

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ONEPLUS TECHNOLOGY (SHENZHEN) CO., LTD.,
Petitioners,

v.

PANTECH CORPORATION,
Patent Owner

Case: IPR2025-00783

U.S. Patent No. 9,288,824

**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO
PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR DIRECTOR REVIEW**

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 CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	1
III. NO ABUSE OF DISCRETION WARRANTS REVERSAL OF THE DIRECTOR’S DISCRETIONARY DENIAL	2
A. Even When Viewing the Scope of Challenged Patents, The Outcome Is Still Discretionary Denial	2
B. No Examiner Error Exists	5
IV. THERE IS NO VIOLATION OF THE APA	9
V. ADDITIONAL FACTORS SUPPORT DISCRETIONARY DENIAL	11
VI. CONCLUSION.....	12

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Advanced Bionics, LLC v. MED-EL 1 Elektromedizinische Geräte GmbH,</i> IPR2019-01469, Paper 6 (PTAB Feb. 13, 2020).....	6
<i>American Airlines, Inc. et al. v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC,</i> IPR2025-00785, Paper 11 (PTAB Aug. 29, 2025).....	2
<i>Anthony Inc. v. Controltec LLC,</i> IPR2025-00559, Paper 12 (Director July 16, 2025).....	8
<i>Ascentcare Dental Prods, Inc., v. Solmetex, LLC,</i> IPR2025-01065, Paper 11 (Director Oct. 17, 2025).....	6
<i>Eunsung Global Corp. v. HydraFacial LLC,</i> IPR2025-00445, Paper 14 (Director, July 10, 2025).....	7
<i>Fujirebio Diagnostics, Inc., v. Quanterix Corp.,</i> IPR2025-01060, Paper 13 (Director, Oct. 17, 2025).....	7
<i>Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech.,</i> 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	10
<i>Lincoln v. Vigil,</i> 508 U.S. 182 (1993).....	9
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Partec Cluster Competence Center GMBH,</i> IPR2025-00318, Paper 9 (PTAB June 12, 2025)	8
<i>Mylan Labs. Ltd. v. Janssen Pharmaceutica, N.V.,</i> 989 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	10
<i>Pantech Corp. v. OnePlus Technology (Shenzhen) Co., Ltd.,</i> No. 5:22-cv-00069-RWS, Dkt. 259 (E.D. Tex. April 1, 2024).....	2
<i>Tesla, Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC,</i> IPR2025-00217, Paper 9 (PTAB June 13, 2025)	3

Case IPR2025-00783
Patent No. 9,288,824
Patent Owner Response to Request for Director Review

Vital Connect, Inc. v. Bardy Diagnostics, Inc.,
IPR2023-00381, Paper 7 (PTAB. July 11, 2023) 7

Xencor, Inc. v. Merus N.V.,
IPR2025-00604, Paper 12 (PTAB July 17, 2025) 8

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 314(a) 10

PATENT OWNER’S EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit No.	Description
2001	Second Amended Docket Control Order, <i>Pantech Corporation and Pantech Wireless, LLC v. OnePlus Technology (Shenzhen) Co., Ltd.</i> , No. 5:24-CV-00038-RWS-JBB (E.D. Tex.) (Dkt. 58) (May 13, 2025)
2002	United States District Courts – National Judicial Caseload Profile
2003	Pantech Corporation’s July 9, 2021 Notice Letter to OnePlus Technology Co., Ltd.
2004	Third Amended Docket Control Order, <i>Pantech Corporation and Pantech Wireless, LLC v. OnePlus Technology (Shenzhen) Co., Ltd.</i> , No. 5:24-CV-00038-RWS-JBB (E.D. Tex.) (Dkt. 86) (July 17, 2025)
2005	Order Modifying Dates in Docket Control Order, <i>Pantech Corporation and Pantech Wireless, LLC v. OnePlus Technology (Shenzhen) Co., Ltd.</i> , No. 5:24-CV-00038-RWS-JBB (E.D. Tex.) (Dkt. 85) (July 17, 2025)
2006	Jury Verdict, <i>Pantech Corp. v. OnePlus Technology (Shenzhen) Co., Ltd.</i> , No. 5:22-cv-00069-RWS (E.D. Tex.) (Dkt. 259) (April 1, 2024)
2007	Final Judgment, <i>Pantech Corp. v. OnePlus Technology (Shenzhen) Co., Ltd.</i> , No. 5:22-cv-00069-RWS (E.D. Tex.) (Dkt. 499) (Jan. 23, 2025)
2008	Kiri Gupta & Urska Petrovcic, <i>Evidence of Systematic “Patent Holdout”</i> , 38 Berkeley Tech. L. J. (2023)
2009	Richard A. Epstein & Kayvan B. Noroozi, <i>Why Incentives for “Patent Holdout” Threaten to Dismantle FRAND, and Why It Matters</i> , 32 Berkeley Tech. L.J. 1381 (2017)
2010	Kalyan Dasgupta & David J. Teece, <i>Protecting Innovation in the Mobile Wireless Ecosystem: Understanding & Addressing “Hold-Out”</i> , 38 Berkeley Tech. L.J. 313 (2023)
2011	Claim Construction Order from <i>Pantech Corp. et al. v. OnePlus Tech. (Shenzhen) Co., Ltd.</i> , No. 5:24-cv-00038-RWS-JBB (E.D. Tex.)

