

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ORACLE CORPORATION

Petitioner

v.

Patent of CLOUDING IP, LLC

Patent Owner

Case IPR2013-00073 (JL)

Patent 6,738,799

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO
PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 6,738,799
UNDER 35 USC §§ 311-319 AND 37 CFR §42.100 ET SEQ.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Overview of U.S. Patent 6,738,799	2
3. Claim Terms Requiring Construction.....	3
A. Claims 1 and 23 Require that a <i>Command to Copy</i> be Written into the Update.	4
B. Claim 37 Requires that a Check is Made to Determine Whether a Second Computer <i>Has</i> a Version of a File.....	6
C. The Signature List Recited in Claims 1 and 23 is a Representation of a Segment of File.....	8
D. An <i>Update</i> is an Item that Allows a Second Computer to Build a Current Version of a File From a Local Copy of the File.	9
E. Summary of Proposed Claim Constructions.	11
4. Argument.....	12
A. The Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood that at Least One Challenged Claim is Unpatentable Over Balcha When Considered in Combination with Miller.	12
B. The Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood that at Least One Challenged Claim is Unpatentable Over Balcha When Considered in Combination with Miller and Freivald.	22
C. The Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood that Claim 37 is Anticipated by Balcha.....	24
D. The Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood that Claims 1 and 23 are Unpatentable Over Miller When Considered in Combination with Freivald.	26

E. The Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood that Claim 37 is Unpatentable Over Miller When Considered in Combination with Freivald. 29

F. The Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood that Claim 37 is Anticipated by Freivald..... 31

G. The Petition Fails to Establish any Reasonable Likelihood that Claims 1, 23 and 24 are Anticipated by Williams..... 35

H. The Petition Fails to Establish any Reasonable Likelihood that Claims 5-10 are Unpatentable in View of Williams When Considered in Combination with Miller. 40

I. The Petition Fails to Establish any Reasonable Likelihood that Claim 37 is Anticipated by Williams..... 43

5. Conclusion 45

Table of Authorities

Cases

Bayer Schering Pharm. AG v. Barr Labs., Inc.,
575 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2009) (Newman, J., dissenting) 17

CCS Fitness, Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.,
288 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2002)..... 3

Ex parte Levy,
17 USPQ2d 1461 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990) 39

In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr.,
367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004)..... 3

KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007)..... 12, 17, 41

Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. Am. Hoist & Derrick Co.,
730 F.2d 1452 (Fed. Cir. 1984)..... 24

Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.,
545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... 24, 40

Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.,
868 F.2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1989)..... 24, 34, 36

Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California,
814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987)..... 24, 25, 34

W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.,
721 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 851 (1984) 19, 42

Statutes

35 U.S.C. 325(d) 45

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 1.75(d)(1)..... 4
37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c)..... 1

Other Authorities

157 Cong. Rec. S1375 (Mar. 8, 2011)..... 1, 45
Changes to Implement Inter Partes Review Proceedings, Post-Grant Review
Proceedings, and Transitional Program for Covered Business
Method Patents, Final Rule,
77 Fed. Reg. 48680 (Aug. 14, 2012)..... 32
Office Patent Trial Practice Guide,
77 Fed. Reg. 48756 (Aug. 14, 2012)..... 3
H.R. Rep. No. 112-98 (part 1) (2011)..... 1
MPEP § 2112..... 38
MPEP § 2142..... 21
MPEP § 2173.01..... 8

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.