

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SIPNET EU S.R.O.  
Petitioner,

v.

STRAIGHT PATH IP GROUP, INC.  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2013-00246  
Patent 6,108,704

---

Before KALYAN K. DESHPANDE, THOMAS L. GIANNETTI, and  
TRENTON A. WARD, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

DESHPANDE, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

FINAL WRITTEN DECISION  
37 U.S.C. § 318(a); 37 C.F.R. § 42.73

## I. INTRODUCTION

### *A. Background*

Sipnet EU S.R.O. (“Petitioner”) filed a Petition to institute an *inter partes* review of claims 1-7 and 32-42 of U.S. Patent No. 6,108,704 (the “’704 patent”). Paper 1 (“Pet.”). Straight Path IP Group (“Patent Owner”) (formerly known as Innovative Communications Technologies, Inc.) filed a preliminary response. Paper 8 (“Prelim. Resp.”). Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 314, we instituted *inter partes* review on October 11, 2013, as to claims 1-7 and 32-42 of the ’704 patent on the following grounds of unpatentability: claims 1–7, 32, and 38–42 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by NetBIOS;<sup>1</sup> claims 1–7 and 32–42 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by WINS;<sup>2</sup> and claims 33–37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over NetBIOS and WINS. Paper 11 (“Dec.”).

After institution of trial, Patent Owner filed a Response (Paper 30, “PO Resp.”) and Petitioner filed a Reply (Paper 33, “Pet. Reply”). Oral hearing was held on July 11, 2014, and the hearing transcript has been entered in the record as Paper 61 (“Tr.”).

The Board has jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(c). This final written decision is issued pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 318(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.73. For the reasons discussed below, we determine that Petitioner has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that claims 1-7 and 32-42 of the ’704 patent are unpatentable.

---

<sup>1</sup> THE OPEN GROUP, TECHNICAL STANDARD – PROTOCOLS FOR X/OPEN PC INTERWORKING/SMB, VERSION 2 (1992) (Ex. 1003) (“NetBIOS”).

<sup>2</sup> WINDOWS NT 3.5, TCP/IP USER GUIDE (1994) (Ex. 1004) (“WINS”).

*B. Related Proceedings*


Petitioner identifies the following related district court proceedings involving the '704 patent: *Net2Phone, Inc. v. eBay Inc., Skype Inc.*, Civil Action No. 06-2469 (D.N.J.), filed June 1, 2006 (“the Skype Litigation”), and *Innovative Communications Technologies, Inc. v. Stalker Software, Inc.*, Civil Action No. 2:12-cv-00009-RGD-TEM (E.D. Va.), filed Jan. 4, 2012 (“the Stalker litigation”). Pet. 3.

Petitioner also identifies the '704 patent as the subject of Ex Parte Reexamination proceeding No. 90/010,416. Pet. 3.

*C. The '704 Patent*

The '704 patent (Ex. 1001) is titled “Point-to-Point Internet Protocol” and generally relates to establishing a point-to-point communication link. Ex. 1001, col. 2, ll. 53–57. The patent explains that a first processing unit automatically transmits its associated e-mail address, and its IP address, to a connection server. *Id.* at col. 5, ll. 25–38. The connection server stores the addresses in a database and, thus, the first processing unit is established as an active on-line party available for communication. *Id.* The first processing unit sends a query to the connection server, which searches the database to determine whether a second processing unit is active and on-line. *Id.* at col. 5, ll. 55–60. If the callee is active and on-line, the connection server sends the IP address of the callee from the database to the first processing unit, i.e., performs a point-to-point Internet protocol communication. *Id.* at col. 5, ll. 60–64. The first processing unit then directly establishes the point-to-point Internet communications with the callee using the retrieved IP address. *Id.* at col. 5, ll. 64–67.

Figure 1 of the '704 patent is reproduced below:



**FIG. 1**

Figure 1 illustrates the architecture between first processing unit 12, second processing unit 22, and connection server 26. *Id.* at col. 5, ll. 15–29.

Claim 1 illustrates the claimed subject matter and is reproduced below:

1. A computer program product for use with a computer system, the computer system executing a first process and operatively connectable to a second process and a server over a computer network, the computer program product comprising:

a computer usable medium having program code embodied in the medium, the program code comprising:

program code for transmitting to the server a network protocol address received by the first process following connection to the computer network;

program code for transmitting, to the server, a query as to whether the second process is connected to the computer network;

program code for receiving a network protocol address of the second process from the server, when the second process is connected to the computer network; and

program code, responsive to the network protocol address of the second process, for establishing a point-to-point communication link between the first process and the second process over the computer network.

*D. Claim Construction*

The Board will interpret claims of an unexpired patent using the broadest reasonable construction in light of the specification of the patent in which they appear. *See* Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,756, 48,766 (Aug. 14, 2012); 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b). Under the broadest reasonable construction standard, claim terms are given their ordinary and customary meaning, as would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art in the context of the entire disclosure. *In re Translogic Tech. Inc.*, 504 F.3d 1249, 1257 (Fed. Cir. 2007).

*1. “connected to the computer network”*

Petitioner, under the broadest reasonable construction, contends that “connected to the computer network” encompasses merely “being on-line.” Pet. 5–6. Petitioner further contends that “connected to the computer network” simply requires being registered with the server, based on the usage of this phrase in the ’704 patent specification. *Id.* at 13; *see* Ex. 1001 col. 5, ll. 31–38.

Patent Owner agrees that “connected to the computer network” encompasses “being on-line,” but argues that registering an address does not satisfy the requirement of “being on-line.” PO Resp. 26. Patent Owner specifically argues that, although “a process may be on-line at the time of registration, it may subsequently go off-line.” *Id.* Patent Owner’s expert, Dr. Ketan Mayer-Patel,

# 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.