

1 KARIN G. PAGNANELLI (SBN 174763)
kgp@msk.com
2 MITCHELL SILBERBERG & KNUPP LLP
11377 West Olympic Boulevard
3 Los Angeles, California 90064-1683
Telephone: (310) 312-2000
4 Facsimile: (310) 312-3100

5 STEPHEN J. JONCUS (*pro hac vice*)
stephen.joncus@klarquist.com
6 SALUMEH R. LOESCH (*pro hac vice*)
salumeh.loesch@klarquist.com
7 JOHN D. VANDENBERG (*pro hac vice*)
john.vandenberg@klarquist.com
8 KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP
121 SW Salmon Street, Suite 1600
9 Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 595-5300

10 Attorneys for Defendants
11 *Microsoft Corporation, Hewlett-Packard Company,*
Dell Inc., and Acer America Corporation

12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
13 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
14 SOUTHERN DIVISION

15 PROXYCONN, INC.,
16 Plaintiff,
17 v.
18 MICROSOFT CORPORATION et al.,
19 Defendants.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

CASE NO. SA CV11-1681 DOC (ANx)
[Consolidated With Case Nos. SA
CV11-1682 DOC (ANx), SA CV11-
1683 DOC (ANx), and SA CV11-1684
DOC (ANx)]

**DEFENDANTS MICROSOFT
CORPORATION, HEWLETT-
PACKARD COMPANY, DELL INC.,
AND ACER AMERICA
CORPORATION'S NOTICE OF
MOTION AND MOTION FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF
INVALIDITY**

Time: 8:30 a.m.
Date: August 20, 2012
Ctrm: 9D
Before: Hon. David O. Carter

MICROSOFT

1 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD HEREIN:**

2 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on August 20, 2012 at 8:30 a.m., Defendants
3 Microsoft Corporation, Hewlett-Packard Company, Dell Inc., and Acer America
4 Corporation (“Defendants”) will bring on for hearing this Motion for summary
5 judgment, before the Honorable David O. Carter, in courtroom 9D at 411 West
6 Fourth Street, Santa Ana, California 92701.

7 Defendants, by and through undersigned counsel, hereby move this Court
8 pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 56 for summary judgment that all claims of the asserted
9 patent are invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2.

10 This Motion is based on the attached Memorandum of Points and
11 Authorities, the Declaration of Darrell D.E. Long, the Declaration of Sean-Michael
12 Riley, the Statement of Undisputed Facts, and any matters of which this Court may
13 take judicial notice, and such additional evidence or argument as may be presented
14 at or before the hearing on this matter.

15 This Motion is made following the conference of counsel pursuant to Local
16 Rule 7-3 on June 21, 2012.

17
18 DATED: July 3, 2012

KARIN G. PAGNANELLI
MITCHELL SILBERBERG & KNUPP LLP

STEPHEN J. JONCUS
SALUMEH R. LOESCH
JOHN D. VANDENBERG
KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

19
20
21
22
23
24 By: /S/Karin G. Pagnanelli
Karin G. Pagnanelli
Attorneys for Defendants
*Microsoft Corporation, Hewlett-Packard
25 Company, Dell Inc., and Acer America
26 Corporation*
27

Mitchell

28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Table of Contents

Page

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

II. BACKGROUND MATH..... 2

 A. Digital Fingerprints 2

 B. Using Digital Fingerprints To Decrease Data Redundancy 2

 C. False Positives With Fingerprints 3

 D. Probabilities Of False Positives Depend On The Environment..... 3

III. THE ASSERTED PATENT..... 4

 A. Patent’s Objectives..... 4

 B. Patent Uses “Digital Digests” To Reduce Data Redundancy 4

 C. Patent: “Digital Digest” Has “Low Probability” Of False Positives 5

 D. Patent: MD5 And CRC Functions Calculate “Digital Digests” 6

 E. Patent: Rules Out MD5 And CRC By Declaring That “Digital Digest” Is Used As A Similarity Check 7

 F. Patent Applicant: CRC Has “High Probability” Of False Positives.... 9

IV. GOVERNING LAW 9

 A. Summary Judgment Standards..... 9

 B. Patent Claims Must Be Particular And Distinct 10

V. ARGUMENT 12

 A. The Patent’s Self-Contradictions Cloud The Claims..... 13

 B. The Patent’s Failure To Disclose Any Example Of A “Digital Digest” Clouds The Claims 14

 C. The Patent Is Unclear On Meaning Of “Low” Probability..... 14

 1. The Patent Is Unclear On The Environment 16

 2. The Claims Provide No Lower Bound For “Low” Probability 18

VI. THIS DEFECT INFECTS ALL CLAIMS..... 20

VII. CONCLUSION 21

Mitchell

Table of Authorities

Page

CASES

1

2

3

4 *Aero Products Int’l, Inc. v. Intex Recreation Corp.*

5 466 F.3d 1000 (Fed. Cir. 2006)..... 11

6 *Amgen Inc. v. Hoechst Marion Roussel, Inc.,*

7 314 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2003)..... 16

8 *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.,*

9 477 U.S. 242 (1986) 10

10 *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett,*

11 477 U.S. 317 (1986) 9, 10

12 *Datamize, LLC v. Plumtree Software, Inc.,*

13 417 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 12, 15

14 *Eibel Process Co. v. Minn. & Ont. Paper Co.,*

15 261 U.S. 45 (1923) 11

16 *Fed. Comm’n Comm’n v. Fox Television Stations,*

17 2012 WL 2644462 (U.S. June 21, 2012)..... 12

18 *Gen. Elec. Co. v. Wabash Appliance Corp.,*

19 304 U.S. 364 (1938) 19

20 *Halliburton Energy Servs., Inc. v. M-I LLC,*

21 514 F.3d 1244 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... 14, 15, 19

22 *Halliburton Oil Well Cementing Co. v. Walker,*

23 329 U.S. 1 (1946) 19

24 *Hearing Components, Inc. v. Shure Inc.,*

25 600 F.3d 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2010)..... 16

26 *Honeywell Int’l, Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n,*

27 341 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2003)..... 17, 18

28 *IGT v. Bally Gaming Int’l, Inc.,*

29 659 F.3d 1109 (Fed. Cir. 2011)..... 11

Mitchell

1 *Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.*,
517 U.S. 370 (1996) 11

2

3 *Microsoft Corp. v. i4i Ltd P'ship*,
131 S. Ct. 2238 (2011) 10

4

5 *Nissan Fire & Marine Ins. Co. v. Fritz Co.*,
210 F.3d 1099 (9th Cir. 2000)..... 10

6 *United Carbon Co. v. Binney & Smith Co.*,
317 U.S. 228 (1942) 1, 11

7

8 **STATUTES**

9 35 U.S.C. § 112..... 1, 10, 16, 21

10 35 U.S.C. § 288..... 20

11

12 **RULES**

13 Fed. R. Civ. P. 56..... 1, 9

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

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.