

Filed on behalf of Microsoft Corporation

By: John D. Vandenberg (Reg. No. 31,312)
john.vandenberg@klarquist.com
Stephen J. Joncus (Reg. No. 44,809)
stephen.joncus@klarquist.com
Klarquist Sparkman, LLP
One World Trade Center, Suite 1600
121 S.W. Salmon Street
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 595-5300
Facsimile: (503) 595-5301

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MICROSOFT CORPORATION
Petitioner

v.

PROXYCONN, INC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2012-00026 (TLG)
Case IPR2013-00109 (TLG)
Patent 6,757,717 B1

**MICROSOFT CORPORATION'S OPPOSITION TO PATENT OWNER'S
CORRECTED MOTION TO AMEND UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.121**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---------------------|------|
| I. CLAIM 35 | 2 |
| II. CLAIM 36 | 4 |
| III. CLAIM 37 | 5 |
| IV. CLAIM 38 | 6 |
| V. CLAIM 39 | 9 |
| VI. CLAIM 40 | 11 |
| VII. CLAIM 41 | 13 |

The Board should deny Patent Owner's over-length motion to amend. Each proposed claim enlarges the scope of the claims and/or introduces new matter, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 316(d)(3). At least one claim is unpatentable for indefiniteness, under 35 U.S.C. § 112(b). Several amendments seek to correct claim defects in ways that do not respond to a ground of unpatentability involved in the trial, in violation of 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(a)(2)(ii). Each claim is anticipated by DRP and/or Yohe, under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Proxyconn does not even try to meet its burden to show that the proposed claims are patentable over prior art known to it.

Microsoft submits its cross-examination of Dr. Alon Konchitsky (Ex. 1024). (The parties have agreed to Microsoft filing this transcript, unsigned.) Dr. Konchitsky is not an expert in this field. Nevertheless, he is a retained agent of Proxyconn and thus it is proper to treat his cited admissions as admissions of Proxyconn, if the Board admits his direct testimony in this trial.

| <u>Ground</u> | <u>35</u> | <u>36</u> | <u>37</u> | <u>38</u> | <u>39</u> | <u>40</u> | <u>41</u> |
|----------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Enlarged | | √ | | √ | | √ | √ |
| New Matter | √ | | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ |
| Indefinite | | | | √ | | | |
| Non-responsive | | √ | | √ | | | √ |
| Anticipated by DRP | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ |
| Anticipated by Yohe | √ | √ | √ | √ | | √ | √ |

I. CLAIM 35

Some Changes from Claim 1: Adds that (1) the receiver is “configured to initiate a request for data” from the sender; (2) the sender is “configured to transmit a digital digest . . . in response to the request;” and (3) the data includes a range of octets in a file.

New Matter: Change (1) is new matter. The ’717 patent does not disclose a receiver being so configured. Admittedly, the patent does refer to the step of beginning a transaction with the receiver sending “a request to the sender/computer.” (IPR2012-00026, Ex. 1002 (“’717”), e.g., 7:65-67, 8:37-39). But, for Figs. 5-7 and 8-10, it does not say request for data. (Compare id., 9:66 (“a request for data” (for Fig. 15) with 7:65-67, 8:37-39 (“a request to the sender”)). And, it does not disclose the receiver being programmed or otherwise configured to initiate this request. It may instead, e.g., merely react to a prompt from elsewhere to send a request. This new “configured to initiate” limitation thus is new matter.

Anticipated by DRP: DRP’s client embodies the claim’s “receiver.” A DRP client is programmed to (a) request data from the server using a GET or differential GET request (IPR2013-00109, Ex. 1003 (“DRP”), 5:22-23, 6:43-7:1, 7:20-31, 7:37, 8:11-13, 9:22-32), (b) store data received over the network from the server into its disk-based cache (id., 5:30-33, 7:2-8), (c) calculate MD5 digests on that same data it receives and stores in cache (id., 3:24-27, 7:42-45, 8:36-37, 11:5-6),

and (d) compare MD5 digests (id., 5:30-33, 7:2-8, 7:42-45, 11:5-6). (See also Ex. 1024 (“Konchitsky TR”¹), 91:18-21, 98:5-9, 108:11-109:18). DRP’s server embodies the claim’s “sender.” A DRP server is programmed to (a) calculate MD5 digests on files it stores in its file-system file cache (DRP, 3:24-27, 5:26-28, 8:25-27, 9:30-31, 10:45-11:2) and (b) transmit MD5 digests of requested data in response to the client’s request for data (id., 5:22-23, 7:33-34, 7:37-39, 8:29-31, 9:22-32). (See also Konchitsky TR 93:14-94:7, 106:12-15). The data includes files and thus a range of octets in a file. (DRP, 2:31-32, 2:44-3:2, 3:13-15, 3:28-31).

Anticipated by Yohe: The three changes to the claim do not overcome Yohe’s anticipation of claim 1. (See IPR2012-00026, Ex. 1001, entries for claim 1). (Change 1:) As part of Yohe’s “file system primitives” (IPR2012-00026, Ex. 1005 (“Yohe”), 3:8-12) and “program operations” (id., 4:13-23), Yohe’s client is programmed to perform the method of Fig. 15. The client is configured to initiate a request for data from the server, beginning with its directory verify request (id., Fig. 15 (720)) to the server. (Change 2:) The server is configured to respond to this request from the client with an MD5 or CRC signature of the requested directory (id., Fig. 15 (721)). (Change 3:) As Dr. Konchitsky testified, Yohe’s “directo-

¹ Dr. Konchitsky is Patent Owner’s retained agent but not an expert in this field.

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.