Case IPR2025-00783

Patent No. 9,288,824

Patent Owner Response to Request for Director Review

2012	<i>Pantech Corporation et al. v. OnePlus Technology (Shenzhen) Co., Ltd.</i> , No. 5:22-cv-00069-RWS, Dkt. 468 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 6, 2025)
2013	<i>June 12, 2020 Letter from Pantech Corporation to OnePlus Technology (Shenzhen) Co., Ltd.</i>

I. INTRODUCTION

Patent Owner Pantech Corporation (“Pantech”) responds to Petitioner’s Request for Director Review (Paper 13) and respectfully requests that the Director affirm the discretionary denial of this IPR (Paper 12). Petitioner offers no new facts, legal authority, or other changed circumstances that would warrant reconsideration of the Director’s discretionary denial. The Decision was based on a “holistic assessment of all the evidence” and correctly concluded that denial was appropriate. Paper 12, at 3. Moreover, the proceedings have complied fully with the APA.

II. BACKGROUND

U.S. Patent No. 9,288,824 issued on March 15, 2016. It has been asserted in *Pantech Corporation, et al. v. OnePlus Technology (Shenzhen) Co., Ltd.*, 5:24-cv-00038-RWS-JBB (E.D. Tex.), filed March 14, 2024. On April 18, 2025, Petitioner filed the instant petition. Paper 2. On July 21, 2025 Patent Owner filed its Request for Discretionary Denial of Institution Under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a). Paper 7. On August 19, 2025, Petitioner filed its Opposition. Paper 8. On August 27, 2025, Patent Owner filed a reply to Petitioner’s Opposition. Paper 10. On August 29, 2025, Petitioner filed its sur-reply. Paper 11. On September 12, 2025, the Director denied institution under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a). Paper 12. Petitioner filed a request for Director review on October 14, 2025. Paper 13.

III. NO ABUSE OF DISCRETION WARRANTS REVERSAL OF THE DIRECTOR'S DISCRETIONARY DENIAL

A. Even When Viewing the Scope of Challenged Patents, The Outcome Is Still Discretionary Denial

Petitioner relies primarily on the number and scope of patents asserted in the district court litigation as a basis for its position that the petition should be referred to the Board for a merits decision. Paper 13 at 2-5. However, Petitioner's argument is negated by the fact that the District Court already has familiarity with the parties, technology, and patent families because the district court previously found Petitioner to be a willful infringer of Pantech's patents. *See* Ex. 2006, *Pantech Corp. v. OnePlus Technology (Shenzhen) Co., Ltd.*, No. 5:22-cv-00069-RWS, Dkt. 259 (E.D. Tex. April 1, 2024) (jury verdict of willful infringement); Ex. 2007, Dkt. 499 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 23, 2025) (final judgment of infringement and no invalidity). Moreover, both here and at the District Court, the patents all relate to aspects of LTE/5G wireless communication technology.¹ There is no indication that the district court cannot handle the scope and nature of this technology.

Petitioner's reliance *American Airlines, Inc. et al. v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC*, IPR2025-00785 et al., Paper 11, does not change the outcome. *See* Paper 13 at

¹ Petitioner improperly introduces new exhibits with its request for director review, which could have been submitted earlier. *See* EX1038.

