

PGR2025-00067
U.S. Patent No. 12,190,198

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.
Petitioners,

v.

XIFI NETWORKS R&D, INC.

Patent Owner.

Post Grant Review No. 2025-00067

U.S. Patent No. 12,190,198

PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	1
A. District Court Proceedings	1
B. The District Court Resolved The Claim-Construction Dispute.....	2
II. PATENT OWNER’S TERMINATION REQUEST SHOULD BE DENIED	4
III. ALL ’198 PATENT CLAIMS ARE OBVIOUS	5
A. Chincholi Discloses All Disputed Limitations	5
1. Chincholi discloses the “virtual MAC interface”.....	5
2. Chincholi discloses the “resource monitoring interface”	10
3. Chincholi discloses “transparent” operation.....	12
B. Motivation to Combine	14
IV. ALL ’198 PATENT CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE UNDER SECTION 101	15
A. Step 1	15
B. Step 2.....	17
V. ALL ’198 PATENT CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE UNDER SECTION 112	18
A. Multiple Limitations Lack Written Description Support	18
1. “in a manner transparent to any layer . . . above the processing interface”.....	19
2. “evaluating data transfer characteristics”	19
3. “resource monitoring interface”	20
4. “adapted to respectively emit radio waves in . . . different bands of frequencies”	20
5. “request or create a first [and second] association between a recipient and the first [and second] actual MAC and PHY interfaces”	21
B. Multiple Limitations Are Indefinite	21
VI. CONCLUSION	22

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

<i>Allied Erecting & Dismantling Co. v. Genesis Attachments, LLC</i> , 825 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	14
<i>Ericsson Inc. v. TCL Communication Tech. Holdings, Ltd.</i> , 955 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	16
<i>Schwing GmbH v. Putzmeister Aktiengesellschaft</i> , 305 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	3
<i>In re Taasera Licensing LLC Patent Litig.</i> , No. 22-MD-03042, 2023 WL 8628323 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 13, 2023).....	22
<i>Two-Way Media Ltd. v. Comcast Cable Communications, LLC</i> , 874 F.3d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	16

Other Authorities

USPTO, Memorandum, <i>PTAB Consideration of Prior Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law</i> (Sept. 16, 2025).....	2
---	---

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit	Description
EX1001	U.S. Patent No. 12,190,198 (“the ’198 patent”)
EX1002	Declaration of Kevin Almeroth, Ph.D.
EX1003	Intentionally Omitted
EX1004	File History of U.S. Patent No. 12,190,198
EX1005	WO 2013/126859 (“Chincholi”)
EX1006	Intentionally Omitted
EX1007	U.S. Patent Application 2009/0141691 (“Jain”)
EX1008	U.S. Patent 9,379,868 (“Wang”)
EX1009	U.S. Patent 9,055,592 (“Clegg”)
EX1010	U.S. Patent 10,567,147 (“DiFazio”)
EX1011	Curriculum Vitae of Kevin Almeroth Ph.D.
EX1012	Intentionally Omitted
EX1013	Intentionally Omitted
EX1014	U.S. Patent 5,345,599 (“Paulraj”)
EX1015	Gerard J. Foschini, “Layered Space-Time Architecture” (Foschini, Bell Labs Technical Journal, 1(2), 41-59) (1996)
EX1016	U.S. Patent No. 7,206,840 (“Choi”)
EX1017	File History of U.S. Patent No. 11,818,591
EX1018	First Amended Complaint (Dkt. 13) in <i>XiFi Networks R&D, Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co., et al.</i> , No. 2:24-cv-01057 (E.D. Tex.)
EX1019	Intentionally Omitted

Exhibit	Description
EX1020	Patent Owner's March 26, 2025 P.R. 3-1 Infringement Contentions
EX1021	Intentionally Omitted
EX1022	Intentionally Omitted
EX1023	Eastern District of Texas Calendar Events Set for October 19, 2026 (Oct. 9, 2025, 4:50 PM)
EX1024	Excerpt of Federal Court Management Statistics (June 30, 2025), https://www.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/document/fcms_na_dist_profile0630.2025.pdf
EX1025	Declaration of Patrick Schmidt in Support of Petitioner's Motion for Pro Hac Vice Admission
EX1026	Supplemental Declaration of Kevin Almeroth, Ph.D.
EX1027	Claim Construction Order (Dkt. 107) in <i>XiFi Networks R&D, Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co., et al.</i> , No. 2:24-cv-01057 (E.D. Tex.)
EX1028	Joint Claim Construction Chart Pursuant to Patent Rule 4-5 (Dkt. 85) in <i>XiFi Networks R&D, Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co., et al.</i> , No. 2:24-cv-01057-JRG (E.D. Tex.)

I. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION

A. District Court Proceedings

PO wrongly claims that Petitioners have “advanced six narrowing constructions, contrary to the positions they took in the Petition.” POR 1-2. The parties agreed on constructions for six terms, including “plain and ordinary” meaning for three. EX1028 7-11. For “information regarding bandwidth availabilities,” Petitioner agreed only that the information must be “current,” while disputing PO’s attempt to require feedback “directly” from actual MAC and PHY interfaces. The District Court has since rejected PO’s attempt. EX1027 11-16, 25.

Petitioner proposed constructions for only three terms, all consistent with the Petition’s application of the plain meaning. EX1028 5-6. These constructions were not offered for tactical advantage, but to prevent PO from reading the claims overbroadly. PO does *not* dispute that the Petition demonstrates these three terms are satisfied under Petitioner’s proposed constructions, or the District Court’s slightly broader constructions.

There is no inconsistency between Petitioner’s District Court positions and the Petition. Petitioner agrees the District Court constructions should apply. The evidence and analysis in the Petition demonstrate the challenged claims are unpatentable under those constructions. EX1026 ¶¶7-32.

B. The District Court Resolved The Claim-Construction Dispute

The only claim-construction dispute remaining is the “information regarding bandwidth availabilities” term. PO argued that the term requires information be obtained “*directly* from at least the recited actual PHY interface(s) and the recited actual MAC interface(s).” POR 14-23. The District Court disagreed, construing the term as “information regarding current bandwidth availabilities of each of the wireless transceivers.” EX1027 11-16, 25.¹

That construction resolves PO’s “directly” argument. It also renders untenable PO’s argument that the “processing interface” must be located at Layer 2. According to PO, the information must be obtained “directly” from actual PHY/MAC interfaces because the processing interface allegedly resides in the MAC sublayer/adjacent to the physical layer. POR 17-23. By rejecting the “directly” requirement, the District Court necessarily determined that the processing interface need not be “adjacent,” which defeats PO’s Layer-2 arguments.

¹ PO provides no reason to depart from the District Court’s claim construction, and the Board should apply the same construction here. *See* USPTO, Memorandum, *PTAB Consideration of Prior Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law* (Sept. 16, 2025) (Board must explain if it reaches a conclusion of law different from a district court).

The Court’s construction is correct. Claim 1 requires “at least one resource monitoring interface” that “provides information regarding the first and second bandwidth availabilities to the virtual MAC interface.” The plain meaning of “provides information regarding the ... bandwidth availabilities to” encompasses both direct and indirect feedback; it does not preclude information passing through intervening layers. Nor does it require the processing interface to occupy any particular protocol-stack layer. EX1026 ¶¶19-20.

The intrinsic record is in accord. Figure 1 depicts the “process layer” as distinct from both the actual MAC layer and actual PHY layer, with the actual MAC between the process layer and actual PHY. EX1001, Fig. 1. That embodiment would be excluded under PO’s construction requiring that the information be obtained “directly” from *both* the actual PHY and actual MAC interfaces without passing through any intervening layer or interface. EX1026 ¶21.

PO’s prosecution-history arguments do not justify importing a direct-feedback or Layer-2 requirement. PO and Dr. Akl do not attempt to show that any prosecution-history statements rise to the level of a disavowal. *Schwing GmbH v. Putzmeister Aktiengesellschaft*, 305 F.3d 1318, 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (disavowal required to limit scope of claim). Nor could they. EX1026 ¶¶22-32.

The Board should apply the District Court’s construction. Under that construction, PO’s direct-feedback and Layer-2 arguments fail.

II. PATENT OWNER’S TERMINATION REQUEST SHOULD BE DENIED

The Director already denied as untimely PO’s request to terminate based on Petitioner’s District Court claim-construction positions. Paper 20. The District Court’s claim-construction order confirms that termination is unwarranted.

