

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re U.S. Patent No. 6,218,930)	MAIL STOP:
Boris KATZENBERG et al.)	<i>Ex parte</i> REEXAMINATION
Reexamination Control No.: 90/012,401)	Group Art Unit: 3992
Filed: July 20, 2012)	Examiner: KE, Peng
For: APPARATUS AND METHOD FOR REMOTELY POWERING ACCESS EQUIPMENT OVER A 10/100 SWITCHED ETHERNET NETWORK)	Confirmation No.: 7779

AMENDMENT AND REPLY

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Madam:

In response to the Office Action dated December 21, 2012, the two month period for reply having been restarted on May 29, 2014, and further to the personal interview of June 26, 2014, please enter the following amendments to the claims and reconsider the rejections in light of the following remarks and accompanying Declaration of Dr. James Knox.

Table of Contents

AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

I. Listing of claims:..... 4

REMARKS

II. Claim Status 8

III. Summary of Interview 8

IV. Background 16

 A. Prior proceedings involving the '930 Patent..... 16

 B. The '930 Patent. 19

 C. Claim constructions..... 20

 D. The Reexamination References. 23

V. Claim elements missing from all Reexamination References..... 25

 A. Missing elements 1: No Reexamination Reference discloses the
 "data signaling pair" elements..... 26

 B. Missing elements 2: No Reexamination Reference discloses the
 claimed "low level current" elements..... 32

 C. Missing element 3: No Reexamination Reference teaches "a data
 node adapted for data switching" 37

 D. Missing Element 4: No USB Reference teaches "remotely
 powering access equipment in a data network." 39

VI. Issue Set 1: Holmdahl does not anticipate the Challenged Claims..... 42

VII. Issue Set 2: Wood does not anticipate the Challenged Claims. 48

VIII. Issue Set 3: The Challenged Claims are not obvious over Amoni
 in view of Holmdahl. 54

 A. Comparison of Amoni with claim elements. 54

 B. The Challenged Claims are not obvious over Amoni in view of
 Holmdahl because any combination of Amoni and Holmdahl
 still does not include critical claimed elements..... 60

IX. Issue Set 4: The Challenged Claims are not obvious over Williams in view of Holmdahl. 61

A. Comparison of Williams to claim elements. 61

B. The Challenged Claims are not obvious over Williams in view of Holmdahl because combination of Williams and Holmdahl still do not include critical claimed elements..... 66

C. The Challenged Claims are not obvious over Williams in view of Holmdahl because there is no reason or motivation to combine Holmdahl (a USB reference) with Williams (the telephony reference). 67

X. Additional reasons why the Challenged Claims are not obvious in light of Issue Sets 3 and 4..... 68

XI. Allowability of newly added claims..... 76

A. There is support in the specification for the proposed new claims..... 77

B. The proposed claims do not broaden the scope of the original claims..... 77

XII. Conclusion..... 81

#	<u>Exhibits</u>
1	U.S Patent 6,218,930 (“930 Patent”)
2	Declaration of James Knox (“Knox Decl.”)
3	Final Written Decision, IPR2013-00071 (“Final Decision”)
4	Decision to Institute, IPR2013-00071 (“Decision to Institute”)
5	Decision Denying Petition, IPR2013-00092 (“Decision Denying Petition”)
6	Network-1 Press Release
7	Defendants’ Invalidation Contentions - <i>Cisco Litigation</i>
8	U.S. Patent 5,991,885 (“Chang”)
9	Transcript of Jury Trial – <i>Cisco Litigation</i>
10	e-mail re: Signal vs Idle Debate

AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

Please add new claims 10 through 23 as they appear below.

Original patent claims 1 through 9 are not changed by this paper and have not been represented below in accordance with 37 CFR 1.530(d) through (j) and MPEP § 2250. All changes are shown relative to the set of claims that appear in the issued patent.

I. Listing of claims:

10. (New) Method according to claim 6, wherein said data node is an Ethernet switch.

11. (New) Method according to claim 6, wherein said data signaling pair is a pair of wires used to transmit data within an Ethernet cable.

12. (New) Method according to claim 6, wherein said low level current is a current used to determine whether the access device is capable of accepting remote power.

13. (New) Method according to claim 6, wherein said low level current is insufficient to operate said access device, but sufficient to generate a voltage level on said data signaling pair that is used to determine whether said access device is capable of accepting remote power.

14. (New) Method according to claim 6, wherein controlling power supplied by the secondary power source involves increasing the level of the low level current to a level sufficient to operate said access device.

15. (New) Method according to claim 6, wherein said secondary power source is the same source of power as said main power source.

16. (New) Method according to claim 6, wherein said secondary power source is the same physical device as the main power source.

17. (New) Method according to claim 6, wherein said main power source provides a DC current flow.

18. (New) Method according to claim 6, wherein there are at least two data signaling pairs connected between the data node and the access device.

19. (New) Method according to claim 6, wherein sensing the voltage level on the data signaling pair includes at least two sensed measurements.

20. (New) Method for remotely powering access equipment in an Ethernet data network, comprising,

(a) providing

(i) an Ethernet data node adapted for data switching,

(ii) an access device adapted for data transmission,

(iii) at least one data signaling pair connected between the data node and the access device and arranged to transmit data therebetween,

(iv) a main power source connected to supply power to the data node,
and

(v) a secondary power source arranged to supply power from the data node via said data signaling pair to the access device,

(b) delivering a low level current from said main power source to the access device over said data signaling pair,

(c) sensing a voltage level on the data signaling pair in response to the low level current,

(d) determining whether the access device is capable of accepting remote power based on the sensed voltage level, and

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.