3. In *American Airlines*, the twelve challenged patents across six families were directed to a diverse range of subject matter (*e.g.*, Internet hotspots, distributed networking, transceiver operation, computer clusters). *See American Airlines*, Paper 11 at 3. This is unlike the patents challenged by Petitioner, which all relate to wireless communication (as demonstrated in greater detail below).

Tesla, Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC, IPR2025-00217 et al., Paper 9 is also distinguishable. In *Tesla*, the Director relied on the fact that “Petitioner has filed a broad stipulation and asserts that the merits are strong because the Board previously determined there was a reasonable likelihood that similar claims of an ancestor patent were unpatentable in three separate proceedings with respect to some of the challenged patents in these proceedings.” *Id.* at 2. The fact that eleven patents across nine families (spanning the subject matter of “generalized hebbian learning,” “docking assistant[s],” “large dynamic range cameras,” “determining buffer occupancy and selecting data for transmission on a radio bearer,” and “power control in a wireless network,” among other subjects, *see Tesla* Paper 8 at 5-7) were challenged was used as a factor that helped just tip this balance towards referral.

Tesla is thus unlike the dispute between Pantech and OnePlus, where all the patents are within a narrow field of art, as demonstrated by the similar fields of the invention for each, and the district court is already familiar with the technology from

a past case of similar patents. Here, the scope of the patents and prior district court matters tip the balance in favor of affirming the decision to discretionarily deny review.

Challenged Patent	Field of the Invention
9,763,283 (IPR2025-00637)	Field Exemplary embodiments relate to wireless communication, and more particularly, to a method and an apparatus for controlling a radio link in a wireless communication system supporting dual connectivity.
9,769,776 (IPR2025-00720)	Field The present invention relates to wireless communication and, more particularly, to an apparatus and method for uplink synchronization in a multiple component carrier system.
10,764,803 (IPR2025-00756)	FIELD OF INVENTION The present invention is related to a wireless communications. More particularly, the present invention is related to an enhanced uplink (EU) operation during a soft handover.
10,863,573 (IPR2025-00762)	Field The present invention relates to wireless communication, and more particularly, to a method and an apparatus of in-sequence delivery considering a multi-flow in a wireless communication system supporting dual connectivity.
11,212,838 (IPR2025-00763)	FIELD OF INVENTION The present application is related to wireless communication.
9,288,824 (IPR2025-00783)	1. Field of the Invention The present invention relates to a wideband radio access system, and more particularly, to a method of transmitting and receiving a random access request (random access preamble) and transmitting and receiving a random access response in a wideband radio access system.

8,995,372 (IPR2025-00887)	1. Field The present invention relates to a method and apparatus for performing random access in a wireless communication system, and more particularly, to a method and apparatus for performing random access in a communication system that supports a plurality of component carriers (CCs).
9,369,251 (IPR2025-00888)	1. Field The embodiment of the present invention relates generally to a wireless communication system, and specifically to a method and an apparatus for performing muting for all or a partial resource region in a resource space (PDSCH, Physical Downlink Shared Channel) for data transmission of a serving cell so as to avoid interference from a neighboring cell at the time of allocating a resource of a channel state information-reference signal (hereinafter referred to as “CSI-RS”) in a wireless communication system, and using muting information for muting.

B. No Examiner Error Exists

Next Petitioner argues that its alleged showing of examiner error counsels against discretionary denial. Paper 13 at 6-7. However, as explained in Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response (Paper 9), Petitioner has not shown that any of its primary references—TS36321-V830, Qualcomm, ZTE, or TS36321-V800—is likely to render the challenged claims unpatentable, and the secondary references relied upon in Grounds 7 and 8—TS36321-V800 and Nokia—fail to cure the deficiencies of either ZTE or TS36321-V800, respectively, under a theory of obviousness. Petitioner essentially relies on conclusory (and flawed) *ipse dixit* interpretations of the prior art (Paper 13 at 5-8), and Patent Owner has already specifically shown how none of these references relied upon teach an important limitation of each of the claims of the ’824 Patent, whereby “the time period [for

receiving a random access response] starts at a time point after an end time of transmitting the random access preamble, and a subframe number corresponding to the time point is obtained by adding an offset to a subframe number corresponding to the end time of transmitting, the random access preamble, and the offset equals three.” *See* ’824 Patent at claims 1 and 7; Paper 9 at 8-19. “If reasonable minds can disagree regarding the purported treatment of the art or arguments, it cannot be said that the Office erred in a manner material to patentability.” *See Advanced Bionics, Paper 6 at 9. , LLC v. MED-EL 1 Elektromedizinische Geräte GmbH*, IPR2019-01469, Paper 6 at 9 (PTAB Feb. 13, 2020) (precedential); *see also Ascentcare Dental Prods, Inc., v. Solmetex, LLC*, IPR2025-01065, Paper 11, at 2-3 (Director Oct. 17, 2025).

