

EXHIBIT A

Filed on Behalf of NETWORK-1 TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

By: Charles R. Macedo (Reg. No. 32,781)
Brian A. Comack (Reg. No. 45,343)
Amster, Rothstein & Ebenstein LLP
90 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10016
Telephone: (212) 336-8074
Facsimile: (212) 336-8001
cmacedo@arelaw.com
N1-Google-CBM@arelaw.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

NETWORK-1 TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
Patent Owner.

Case CBM2015-00113
Patent 8,904,464

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §42.220

Table of Contents

I. Petitioner’s 103 Grounds fail because Petitioner’s proposed combinations are missing key elements of each independent claim.....3

A. Claim elements 1.B/18.C, 1.C/18.D, and 1.D/18.A—“*electronic media work identifier*.”6

1. The broadest reasonable construction of “*identifier*,” in the context of the phrase “*electronic media work identifier*” and the ‘464 Patent, is a name or label that identifies something, in this case the “*electronic media work*.”7

2. The samples disclosed in Ferris are not “*electronic media work identifiers*.”13

B. Claim elements 1.C/18.D—“storing ... correlation information.”16

C. Claim elements 1.F/18.F—“providing from the computer system to a user electronic device, the first electronic media work...”17

1. Reason 1: The “*computer system*” that provides the PADUID does not provide an “*electronic media work*” to anything at the User’s Home 416, much less the “*user electronic device*.”19

2. Reason 2: the Broadcasters 402 do not provide an “*electronic media work*” to the remote control device 417.24

3. Board’s concerns.....26

D. Claim elements 1.H/18.H and 1.I/18.I—“*machine-readable instructions*.”30

1. “*Machine-readable instructions*” means code or pseudocode that is executed using a computer processor, not a message to be read and followed by a human.32

2. Petitioner does not identify “*machine-readable instructions*” in Ferris that are generated by a computer system and provided to a user electronic device.40

E. Dependent claims.49

II. Obvious combinations.50

 A. Combining Ferris and Lambert.51

 B. Combining Ferris and Gionis.61

 1. Reason 1: Replacing the sliding-window algorithm of Ferris with the Gionis algorithm will result in a system that produces unacceptable errors.62

 2. Reason 2: Replacing the algorithm disclosed in Ferris algorithm with the Gionis algorithm will result in a less efficient—not more efficient—system.67

 3. Board Concerns.....69

III. Petitioner cannot supplement its analysis and evidence.....73

IV. Conclusion.78

Table of Authorities**Cases**

<i>Alberts v. Kappos</i> , 917 F.Supp.2d 94 (D.D.C. 2013)	59
<i>Apple Inc. v. Cellular Communications Equipment, LLC</i> , IPR2015-00576 (June 12, 2015)	60
<i>Avaya Inc. v. Network-1</i> , IPR2013-00071 (May 22, 2014)	76
<i>Biodelivery Sciences International, Inc. v. RB Pharmaceuticals Limited</i> , IPR2014-00325 (July 29, 2014)	48, 53
<i>CallCopy, Inc. v. Verint Americas, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00492 (Feb. 5, 2014)	49
<i>CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Int'l Corp.</i> , 349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	4
<i>Comaper Corp. v. Antec, Inc.</i> , 596 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	9, 39
<i>Denso Corporation v. Netlatch, LLC</i> , IPR2015-00473 (July 15, 2015)	70
<i>Dr. Reddy's Laboratories, Inc. v. Pozen Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00802 (October 9, 2015)	53
<i>Eizo Corporation v. Barco N.V.</i> , IPR2014-00358 (July 14, 2015)	74
<i>Electro-Nucleonics, Inc. v. Mossinghoff</i> , 592 F.Supp. 608 (D.C.D.C. 1984)	58
<i>EMC Corp. v. Clouding Corp.</i> , IPR2014-01309 (February 4, 2015)	62
<i>Esselte Corporation, Esselte AB, and Esselte Leitz GmbH & Co. KG v. Sanford L.P.</i> , IPR2015-00771 (August 28, 2015)	8
<i>Global Tel*Link Corp. v. Securus Technologies, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00785 (October 7, 2015)	4

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.