PO wrongly argues that Petitioner’s District Court claim-construction positions were inconsistent with the Petition. POR 24-29. Petitioner stipulated to the six agreed-upon constructions as a compromise to avoid unnecessary disputes; the parties agree those constructions are consistent with plain and ordinary meaning. For “information regarding bandwidth availabilities,” PO—not Petitioner—sought to narrow by requiring information be obtained “directly” from actual MAC and PHY interfaces. Petitioner agreed only that the information must be “current.” The District Court construed the term consistently with Petitioner’s position. EX1027 11-16, 25.

Nor do Petitioner’s proposed constructions for the preambles, “wireless networking device,” and “different bands of frequencies” create inconsistency. Petitioner offered those constructions after PO indicated it intended to apply the claims overbroadly. It is undisputed that Petitioner’s proposals are all in line with the Petition. PO does *not* dispute that the Petition demonstrates that these three terms are met.

Because PO does not dispute that the Petition demonstrates a “wireless networking device,” its assertion that Dr. Almeroth’s analysis is inconsistent with Petitioner’s District Court construction is irrelevant. It is also wrong. Dr. Almeroth recognized that the claim preambles may be limiting, EX1002 ¶¶81-82, and opined that Chincholi’s “NT” (which operate as an access point) and “WTRU” (which may operate in ad-hoc mode) both qualify as a “wireless networking device.” *Id.* Those opinions are consistent with Petitioner’s proposed construction. PO fails to show otherwise.

III. ALL ’198 PATENT CLAIMS ARE OBVIOUS

A. Chincholi Discloses All Disputed Limitations

PO largely reprises the same objections raised pre-institution, including that Chincholi lacks a “virtual MAC interface” and does not disclose the feedback and transparency limitations. PO and Dr. Akl identify no new evidence undermining the Petition’s showing.

1. Chincholi discloses the “virtual MAC interface”

The Petition demonstrates that Chincholi’s OMMA layer contains a “virtual MAC interface” under the stipulated construction—*i.e.*, “a software- or logical-based interface that is separately addressable from the recited actual MAC interfaces and that obscures the recited actual MAC interfaces from higher protocol stack layers.” Pet. 22-25.

First, Chincholi’s OMMA is a “single thin software layer,” EX1005 [0120], and thus satisfies the construction’s requirement for a software- or logical-based interface. EX1002 ¶85; EX1026 ¶¶35-36.

Second, the placement of the OMMA to create a virtual interface between the actual MAC interfaces and higher layers results in MAC addresses not being visible to higher layers, thereby obscuring the actual MAC interfaces from higher layers. EX1002 ¶98; EX1026 ¶¶44-53. Chincholi’s OMMA handles data units to and from the MAC layer in the form of “MSDUs” (MAC Service Data Units), and data units to and from the IP layer in the form of IP packets, both of which lack MAC headers having actual MAC addresses. EX1005 [0138] & Table 1; EX1002 ¶176-77; EX1026 ¶¶45-48. A POSITA understands that the MAC layer receives MSDUs containing higher-layer data payloads and wraps those payloads with MAC headers, generating MPDUs (MAC Protocol Data Units). EX1026 ¶¶45-46. This confirms that Chincholi’s OMMA “obscures” actual MAC interfaces from higher protocol-stack layers. *Id.* ¶¶49-50. Chincholi’s OMMA also reorders packets before passing them to higher layers, hiding out-of-order delivery and further obscuring lower-layer multi-RAT operation. EX1005 [0128], [0172]-[0178]; EX1026 ¶74.

Third, Chincholi’s OMMA Controller is separately addressable from the actual MAC addresses. WTRUs in Chincholi send signaling messages regarding their availability to the OMMA of associated NTs. EX1026 ¶¶37-43. Chincholi

teaches that (i) an NT advertises its RAT capabilities, (ii) a WTRU responds with a STA_RAT_Availability message, and (iii) the OMMA Controller at the NT receives the message and uses it to update its capability database. EX1005 [0243]-[0245], Fig. 31; EX1026 ¶¶39-40. The STA_RAT_Availability message directed from WTRUs to the OMMA of NTs includes “AP_Addr,” EX1005 [0244], which is the address of the NT separate from actual MAC addresses of the NT’s individual RATs. EX1026 ¶¶40-43. The AP_Addr is a unique address, separate from the NT’s actual MAC addresses, and is used by WTRUs to send signaling packets to the OMMA of associated NTs over the wireless medium. EX1026 ¶43. This confirms that the OMMA of each NT is “separately addressable” from the actual MAC interfaces. EX1026 ¶¶42-43.

