

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LENOVO (UNITED STATES) INC., DELL INC.,
DELL TECHNOLOGIES INC., AND HP INC.,

Petitioners,

v.

UNIVERSAL CONNECTIVITY TECHNOLOGIES INC.,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2024-01482
U.S. Patent No. 7,856,520

**PATENT OWNER'S SUR-REPLY
TO PETITIONERS' REPLY**

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit No.	Description
2001	Docket Control Order, <i>Universal Connectivity Technologies Inc. v. Lenovo Group Limited</i> , No. 2:23-cv-00449-JRG (E.D. Tex. June 12, 2024)
2002	Civil Minutes, <i>Universal Connectivity Technologies Inc. v. HP Inc.</i> , No. 4:24-cv-04097-YGR (N.D. Cal. Nov. 4, 2024)
2003	Order, <i>Universal Connectivity Technologies Inc. v. Dell Inc.</i> , No. 1:23-cv-01506-RP (W.D. Tex. Dec. 12, 2024)
2004	Defendant's Invalidity and Eligibility Contentions, <i>Universal Connectivity Technologies Inc. v. Lenovo Group Limited</i> , No. 2:23-cv-00449-JRG (E.D. Tex. July 24, 2024)
2005	Defendants Dell Technologies Inc. and Dell Inc.'s Preliminary Invalidity Contentions, <i>Universal Connectivity Technologies Inc. v. Dell Inc.</i> , No. 1:23-cv-01506-RP (W.D. Tex. July 24, 2024)
2006	HP's Invalidity Contentions, <i>Universal Connectivity Technologies Inc. v. HP Inc.</i> , No. 4:24-cv-04097-YGR (N.D. Cal. Dec. 5, 2024)
2007	U.S. District Courts—Federal Court Management Statistics—Profiles—During the 12-Month Periods Ending September 30, 2019 through 2024
2008	Memorandum Opinion and Order, <i>Universal Connectivity Technologies Inc. v. Lenovo Group Limited</i> , No. 2:23-cv-00449-JRG (E.D. Tex. Oct. 17, 2024)
2009	Order, <i>Universal Connectivity Technologies Inc. v. Lenovo Group Limited</i> , No. 2:23-cv-00449-JRG (E.D. Tex. Oct. 2, 2024)

I. PATENT OWNER CORRECTLY READS AND RELIES ON THE ENTIRETY OF THE CLAIMS

Petitioner's Reply arguments are misleading and only intended to distract attention from the fact that the prior art, i.e., Yung or Yung in view of HDMI 1.3, does not teach the entirety of claims of the '520 Patent. More specifically, Petitioner contends that "Patent Owner improperly reads in a requirement that multiple ... control signals ... must be converted and transmitted." Reply at 2. Not only is this incorrect—Patent Owner does not read the claims to require multiple control signals to be converted and transmitted—but is also a diversion from the fact that the Petition fails to show how the prior art teaches "*each of the one or more control signals representing one of a plurality of different types of control signals*" in combination with the rest of the claims.

The claims of the '520 Patent require "converting one or more control signals for a standard protocol to one or more data packets, *each of the one or more control signals representing one of a plurality of different types of control signals*" such that the "generated data packets" can be "transmit[ed] ... from the first device to the second device via the first control bus," "the first control bus being a bi-directional, single-line bus." See, e.g., EX1001, cl 1. "Representing" is the present

continuous tense of the verb “represent,” which has a plain and ordinary meaning of “to be a sign or symbol of something,” <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/represent>; *see also Tehrani v. Hamilton Medical, Inc.*, 331 F.3d 1355, 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (“We agree ... that the ordinary meaning of ‘representing’ is broad enough to include ‘symbolizing’ or ‘to stand for.’”).

Applying this plain and ordinary meaning, the claims require that “each control signal,” which is “convert[ed] ... to a “data packet” that is subsequently “transmit[ed] ... via the [single-line] control bus,” must “signify,” “symbolize” or “stand for” “one of a plurality of [*i.e.*, two or more] types of control signals.” This plain and ordinary meaning is confirmed by the specification of the ’520 Patent, which describes that “if there is a control signal to be transmitted,” “the signal is converted into a data packet” “as shown in FIG. 8.” EX1001, 7:34-38. The patent further illustrates how each of multiple types of HDMI control signals are “signified” in the resulting data packet after conversion. *See, e.g., id.*, 9:23-25 (Fig. 8 illustrates “a 2-bit header 804 to indicate the type of data packet.”), 9:50-54 (Fig. 9 illustrates how 2-bit header represents the DDC type (‘00’), CEC type (‘01’), or private channel type (‘11’)).

Applying the plain and ordinary meaning, the Preliminary Response demonstrates that HDMI, as disclosed in Yung and HDMI 1.3 with its individual control busses, e.g., CEC and DDC, does not teach that “each ... control signal[] ***represent[s] one of a plurality of different types of control signals***,” where the “control signal is converted to a data packet” that is “transmit[ed] via the [single line] control bus.” *See, e.g.,* POPR at 31-37. At most, Yung and HDMI 1.3 disclose different types of control signals being transmitted on different control busses. *See id.*

While the Petition acknowledges that the ’520 Patent describes and claims a “plurality of different types of control signals,” Petition at 33-34, it fails to explain how “each ... control signal” that is “converted ... to [a] data packet[]” “***represent[s] one of a plurality of different types of control signals***.” In doing so, Petitioner either ignores the claimed “representing” requirement, or treats it as meaningless or superfluous. Either way, Petitioner cannot be correct. “It is highly disfavored to construe terms in a way that renders them void, meaningless, or superfluous.” *Intel Corp. v. Qualcomm Inc.*, 21 F.4th 801, 810 (Fed. Cir. 2021). Accordingly, the Board should deny institution on the merits.

