CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

NETWORK-1 TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE LLC and YOUTUBE, LLC,

Defendants.

14 Civ. 2396 (PGG)

14 Civ. 9558 (PGG)

PLAINTIFF NETWORK-1 TECHNOLOGIES, INC.'S
BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. SUMMARY JUDGMENT STANDARDS 2

III. GOOGLE'S PRIOR ART THEORIES BASED ON "SYSTEMS" FAIL AS A MATTER OF LAW 3

A. Background 4

i. Clango 4

ii. FreeAmp 5

B. Legal Standards 5

i. Anticipation 6

ii. Obviousness 10

C. The Search Functions Of Clango That Google Relies On To Meet The Claimed Search Features Were Not Disclosed To The Public And Cannot Qualify As Prior Art 11

i. Google relies on the kd-tree search allegedly used by Clango to meet the claimed search feature elements 12

ii. It is undisputed that the kd-tree search of the Clango system was not disclosed to the public 13

iii. Because the Clango search functionality was not disclosed to the public, it cannot anticipate the claimed search feature elements under Section 102(a) 15

iv. It is undisputed that the Clango kd-tree search algorithm was suppressed or concealed, so that it cannot serve as prior art under Section 102(g) 16

v. Because the Clango search was not prior art under Section 102, it cannot be relied on to show obviousness under Section 103 17

D. Google Fails To Establish The Alleged Public Use Or Prior Invention of Clango (Specifically The Use Of kd-Tree Search) At The Relevant Time Because It Relies On Uncorroborated Testimony 17

i. Google's expert asserts that Clango performed kd-tree search as of particular dates based solely on testimony 18

ii. Google failed to procure corroborating evidence that any version of Clango used kd-tree search prior to the critical date 19

iii. Because the testimony is uncorroborated, it cannot support Clango as prior art 20

E. Google Fails To Establish That Clango Could Be Combined With Any Other Prior Art To Render Any Patent Claim Obvious 21

i. Obviousness combinations require proof of a motivation to combine and a reasonable expectation of success 21

ii. Persons of skill in the art could not have combined Clango with Chen because Clango's search functionality was hidden from the public 21

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

F. The Search Functions Of FreeAmp That Google Relies On To Meet The Claimed Search Features Were Not Disclosed To The Public And Cannot Qualify As Prior Art 22

i. Google relies on the "two-level hash" search allegedly used by FreeAmp to meet the claimed search feature elements 23

ii. It is undisputed that the "two-level hash" search of the FreeAmp system was not disclosed to the public 24

iii. Because the FreeAmp search functionality was not disclosed to the public, it cannot anticipate or render obvious the claimed search feature elements under Section 102(a) 25

iv. It is undisputed that the FreeAmp two-level hash search algorithm was suppressed or concealed, so it cannot serve as prior art under Section 102(g) 26

v. Because the FreeAmp search was not prior art under Section 102, it cannot be relied on to show obviousness under Section 103 27

G. Google Fails To Establish The Alleged Public Use Or Prior Invention Of FreeAmp (Specifically The Use Of A Two-Level Hash Search) Prior To The Critical Date Because It Relies On Uncorroborated Testimony 27

i. Google's expert asserts that FreeAmp performed two-level hash search prior to Dr. Cox's invention based solely on testimony 28

ii. Google failed to procure corroborating evidence that FreeAmp used a two-level hash search as of the date asserted by Google 28

iii. Because the testimony is uncorroborated, it cannot support FreeAmp as prior art 28

H. Google Fails To Establish That FreeAmp Could Be Combined With Any Other Prior Art To Render Any Patent Claim Obvious 29

i. Obviousness combinations require proof of a motivation to combine and a reasonable expectation of success 30

ii. Persons of skill in the art could not have combined FreeAmp because FreeAmp's two-level hash search functionality was hidden from the public 30

A. Google's Inter Partes Reviews of the Challenged Claims of the '988 and '237 Patents Resulted in Final Written Decisions Affirming Their Validity 31

B. Section 315 Estoppel Applies to Prior Art Google Raised or Reasonably Could Have Raised In Its IPR Petitions 32

C. Google Is Estopped From Challenging The Asserted Claims of the '237 and '988 Patents Based On the Combination of Chen and Arya 35