PO’s various arguments fail.

First, PO’s assertion that actual MAC addresses are “apparent to the OMMA and to layers above the OMMA,” POR 32, is unsupported by anything in Chincholi. Because the OMMA deals with packets lacking MAC headers, EX1026 ¶¶45-51; *see also* EX1005 [0138] (describing OMMA operating on MSDUs), PO’s assertion is wrong.

Second, PO’s argument that Chincholi’s OMMA is not “virtual,” POR 31-35, ignores that the OMMA is a “single thin software layer,” EX1005 [0120], which meets the agreed-construction for “a software- or logical-based interface”

EX1026 ¶¶33-36. In arguing that “a virtual MAC interface would have a programmed or non-static address,” POR 33, PO imports new limitations. PO’s argument that Chincholi does not contain the word “virtual,” POR 33-34, is irrelevant—Dr. Almeroth explained the substance of Chincholi implements a “virtual” interface. EX1002 ¶¶98-100; EX1026 ¶¶33-36.

Third, PO is incorrect that the OMMA “merely acts as a conduit.” POR 33. Chincholi’s OMMA uses feedback and scheduling to select and direct traffic among RAT/MAC/PHY paths, so higher layers exchange packets with OMMA rather than selecting underlying actual MAC interfaces. EX1005 [0143], [0213]; *see also id.* [0161], [0205]; EX1026 ¶56. Chincholi’s OMMA is not a passive conduit: it supports diversity, multiplexing, hybrid, and dynamic RAT-switching modes, uses traffic shaping and feedback-based routing to distribute packets across RATs, and includes packet-scheduling and re-ordering logic. EX1005 [0150]-[0161], [0172]-[0178], [0187]-[0188], Figs. 10-13, 25; EX1026 ¶¶57, 74.

Fourth, PO’s claim that the OMMA is “not disclosed as being a separately addressable entity,” POR 33, overlooks the functionality described above wherein WTRUs address signaling packets to the OMMA using an address separate from the actual MAC addresses of the NT. EX1005 [0243]-[0245], Fig. 31; EX1026 ¶¶39-43.

Fifth, PO's claim that the "Petition resorts to equivalents-type arguments," POR 34, is baseless. That Chincholi's OMMA embodies all of the functionality that the '198 associates with the "virtual MAC interface" supports other evidence showing the term is met. EX1002 ¶¶96, 98-100; EX1026 ¶54, 58-59. PO quibbles with the Petition's mapping of Chincholi's functional blocks to those in the '198 patent. POR 34-38. But PO tellingly does not dispute that dependent claims 4, 5, and 6, which require these functionalities, are met by Chincholi. EX1001, cls. 4-6; Pet. 33-36; EX1002 ¶¶114-116.

Sixth, PO's argument that because Chincholi's two or more RATs operate "independently" of one another, they are not "directed" by the OMMA, POR 35, is a non-sequitur. Petitioner identified how Chincholi's OMMA "directs" the RATs as claimed via the "MAC Resource Reservation Module" and the "Traffic Shaping Module," which manage and direct traffic toward appropriate RAT resources. Pet. 24-25; EX1002 ¶¶99-100; EX1026 ¶55.

Seventh, PO's argument that Chincholi's OMMA does not disclose a "virtual MAC interface" because it is at "layer 3" of the protocol stack, POR 38-40, is inapposite. As discussed above, *supra*, Section I.B., there is no basis for requiring the "virtual MAC interface" be located at any particular layer. The parties' stipulated construction imposes no MAC-sublayer or Layer-2 placement

requirement. The District Court’s rejection of PO’s related “direct” feedback construction necessarily rejects PO’s attempt to import layer-placement restrictions.

Regardless, even if PO’s Layer-2 argument were correct as a matter of claim construction, the premise that Chincholi’s disclosures are limited to “layer 3” is wrong. Chincholi teaches, “[t]he OMMA layer may not be an independent layer, but rather the functionality of the OMMA layer may reside partially on one or more layers (e.g., the IP layer, *the MAC layer, etc.*) of the protocol stack.” EX1005 [0122]. Chincholi therefore meets the claim limitation regardless. EX1026 ¶60.