II. DISCRETIONARY DENIAL IS FAVORED IN THIS CASE

Factor 1: Petitioner’ argument that this factor is neutral or disfavors denial because no stay has been sought in the LGL Case is flawed. The LGL Case has not been stayed, nor is there any evidence that a stay would be granted upon institution. This factor favors denial.

Factor 2: Petitioners allege that the trial date of the LGL Case is “speculative” but provide no evidence in support. Reply, 5. Both the scheduled trial date and the date of trial based on median time-to-trial statistics occur months before a final written decision would be expected here. In addition, the *Sotera* stipulations do not remove concerns regarding the timing of trial with respect to a final written decision.

Factor 3: Petitioners do not dispute the substantial investment in resources already devoted to the LGL Case. Petitioners also cannot dispute that claim construction is ongoing, with opening briefs due on March 28, 2025, and responsive briefs due on April 11, 2025. Petitioners’ *Sotera* stipulations do not eliminate the investments the parties have already made in district court.

Factor 4: Petitioners do not dispute the substantial overlap in the arguments and evidence presented in the Petition and in district court.

Petitioners' contention that their *Sotera* stipulations remove all concerns regarding this overlap is unsupported here. In fact, as shown by the *Sotera* stipulations (*see, e.g.*, EX1017 at 1 n.1) and the district court invalidity contentions (*see, e.g.*, EX2004 at 129), Petitioners have expressly reserved the right to challenge invalidity at the district court based on the same references relied upon here in combination with "any system, product, or public knowledge or use that embodies" any of the identified prior art patents or printed publications. Thus, it appears that Petitioners will present the same arguments in district court that they have presented here under the guise of a "system art" combination whose only purpose is to avoid their commitment under the stipulations.

Factor 5: Petitioners' argument ignores the Board's express language in *Fintiv II*. In addition, Petitioners provide no support for their contention that this factor is neutralized when less than all parties to the IPR proceeding are also parties to a district court litigation involving the same patent.

Factor 6: As discussed in the POPR and herein, the Petition fails to show how the prior art teaches the entirety of the claims of the '520 Patent. All six *Fintiv* factors strongly favor discretionary denial.

Date: March 17, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/Brett Cooper/

Brett Cooper, Reg. No. 55,085
Lead counsel for Patent Owner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE (37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e)(1))

The undersigned hereby certifies that the above document was served on March 17, 2025, by filing this document through the Patent Trial and Appeal Case Tracking System as well as delivering a copy via electronic mail upon the following attorneys of record for the Petitioners:

W. Karl Renner (Reg. No. 41,265)

Email: AXF-PTAB@fr.com

Roberto Devoto (Reg. No. 55,108)

Email: Devoto@fr.com

Adam Shartzter (Reg. No. 57,264)

Email: Shartzter@fr.com

Craig Deutsch (Reg. No. 69,264)

Email: Deutsch@fr.com

Karan Jhurani (Reg. No. 71,777)

Email: Jhurani@fr.com

Rishi Gupta (Reg. No. 64,768)

Email: Rgupta@fr.com

Fish & Richardson P.C.

60 South Sixth Street, Suite 3200

Minneapolis, MN 55402

Tel: 202-783-5070

Fax: 877-769-7945

Jason R. Mudd (Reg. No. 57,700)

Phone: 816-559-2437

Email: jmudd@shb.com

Lauren E. Douville (Reg. No. 77,145)

Phone: 816-559-0348

Email: ldouville@shb.com

Paul M. Vogel (Reg. No. 74,774)

Phone: 816-474-6550

Email: pvogel@shb.com

Shook, Hardy & Bacon L.L.P.

2555 Grand Boulevard
Kansas City, MO 64108

Brian W. Oaks (Reg. No. 44,981)
Phone: 512-726-2574
Email: boaks@mwe.com
Nick Schuneman (Reg. No. 62,088)
Phone: 512-726-2572
Email: nschuneman@mwe.com
McDermott Will & Emery LLP
303 Colorado Street, Suite 2200
Austin, TX 78701

Tessa Kroll (Reg. No. 79,327)
McDermott Will & Emery LLP
444 West Lake Street, Suite 4000
Chicago, IL 60606
TEL: 312-984-6973
Email: tkroll@mwe.com

HP-UCT-IPR@shb.com
DL-DELL-UCT-MWE@mwe.com
IPR55851-0013IP1@fr.com
PTABInbound@fr.com

Date: March 17, 2025

/Brett Cooper/

BC Law Group, P.C.
200 Madison Avenue, 24th Floor
New York, NY 10016
(212) 951-0100

Brett Cooper
Reg. No. 55,085
Attorney for Patent Owner