

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SIPNET EU S.R.O.

Petitioner

v.

INNOVATIVE COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

(now STRAIGHT PATH IP GROUP, INC.)

Patent Owner

Patent No. 6,108,704

Filing Date: September 25, 1995

Issue Date: August 22, 2000

Title: POINT-TO-POINT INTERNET PROTOCOL

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2013-00246, Filing Date April 11, 2013

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
TO PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW**

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
I. BACKGROUND FACTS	2
A. The '704 Patent	2
B. The '704 Patent <i>Ex Parte</i> Reexamination Proceedings	2
C. Related District Court Litigation Involving the '704 Patent	4
II. PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW	4
A. Real Party In Interest.....	4
B. Petitioner's Asserted Prior Art References	4
C. Petitioner's Asserted Prior Art Combinations and Grounds for Invalidity.....	5
D. Petitioner's Asserted Claim Constructions	5
E. Petitioner's "Overview of Invalidity Analysis"	6
III. LEGAL STANDARDS	7
A. Threshold Standard for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review	7
B. Applicable Statutory and Regulatory Framework for Evaluating Petitions for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review.....	7
ARGUMENT	9
I. THE PETITION FAILS TO MEET THE PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS FOR <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW	9
A. The Petition Does Not Meaningfully Identify the Proper Claim Construction to Be Applied As Required By 37 § C.F.R. 42.104(b)(3).....	9
B. The Petition Consists Primarily of Conclusory Assertions and Unsupported Attorney Arguments Rather Than the Detailed Analysis and Explanation Required By 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.22 and 42.104(b)	10
C. The Petition Relies on Prior Art References and Arguments That Were the Same As or Substantially Similar to Those Previously Raised During the <i>Ex Parte</i> Reexamination Proceedings.....	11
D. The Petition Does Not Appear to Identify <i>All</i> "Real Parties in Interest" as Required By 35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(2).....	13
II. THE PETITION FAILS TO MEET THE SUBSTANTIVE REQUIREMENTS FOR ANTICIPATION AND OBVIOUSNESS UNDER FEDERAL CIRCUIT LAW	14
A. Petitioner's Asserted References Fail to Meet the Strict Standards for "Prior Art" Under Federal Circuit Law	14

1. Petitioner Has Failed to Qualify Its “Printed Publications” as “Publicly Accessible” Prior Art References	14
2. Petitioner Cannot Rely on Wikipedia to Establish a Prior Art Date	16
3. Petitioner’s Submission of Incomplete Prior Art References Precludes a Proper Anticipation and Obviousness Analysis	17
B. The Petition Relies on a Flawed and Incomplete Anticipation Analysis	19
1. Petitioner Relies on a Combination of References to Argue Anticipation.....	19
2. Petitioner’s Anticipation Arguments are Insufficient Under Federal Circuit Law	21
C. The Petition Relies on a Flawed and Incomplete Obviousness Analysis	22
III. <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW IS UNWARRANTED IN VIEW OF THE COMBINED PROCEDURAL AND SUBSTANTIVE DEFICIENCIES IN THE PETITION	25
A. Messenger.....	25
B. Messenger and (NetBIOS or WINS).....	26
C. NetBIOS and WINS.....	27
D. NetBIOS.....	29
E. WINS.....	30
F. DNS 1, DNS 2, and DNS Orig.	30
G. DEC '652.....	32
H. (DNS 1/2/Orig.) and (VocalTec or Taligent '278 or '704 Patent admitted prior art).....	33
CONCLUSION.....	34

Table of Authorities

Cases

<i>Bruckelmyer v. Ground Heaters, Inc.</i> , 445 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	15
<i>Crown Packaging Tech., Inc. v. Ball Metal Bev. Container Corp.</i> , 635 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	22
<i>Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Gen-Probe, Inc.</i> , 424 F.3d 1276 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	11
<i>Ex parte Bailey</i> , No. 2010-010310, Application No. 11,168,650, 2013 Pat. App. LEXIS 2470 (Pat. App. Apr. 25, 2013)	16
<i>Ex parte Mandy</i> , No. 2011-000015, Application No. 10/537,714, 2013 Pat. App. LEXIS 3163 (Pat. App. May 23, 2013)	16
<i>Ferring B.V. v. Barr Labs., Inc.</i> , 437 F.3d 1181 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	11
<i>Glaverbel Societe Anonyme v. Northlake Marketing & Supply, Inc.</i> , 45 F.3d 1550 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	11
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	22
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed Cir. 2006).....	25
<i>In re Klopfenstein</i> , 380 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	15
<i>In re Robertson</i> , 169 F.3d 743 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	22
<i>In re Wyer</i> , 655 F.2d 221 (CCPA 1981)	15
<i>Invitrogen Corp. v. Clontech Labs., Inc.</i> , 429 F.3d 1052 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	11
<i>Motorola, Inc. v. Interdigital Tech. Corp.</i> , 121 F.3d 1461 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	21
<i>Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	10, 17
<i>Norian Corp. v. Stryker Corp.</i> , 363 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	16
<i>Northern Telecom, Inc. v. Datapoint Corp.</i> , 908 F.2d 931 (Fed. Cir. 1990).....	14

...

<i>Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.</i> , 774 F.2d 1082 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	18
<i>Perfect Web Techs., Inc. v. InfoUSA, Inc.</i> , 587 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	25
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	5
<i>Pure Gold, Inc. v. Syntex (U.S.A.), Inc.</i> , 739 F.2d 624 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....	11
<i>ResQNet.com, Inc. v. Lansa, Inc.</i> , 533 F. Supp. 2d 397 (S.D.N.Y. 2008).....	15
<i>Semiconductor Energy Lab. Co. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 204 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	12
<i>Studiengesellschaft Kohle, mbH v. Dart Indus., Inc.</i> , 726 F.2d 724 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....	20
<i>Techradium, Inc. v. Blackboard Connect Inc.</i> , 2009 WL 1152985 (E.D. Tex. 2009)	17
<i>Teleflex, Inc. v. Ficoso N. Am. Corp.</i> , 299 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	20
<i>TriMed, Inc. v. Stryker Corp.</i> , 608 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	25

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 312.....	7, 8
35 U.S.C. § 325.....	8

Rules

37 C.F.R. § 42.104.....	7, 8, 11
37 C.F.R. § 42.106.....	8
37 C.F.R. § 42.107.....	8
37 C.F.R. § 42.22.....	7
37 C.F.R. § 42.65.....	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.