2. Chincholi discloses the “resource monitoring interface”

Contrary to PO at POR 41-42, Chincholi teaches feeding back “current” information regarding bandwidth availabilities and not mere “historical metrics and averages.” EX1026 ¶¶61-68. The OMMA Feedback Device Classifier collects “measurement metrics fed back from each RAT,” including “channel quality metrics and the number of available resources on the medium.” Pet. 25-28. Although some feedback metrics “*may* reflect the average state of the system operating on each RAT,” EX1005 [0141], that permissive disclosure does not exclude current resource-availability information. EX1026 ¶68.

Chincholi teaches that “[a]t *startup*, the OMMA layer may receive the available bandwidth of each of the one or more RATs,” and “[a]t the beginning of the *ramp-up phase*, the OMMA layer may receive RSSI values as seen by the one

or more RATs.” EX1005 [0167]; Pet. 21. Those then-received available-bandwidth and RSSI values to disclose current bandwidth/resource availability. EX1026 ¶¶65-66. Chincholi also discloses dynamic RAT switching based on “*instantaneous* channel quality/availability of the RATs,” EX1005 [0154], which confirms the information is “current.” EX1026 ¶67.

Chincholi also identifies feedback metrics such as RSSI “level,” “number of channels,” and “channel bandwidth,” and describes the OMMA Scheduler as using these metrics for feedback-based routing. EX1005 [0215]-[0216]. A POSITA would understand these examples confirm Chincholi’s feedback is not limited to historical-only averages. EX1026 ¶68. For example, RSSI level is a signal-strength metric, and number of channels and channel bandwidth are resource-availability metrics. *Id.*

PO’s argument that the resource monitoring interface must receive bandwidth availability “directly” fails under the District Court’s construction. Also, because Chincholi teaches implementation of the OMMA functionality in the actual MAC layer, EX1005 [0122]; EX1026 ¶¶69-70, Chincholi contemplates a “resource monitoring interface” adjacent to the actual PHY layer. Such adjacency is what PO argues provides for the “direct” feedback to the resource monitoring interface. POR 45-46. Thus Chincholi discloses dependent claims 15 and 16 as well. EX1026 ¶69.

Notably, unlike Chincholi, the '198 specification makes no mention of a resource monitoring interface, let alone one limited to feeding back only “current” bandwidth availability received “directly” from the actual MAC/PHY interfaces. In response to this written description deficiency, PO argued that “[a] POSITA would recognize that the RF block and virtual PHY layers can be programmed or ‘formed’” to act as a resource monitoring interface. POR 66. PO therefore cannot dispute that the claimed implementation was at least obvious.

3. Chincholi discloses “transparent” operation

PO wrongly asserts that Chincholi’s transparent mode is disclosed in only “a single sentence.” POR 47. Chincholi repeatedly distinguishes transparent and non-transparent OMMA operation and illustrates a “transparent OMMA Receiver” embodiment. EX1005 [0212], [0256], Fig. 34; EX1026 ¶¶77.

PO argues the claim requires a “particular manner of achieving transparency” with respect to various functions. POR 48. But the stipulated construction merely requires operation “in a manner where any protocol stack layer of the wireless networking device above the processing interface is unaware of the operation of the processing interface.” In transparent mode, the OMMA distributes, combines, and forwards packets without higher layers being aware of the OMMA’s internal routing, combining, and RAT-selection operations. EX1005 [0126], [0192]; EX1026 ¶¶72-74. That is the transparency the claim requires. *Id.*

Chincholi's TCP discussion confirms the "transparency" limitation is met. Packets sent over different RATs may arrive out of order, causing the receiving TCP entity to trigger retransmission or congestion-control behavior. EX1005 [0171]-[0173]. To address this, the OMMA layer may reorder packets based on OMMA sequence numbers, and may hold packets temporarily until the next expected packet arrives. EX1005 [0176]-[0178]. The OMMA of the transmitting device may also schedule packets in a manner that avoids triggering TCP congestion-control mechanisms. EX1005 [0179]. Thus, the OMMA manages multi-RAT operation "in a manner where any protocol stack layer of the wireless networking device above the processing interface is unaware of the operation of the processing interface." EX1026 ¶74.

