

# Exhibit F

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
TYLER DIVISION**

SIPCO, LLC, and IP CO, LLC  
(d/b/a INTUS IQ),

Plaintiffs,

v.

EMERSON ELECTRIC CO., EMERSON  
PROCESS MANAGEMENT LLLP, FISHER-  
ROSEMOUNT SYSTEMS, INC.,  
ROSEMOUNT INC., BP, p.l.c., BP  
AMERICA, INC., and BP AMERICA  
PRODUCTION COMPANY,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 6:15-cv-907

**DEFENDANTS' SUPPLEMENTAL JOINT INVALIDITY CONTENTIONS**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. RESERVATIONS..... 2

III. IDENTIFICATION OF PRIOR ART PURSUANT TO PATENT L.R. 3-3(A)..... 9

    A. Prior Art Patents ..... 9

    B. Prior Art Publications..... 11

    C. Prior Art Public Uses/Sales/Offer for Sales Under § 102(b) or Prior Invention Under § 102(g) ..... 18

    D. Prior Art Based on Derivation Under § 102(f)..... 21

IV. REPRESENTATIVE CLAIM CHARTS IDENTIFYING WHERE EACH CLAIM ELEMENT IS FOUND IN THE PRIOR ART OR RENDERED OBVIOUS PURSUANT TO PATENT L.R. 3-3(B) AND (C) ..... 22

V. ADDITIONAL OBVIOUSNESS CONSIDERATIONS AND REASONS TO COMBINE THE PRIOR ART ..... 26

    A. Asserted Brownrigg Patents ..... 28

        1. Wireless Network and Gateway Limitations..... 28

            a) “Server”/“Plurality of Clients”/“Network”/ “Housekeeping”/“Node”/“Gateway” ....32

            b) Protocol Translation and Formatting .....34

            c) “Maintaining a Send/Receive Data Buffer in Digital Memory”/“A Send and Receive Data Buffer Maintenance Step” .....35

        2. Client Link or Path Selection ..... 35

        3. Map or Tree Limitations..... 38

            a) Maintaining a Map of Data Packet Transmission Paths or a “Link Tree” .....38

            b) Server Operations to Change Transmission Paths.....40

            c) Comparing a Link and Updating a Client Link Tree.....45

        4. Authentication of Clients..... 46

    B. Asserted Petite Patents ..... 47

        1. Admitted Prior Art..... 47

        2. Examples of Prior Art Combinations ..... 49

VI. IDENTIFICATION OF INVALIDITY ARGUMENTS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112 PURSUANT TO PATENT L.R. 3-3(D)..... 57

    A. The Asserted Petite Patents ..... 57

        1. The ‘492 Patent..... 57

        2. The ‘692 Patent..... 60

3. The '893 Patent.....	62
4. The '661 Patent.....	63
5. The '780 Patent.....	64
6. The '842 Patent.....	65
7. The '732 Patent.....	65
B. Asserted Brownrigg Patents .....	65
VII. IDENTIFICATION OF INVALIDITY ARGUMENTS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101 PURSUANT TO PATENT L.R. 3-3(D).....	66
A. The Law of Subject Matter Ineligibility.....	66
B. The Asserted Petite Patents .....	69
C. Asserted Brownrigg Patents .....	69
D. Double Patenting .....	70
VIII.DOCUMENT PRODUCTION PURSUANT TO PATENT L.R. 3-4.....	70
A. Additional Prior Art .....	70

## I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to the Amended Docket Control Order (Dkt. 73) entered in this case and Patent Local Rule 3-3, Defendants Emerson Electric Co., Emerson Process Management LLLP, Fisher-Rosemount Systems, Inc., Rosemount Inc., BP, p.l.c., BP America, Inc., and BP America Production Company (“Defendants”). BP, p.l.c. provisionally makes these supplemental contentions to preserve its rights, notwithstanding and without waiving its rights to answer, tender any Rule 12 motion, or otherwise plead in response to the Amended Complaint served on April 4, 2016.

In its Local Patent Rule 3-1 and 3-2 Disclosures (“Infringement Contentions”), served on Defendants on February 29, 2016, Plaintiff SIPCO, LLC asserted claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, 13-21, and 25 of U.S. Patent No. 7,697,492 (“the ‘492 patent”); claims 1, 3-8, 11-14, 24-32, 34, 36-38, 42, 43, 46-49, 51-57, and 59-64 of U.S. Patent No. 6,437,692 (“the ‘692 patent”); claims 1, 5, 6, 8-12, and 14 of U.S. Patent No. 7,468,661 (“the ‘661 patent”); claims 1-3, 10, 17, 18, and 37 of U.S. Patent No. 6,914,893 (“the ‘893 patent”); claims 1, 2, and 4-8 of U.S. Patent No. 8,754,780 (“the ‘780 patent”); claims 1, 7, 9, 16, and 17 of U.S. Patent No. 8,908,842 (“the ‘842 patent”); and claims 1, 13, 14, 16-19, and 31-35 of U.S. Patent No. 8,013,732 (“the ‘732 patent”) (collectively, “Asserted Petite Patents” and “Asserted Petite Claims”).

In its Local Patent Rule 3-1 and 3-2 Disclosures (“Infringement Contentions”), served on Defendants on February 29, 2016, Plaintiff IPCO, LLC asserted claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 10, 11, 13, and 14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,249,516 (“the ‘516 patent”); claims 1, 4, 10, and 12-14 of U.S. Patent No. 8,000,314 (“the ‘314 patent”); claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-12, 14-22, 31-36, 40, and 41 of U.S. Patent No. 8,233,471 (“the ‘471 patent”); and claims 1-5, 7-27, 33-42, 44, and 45 of U.S. Patent No. 8,625,496 (“the ‘496 patent”) (collectively, “Asserted Brownrigg Patents” and “Asserted Brownrigg Claims”). The Asserted Petite Patents and the Asserted Brownrigg Patents are,

# 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.