Petitioner cannot overcome the hurdle of showing that reasonable minds could not disagree. Petitioner first argues that the examiner overlooked an alleged written description problem. *See* Paper 13 at 7. But Petitioner’s cursory argument is lacking. Patent Owner has shown in detail the written description support in the priority applications. *See* Paper 9 at 9-14. Petitioner next argues that the Examiner overlooked the particular alleged prior art that it now sets forth. *See* Paper 13 at 7. But as Patent Owner has shown, none of these references meet the claim limitations

at issue, and Qualcomm and TS36321-V830 are not prior art to the '824 Patent under U.S. patent laws. Paper 9 at 9-19.

Simply put, Petitioner does not meet its burden. To evaluate material error, the Board weighs *Becton, Dickinson* factors c, e and f. Petitioner does not reference any of these factors, let alone analyze them. *Vital Connect, Inc. v. Bardy Diagnostics, Inc.*, IPR2023-00381, Paper 7 at 20 (PTAB July 11, 2023) (“[W]hile there are no ‘magic words’ necessary to address material error, Petitioner’s alleged grounds of unpatentability cannot establish material error *per se* under our binding precedent. . . . Otherwise, the reasonable likelihood standard of § 314(a) and the second part of the *Advanced Bionics* framework (‘material error’) would collapse into one.”). Moreover, Patent Owner has not argued for denial under § 325(d). Thus, all Petitioner has done is demonstrate (at most) that reasonable minds can disagree on the treatment of the art. *See, e.g., Fujirebio Diagnostics, Inc., v. Quanterix Corp.*, IPR2025-01060, Paper 13, at 2-3 (Director, Oct. 17, 2025).

Petitioner’s cited case law does not change the outcome in this respect either. *Eunsung Global Corp. v. HydraFacial LLC*, IPR2025-00445, Paper 14 at 3 (Director, July 10, 2025) addressed IPRs on three patents where only one out of the three had been in force since 2017. For that patent, however, the Director found that “Petitioner persuasively demonstrates that the patent examiner overlooked certain

teachings in Karasiuk that appear to disclose the allowable features of the claims.”

Id. Here, Petitioner has not made a similar persuasive showing. That is, in *Eunsung*, there was a persuasive showing of the weight of the merits in favor of institution, but here (as can be seen, if desired, in Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response, Paper 9 (all cited references lack the same limitation key to patentability)) the merits are weak and certainly not so strong as to outweigh the other factors.

Petitioner’s reliance on *Anthony Inc. v. Controltec LLC*, IPR2025-00559, Paper 12 at 2 (Director July 16, 2025) is misplaced because the prosecution history differed and was integral in the decision finding Examiner error:

Specifically, at the beginning of patent examination, the patent examiner issued a restriction requirement for the application that eventually became the challenged patents. Ex. 1002, 72. Patent Owner elected a group of claims and filed a divisional patent application. *Id.* at 36. The patent examiner issued a notice of allowance of both patent applications as the first office action. *Id.* at 14. Petitioner persuasively explains that the patent examiner erred by overlooking the teachings of Carter.

Id. at 2.

For both *Microsoft Corp. v. Partec Cluster Competence Center GMBH*, IPR2025-00318, Paper 9, and *Xencor, Inc. v. Merus N.V.*, IPR2025-00604, Paper 12 (cited by Petitioner at Paper 13 at 6), the specific overlooked teachings were

particular to the claims being challenged, and the factual inquiry undertaken in those proceedings in no way changes the standard of material examiner error nor changes the lack of error in the present circumstances, as explained above.

Ultimately, as Patent Owner as set forth, no examiner error exists, and Petitioner's disagreement with the merits of the past decisions is not grounds to overturn the Director's decision on discretionary denial.

IV. THERE IS NO VIOLATION OF THE APA

Petitioner's final section alleges that the application of the "settled expectations" factor for discretionary denial of review violates the APA because of a lack of notice-and-comment rulemaking. *See* Paper 13 at 8-10. This argument fails—notice and comment rulemaking was not required.

