOM, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

INTELLECTUAL VENTURES II LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-_____
Patent No. 8,897,828

PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8.....	2
	A. Real Party-In-Interest	2
	1. Sprint Real Parties-In-Interest.....	2
	2. T-Mobile Real Parties-In-Interest.....	2
	B. Related Matters.....	2
	C. Lead and Back-up Counsel and Service Information Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)	3
	D. Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4))	4
III.	PAYMENT OF FEES	4
IV.	REQUIREMENTS FOR <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW	4
	A. Grounds for Standing	4
	B. Claims for Which Review is Requested.....	4
	1. Statutory Grounds of Challenge	5
	2. How the Construed Claims are Unpatentable Under the Statutory Grounds Identified in 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(2) and Supporting Evidence Relied Upon to Support the Challenge	8
V.	BACKGROUND OF THE '828 PATENT	8
	A. Overview of the '828 Patent.....	9
	B. Prosecution History of the '828 Patent	11
VI.	BACKGROUND OF PRIOR ART	16

VII.	PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	16
VIII.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	17
A.	“multilevel TPC command”	18
IX.	GROUND OF UNPATENTABILITY.....	19
A.	Ground #1: Zeira in view of Krishnan and Khan renders claims 1-2, 5-6, 8-9, 12-13, 15-16, 19-20, 22-23, 26-27, 29- 30, 33-34, 36-37, and 40-41 of the '828 patent unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).....	19
1.	Overview of Zeira	19
2.	Overview of Krishnan.....	21
3.	Overview of Khan.....	22
4.	Claim 1	24
5.	Claim 2: “The method of claim 1, wherein the TPC command is a multilevel TPC command.”	45
6.	Claim 5: “The method of claim 1, wherein the determining the path loss further includes computing a difference between a signaled transmit power and a measured power of the downlink channel.”	46
7.	Claim 6: “The method of claim 1, wherein the calculated transmit power is based on a selected transport format.”	47
8.	Claim 8.....	48
9.	Claim 9: “The UE of claim 8, wherein the TPC command is a multilevel TPC command.”	51
10.	Claim 12: “The UE of claim 8, wherein the determination of the path loss further includes a computation of a difference between a signaled transmit power and a measured received power of the downlink channel.”	51

11.	Claim 13: “The UE of claim 8, wherein the calculated transmit power is based on a selected transport format.”	51
12.	Claim 15	51
13.	Claim 16: “The method of claim 15, wherein the TPC command is a multilevel TPC command.”	54
14.	Claim 19: “The method of claim 15, wherein the determining the path loss further includes computing a difference between a signaled transmit power and a measured received power of the downlink channel.”	54
15.	Claim 20: “The method of claim 15, wherein the calculated transmit power is based on a selected transport format.”	54
16.	Claim 22	55
17.	Claim 23: “The wireless network of claim 22, wherein the TPC command is a multilevel TPC command.”	56
18.	Claim 26: “The wireless network of claim 22, wherein the determination of the path loss further includes a computation of a difference between a signaled transmit power and a measured received power of the downlink channel.”	56
19.	Claim 27: “The wireless network of claim 22, wherein the calculated transmit power is based on a selected transport format.”	57
20.	Claim 29	57
21.	Claim 30: “The method of claim 29, wherein the TPC command is a multilevel TPC command.”	59
22.	Claim 33: “The method of claim 29, wherein the determined path loss further includes computing a difference between a signaled transmit power and a measured received power of the downlink channel.”	59
23.	Claim 34: “The method of claim 29, wherein the calculated transmit power is based on a selected transport format.”	59

24.	Claim 36.....	59
25.	Claim 37: “The network device of claim 36, wherein the TPC command is a multilevel TPC command.”	62
26.	Claim 40: “The network device of claim 36, wherein the determined path loss further includes a computation of a difference between a signaled transmit power and a measured received power of the downlink channel.”	62
27.	Claim 41: “The network device of claim 36, wherein the calculated transmit power is based on a selected transport format.”	62
B.	Ground #2: Zeira in view of Krishnan, Khan, and Andersson renders claims 2, 9, 16, 23, 30, and 37 of the ’828 patent unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).	62
1.	Overview of Andersson	63
2.	Claim 2: “The method of claim 1, wherein the TPC command is a multilevel TPC command.”	63
3.	Claim 9: “The UE of claim 8, wherein the TPC command is a multilevel TPC command.” Claim 16: “The method of claim 15, wherein the TPC command is a multilevel TPC command.” Claim 23: “The wireless network of claim 22, wherein the TPC command is a multilevel TPC command Claim 30: “The method of claim 29, wherein the TPC command is a multilevel TPC command.” Claim 37: “The network device of claim 36, wherein the TPC command is a multilevel TPC command.....	66
X.	CONCLUSION.....	67

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.