In addition, as Dr. Almeroth explained in his original declaration, "Chincholi discloses that the OMMA (*i.e.*, the processing interface) includes the claimed 'virtual MAC interface' formed within it." EX1002 ¶98. Chincholi's software OMMA layer is positioned above actual MAC layers, presents a common interface to the IP layer, handles MSDUs rather than actual MAC-layer MPDUs and thereby obscures actual MAC interfaces from higher protocol-stack layers, and is separately addressable from the actual MAC interfaces. EX1026 ¶¶75-76.

PO's argument that Chincholi discloses transparency only "above layer 3," POR 48-49, relies again on its misguided claim construction. *Supra* §I.B. The

stipulated construction imposes no Layer-2 or MAC-sublayer requirement, and the District Court's rejection of PO's related "direct" feedback construction undercuts PO's attempt to import layer-placement restrictions into the claims. It also overlooks Chincholi's Layer-2 embodiment. EX1005 [0122]; EX1026 ¶78.

Notably, while PO faults Chincholi's express transparency disclosure as insufficient, PO's written-description position relies on a thinner inference from Figure 1. POR 62-64. Chincholi's transparent-mode OMMA disclosures at least render the limitation obvious. EX1026 ¶¶71, 79.

B. Motivation to Combine

PO and Dr. Akl attack strawman combinations. They argue combining Chincholi with Clegg would require bodily incorporating Clegg's "ultra-wideband tuner" and "necessitate extensive technical reworking." POR 50; EX1026 ¶¶80-81. None of those arguments addresses the combination the Petition presented. Pet. 10-12; EX1002 ¶¶77-79; EX1026 ¶80.

The Petition did not propose incorporating Clegg's ultra-wideband tuner into Chincholi. *See Allied Erecting & Dismantling Co. v. Genesis Attachments, LLC*, 825 F.3d 1373, 1381 (Fed. Cir. 2016) ("The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference."). The Petition explained that a POSITA would have understood that Chincholi's monitoring and response techniques could be enhanced

by Clegg’s teachings for addressing carrier-specific interference within bandwidth channels. Pet. 12; EX1026 ¶¶82-90. PO admits that Clegg’s techniques apply to IEEE 802.11, POR 51, which Chincholi implements, EX1005 [0121]; EX1002 ¶113. Chincholi already teaches dynamic allocation of contiguous and non-contiguous channels (EX1005 [0118]); Clegg adds “additional detail on how to mitigate carrier-specific interference within channels.” Pet. 12. Petitioner’s combination does not require replacing Chincholi’s transceivers with Clegg’s ultra-wideband tuner. EX1026 ¶¶82, 87-90.

The Petition articulated non-hindsight reasons to combine: Clegg’s carrier-specific interference mitigation teachings would predictably improve Chincholi’s feedback-based multi-RAT system. Pet. 10-12; EX1026 ¶91.

IV. ALL ’198 PATENT CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE UNDER SECTION 101

A. Step 1

PO’s only Step 1 argument is that the claims are directed to a “concrete improvement to a conventional wireless networking system,” supposedly arising from inserting a “virtual MAC interface and resource monitoring interface into the MAC sublayer of layer 2” of a protocol stack. POR 55, 54-59. This argument fails because it depends on an architectural feature absent from construed claims. *Supra* §I.B; EX1027 11-16, 25; EX1026 ¶92.

The claims do not require PO's asserted Layer-2 architecture. They instead recite nothing more than functionally connected components, such as a "processing interface," "virtual MAC interface," and "resource monitoring interface." EX1002 ¶¶188-189; EX1026 ¶92.

Ericsson Inc. v. TCL Communication Tech. Holdings, Ltd. is directly on point. There the Federal Circuit rejected the patentee's argument that the invention was directed to a specific layered architecture because "[n]either claim recites any particular architecture at all." 955 F.3d 1317, 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2020). *Two-Way Media Ltd. v. Comcast Cable Communications, LLC*, likewise rejected reliance on an unclaimed software architecture. 874 F.3d 1329, 1338-39 (Fed. Cir. 2017). The same flaw is present here. PO relies on placement of the processing interface in the MAC sublayer of Layer 2. But the claims impose no such protocol-stack placement requirement. EX1026 ¶92.