V. CONCLUSION 36

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.,
477 U.S. 242 (1986) 3

Apotex USA, Inc. v. Merck & Co.,
254 F.3d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 2001) 8, 17, 28

BASF Corp. v. SNF Holding Co.,
955 F.3d 958 (Fed. Cir. 2020) 7, 8

Cal. Inst. of Tech. v. Broadcom Ltd.,
No. CV 16-3714 GW (AGRX), 2018 WL 7456042 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 28, 2018) 35, 36

Carella v. Starlight Archery & Pro Line Co.,
804 F.2d 135 (Fed. Cir. 1986) 7

Celotex Corp. v. Catrett,
477 U.S. 317 (1986) 3

Cobalt Boats, LLC v. Sea Ray Boats, Inc.,
No. 2:15-cv-21, 2017 WL 2605977 (E.D. Va. June 5, 2017) 36

Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.,
688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 11, 22, 31

Dey, L.P. v. Sunovian Pharmaceuticals, Inc.,
715 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 8, 16, 26

Douglas Dynamics, LLC v. Meyer Prods. LLC,
No. 14-CV-886-JDP, 2017 WL 1382556 (W.D. Wis. Apr. 18, 2017) 35

Finnigan Corp. v. ITC,
180 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 1999) 10

Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City,
85 S. Ct. 684 (1966) 11, 18, 28

Horvath v. Lee,
564 F.2d 948 (CCPA 1977) 8

Int'l Glass Co. v. United States,
408 F.2d 395 (Ct. Cl. 1969) 9

Juicy Whip, Inc. v. Orange Bang, Inc.,
292 F.3d 728 (Fed. Cir. 2002) 10, 21, 30

Kimberly -Clark Corp. v. Johnson & Johnson,
745 F.2d 1437 (Fed. Cir. 1984) 9

KSR Int'l. Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.,
127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007) 11

Lacks Indus., Inc. v. McKechnie Vehicle Components USA, Inc.,
322 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2003) 10, 21, 30

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.,
107 F.3d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1997) 8

Martek Biosciences Corp. v. Nutrinova, Inc.,
579 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2009) 10

Microsoft Corp. v. i4i Ltd. Partnership,
131 S. Ct. 2238 (2011) 6

Novartis Pharm. Corp. v. Par Pharm. Inc.,
No. 14-1289, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 62489 (D. Del. Apr. 11, 2019) 35

Oddzon Prods., Inc. v. Just Toys, Inc.,
122 F.3d 1396 (Fed. Cir. 1997) 9

Parallel Networks Licensing, LLC v. Int'l Bus. Machs. Corp., No. CV 13-2072 (KAJ), 2017 WL
1045912, at *10 n.13 (D. Del. Feb. 22, 2017) 34

SAS Institute Inc. v. Iancu,
138 S.Ct. 1348 (2018) 33, 34, 36

SiOnyx, LLC v. Hamamatsu Photonics K.K.,
330 F. Supp. 3d 574 (D. Mass. 2018) 35, 36, 37

Trustees of Columbia Univ. in the City of New York v. Symantec Corp.,
No. 3:13CV808, 2019 WL 2814682 (E.D. Va. July 2, 2019) 34, 35, 36

W.L. Gore & Assoc. v. Garlock, Inc.,
721 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983) 8, 16, 26

Woodland Trust. v. Flowertree Nursery, Inc.,
148 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 1998) 7, 10

ZitoVault, LLC v. Int'l Bus. Machs. Corp.,
No. 3:16-cv-0962-M, 2018 WL 2971178 (N.D. Tex. Apr. 4, 2018) 37

Rules

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 56(a) 1

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102 ..... 1, 3, 6

35 U.S.C. § 103 ..... 1, 3, 6, 10

35 U.S.C. § 282 6

35 U.S.C. § 311(b) 34

35 U.S.C. § 315 ..... passim

Other Authorities

157 Cong. Rec. S1360-94 (daily ed. Mar. 8, 2011) (statement of Sen. Grassley) 36

157 Cong. Rec. S1375 (daily ed. Mar. 8, 2011) (statement of Sen. Kyl) 35

America Invents Act: Hearing on H.R. 1249 Before the House Comm. on the Judiciary, 112th Cong.
52-53 (2011) 35

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.