Petitioner's unelaborated argument about a supposed violation of the APA because the application of the "settled expectations" factor "did not undergo notice-and-comment rulemaking" is incorrect. "The notice-and-comment requirements apply [] only to so-called 'legislative' or 'substantive' rules; they do not apply to 'interpretative rules, general statements of policy, or rules of agency organization, procedure, or practice.'" *Lincoln v. Vigil*, 508 U.S. 182, 196 (1993). Petitioner provides no support for why it believes the "settled expectations" factor, among others outlined in the Stewart Memo, is a "substantive rule. The Stewart Memo

explains that “consistent with the discretionary considerations enumerated in existing Board precedent (including *Fintiv*, *General Plastic*, and *Advanced Bionics**) and the Consolidated Trial Practice Guide (Nov. 2019), the parties are permitted to address all relevant considerations, which **may** include: ... settled expectations....” Stewart Memo, at 2 (emphasis added). Contrary to Petitioner’s arguments, the Stewart Memo does not introduce “settled expectations” as an “IPR precondition.” Paper 13 at 9. Moreover, the *inter partes* review statute leaves institution entirely at the discretion of the Director. See 35 U.S.C. § 314(a); *Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech.*, 815 F.3d 1356, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2016). “[T]he PTO is permitted, but never compelled, to institute an IPR proceeding.” *Id.*

Indeed, as the Director is aware, none of the *Fintiv* factors have undergone notice-and-comment rulemaking, and their application has been confirmed by the Federal Circuit. See *Mylan Labs. Ltd. v. Janssen Pharmaceutica, N.V.*, 989 F.3d 1375, 1382 (Fed. Cir. 2021) (“Mylan lacks a clear and indisputable right to review of the Patent Office’s determination to apply the *Fintiv* factors or the Patent Office’s choice to apply them in this case through adjudication rather than notice-and-comment rulemaking.”). It is entirely unclear, and Petitioner has not explained, why the “settled expectations” factor would be different in this regard from any other *Fintiv* factor.

V. ADDITIONAL FACTORS SUPPORT DISCRETIONARY DENIAL

To the extent any additional factors should be considered in re-evaluating the decision on discretionary denial, it is that the settled expectations of Pantech are even farther reaching. As explained in the Request for Discretionary Denial, the '824 relevant patent family has been committed to 3GPP since February 7, 2013, creating strong, settled expectations within the industry that these patents are valid and enforceable. Specifically, Pantech and the telecommunications industry have relied on the status of these patents as SEPs for an extended period, which is evidenced by the widespread adoption of the 3GPP standards and the corresponding widespread licensing and enforcement activities surrounding these patents. Thus, the strong settled expectations of both Pantech and the industry at large are that these patents are valid, enforceable and subject to FRAND licensing and extend beyond just the years the '824 Patent has been in force. Allowing institution of this IPR under these circumstances would undermine the established licensing framework and disrupt the reasonable, settled expectations of both Pantech and the industry. Moreover, Petitioner should not be rewarded for its refusal to negotiate in good faith and holdout tactics in direct violation of its FRAND obligations.

VI. CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Petitioner's Request for Director Review should be denied and the Director should affirm the Decision Denying Institution.

Dated: October 23, 2025

Respectfully submitted,
/James A. Fussell Reg No 54885 /
Amanda S. Bonner
Registration No. 65,224
Mayer Brown LLP
71 S. Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606
Telephone: 312-782-0600
Facsimile: 312-706-8157
asbonner@mayerbrown.com

James A. Fussell, III
Registration No. 54,885
Clark S. Bakewell
Registration No. 71,615
Mayer Brown LLP
1999 K Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20006
Telephone: 202-263-3000
Facsimile: 202-263-3300
jfussell@mayerbrown.com
cbakewell@mayerbrown.com

Attorneys for Pantech Corporation

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 23rd day of October, 2025, a copy of the attached **PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO DIRECTOR REVIEW REQUEST** was served by electronic mail to the attorneys of record, at the following addresses:

Zhiwei (Wayne) Zou
Wayne.zou@bayes.law

With a courtesy copy by electronic mail to:

OnePlus-Pantech-IPR@bayes.law

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 23, 2025

By: /James A. Fussell Reg No 54885/
James A. Fussell (Reg. No. 54,885)