That the invention is directed to a mere abstraction is reinforced by PO's own claim construction positions. PO originally sought to tie the "virtual MAC interface" to Layer-2 of a protocol stack, but ultimately accepted a broader, functional construction. *Supra* §I.B. PO then pressed a related Layer-2 theory through its "directly" construction for the bandwidth-availability term, but the Court rejected it. EX1027 11-16, 25. PO cannot now rely upon a Layer-2 placement requirement to avoid § 101. *Ericsson*, 955 F.3d at 1329.

Without the unclaimed architectural overlay, the claims are directed to the abstract idea of evaluating available communication resources and selecting among them for transmitting data. EX1002 ¶¶188-189; EX1026 ¶92. The claims fail to specify any concrete implementation for *how* the processing interface performs its recited functions. EX1002 ¶189. Such overly functional claiming of software and network components, untethered to a concrete implementation, is abstract claiming.

PO's cited cases are distinguishable. The *Enfish* claims were limited to a specific self-referential table that improved computer functionality. *Packet Intelligence*, *SRI*, *Uniloc*, and *Data Engine* likewise involved claimed mechanisms and structures absent here.

B. Step 2

The claims also fail Step Two because they recite no inventive concept. EX1002 ¶¶190-191; EX1026 ¶92. PO again asserts that the inventive concept lies in placing the virtual MAC interface “in MAC sublayer of Layer 2 of a network stack” to provide “transparent bandwidth allocation decision making.” POR 59. That argument fares no better at Step 2 than it did at Step 1. A Layer-2 architecture is not claimed, as confirmed by the District Court's construction. *Supra* §I.B; EX1027 11-16, 25. Also, an inventive concept cannot be supplied by features appearing only in the specification. *Ericsson*, 955 F.3d at 1328-29.

Nor do the claims recite anything more than conventional components performing conventional functions. EX1002 ¶¶188, 190-191; EX1026 ¶92. They recite a “processing interface,” “application interface,” “actual MAC [and PHY] interfaces,” “wireless transceivers,” “virtual MAC interface,” and “resource monitoring interface,” connected in functional terms. The claims define the processing interface by mere conventional functions. EX1002 ¶¶190-191. That is not enough.

The same is true of the asserted “transparency” improvement. The claims do not recite any mechanism for achieving transparency; they simply state the desired outcome. EX1002 ¶¶189-191; EX1026 ¶92. Result-oriented language cannot supply an inventive concept.

V. ALL '198 PATENT CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE UNDER SECTION 112

A. Multiple Limitations Lack Written Description Support

PO's response rests on the same basic error throughout: It relies on what a POSITA might infer or find obvious from the specification, rather than on what the specification discloses. POR 62-69; EX1026 ¶93. Neither the '198 specification nor the provisional supplies support for the challenged limitations. EX1026 ¶93. PO's resort to the provisional—and its own self-serving characterizations of it in the '591 prosecution history—underscores the thinness of the written description.

1. “in a manner transparent to any layer . . . above the processing interface”

Conceding its written description does not mention “transparent” operation, PO argues that a POSITA would infer a “single point of access” from Figure 1. POR 62-64. But operating as a “single point of access” between the MAC/PHY layers and the application layers says nothing about whether the processing interface operates transparently. EX1026 ¶94. A single interface does not imply transparency; higher layers may use a single interface while still being aware of that interface’s operation. *Id.* Nothing in the ’198 specification discloses that upper layers are unaware of operation of the processing layer. *Id.*

2. “evaluating data transfer characteristics”

PO argues a POSITA would have understood “data transfer characteristics” to reference known quality-of-service parameters, and that the disclosure “suggest[s]” such evaluation through references to bandwidth, environmental conditions, and range. POR 64. But the specification’s passing references to data cycles, transfer rates, capability, efficiency, and optimization focus on bandwidth availability, not evaluating data transfer characteristics. EX1026 ¶95. PO’s argument depends on what a POSITA might find obvious, not on what the inventor described. *Id.*

3. “resource monitoring interface”

PO argues that “[a] POSITA would recognize that the RF block and virtual PHY layers *can be programmed or ‘formed’* to perform desired tasks and not others.” POR 66. But the inventor disclosed only the RF block and virtual PHY arrangement. PO cannot now broaden that disclosure into a generic “resource monitoring interface” untethered to the narrower components described. EX1026 ¶96.

4. “adapted to respectively emit radio waves in . . . different bands of frequencies”

PO asserts a POSITA would have understood that conventional Wi-Fi radios could emit on different bands. POR 67. But Figure 1 shows no radios at all, and a POSITA would understand that multiple MAC/PHY pairs could exist with a single radio. EX1026 ¶97. PO’s argument is also undermined by its complaint, which alleges that the inventor was frustrated by prior Wi-Fi’s ability to use “*only one channel or band* (then, either 2.4 or 5 GHz) at a time” and “set to work on inventing a solution” allowing use of “more than one channel or band at a time.” EX1018 ¶18. PO cannot now claim that a multi-transceiver system adapted to operate on different bands can be inferred from the scant disclosure in Figure 1.

5. “request or create a first [and second] association between a recipient and the first [and second] actual MAC and PHY interfaces”

PO contends a POSITA would have understood that “association” merely indicates “two components are in radio range of each other and connect with each other.” POR 68. That is undermined by PO’s complaint, which asserts that conventional Wi-Fi systems did *not* permit a receiver to maintain associations on multiple bands at the same time. EX1018 ¶34.

Nor does Figure 1 disclose first and second associations between a recipient and first and second actual MAC/PHY interfaces. EX1026 ¶98. At most, Figure 1 depicts application traffic associated with MAC/PHY resources; it says nothing about whether there are multiple associations with different recipients, as opposed to a single recipient merely receiving data from multiple applications. *Id.*

B. Multiple Limitations Are Indefinite

PO’s responses do not cure the indefiniteness problems. For “partially simultaneously,” PO argues that a POSITA would understand the phrase in the context of parallel transmissions during a TXOP. POR 69-70. But this term does not appear in the priority applications or the ’198 specification, and the patent says nothing about TXOPs or any benchmark for distinguishing the “partially simultaneously” and “simultaneously.” EX1026 ¶99. The problem is not the use of temporal qualifiers in the abstract; it is that the patent provides no objective way to

determine where “partial” simultaneity ends and “substantial” simultaneity begins.

See In re Taasera Licensing LLC Patent Litig., No. 22-MD-03042, 2023 WL 8628323, at *20 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 13, 2023). As the Petition explained, this indefiniteness argument is consistent with Ground 1. Pet. 88 n.3.

The same is true of “partially satisfy.” PO argues that a POSITA would understand “partially satisfy” to mean “any bandwidth that measurably contributed to a bandwidth requirement” or “any number less than [the full bandwidth]” would satisfy this limitation. POR 70-71. But the ’198 specification only describes *satisfaction* of the bandwidth requirement, never a *partial* satisfaction of the requirement. Pet. 90. PO does not address the specification’s failure to provide objective guidance on how far short the system can fall from satisfying the application bandwidth requirement while still satisfying the “partially satisfying” requirement. Pet. 91; EX1026 ¶100.

VI. CONCLUSION

The Board should cancel all claims of the ’198 patent.

PGR2025-00067
U.S. Patent No. 12,190,198

DATED: June 30, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ James Glass
James M. Glass

Counsel for Petitioners

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

This Reply complies with the type-volume limitation of 5,600 words, comprising 4,407 words, as counted using the Microsoft Word software that was used to prepare this paper, excluding the parts exempted by 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(c).

Respectfully submitted,

DATED: June 30, 2026

By: /s/ James Glass
James M. Glass (Reg. No. 46,729)
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN, LLP
295 Fifth Avenue, 9th Floor
New York, NY 10016
Tel: (212) 849-7000
jimglass@quinnemanuel.com

*Counsel for Petitioners Samsung
Electronics Co., Ltd., and Samsung
Electronics America, Inc.*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6, I hereby certify that on June 30, 2026 the foregoing document was served via email on the following counsel of record:

CMorton@RobinsKaplan.com

JGutierrez@RobinsKaplan.com

AFahrenkrog@RobinsKaplan.com

RKXiFi@RobinsKaplan.com

DATED: June 30, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ James Glass

James M. Glass (Reg. No. 46,729)
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN, LLP
295 Fifth Avenue, 9th Floor
New York, NY 10016
Tel: (212) 849-7000
jimglass@quinnemanuel.com

*Counsel for Petitioners Samsung
Electronics Co., Ltd., and Samsung
Electronics America, Inc.*