

Filed on behalf of Ricoh Americas Corporation and Xerox Corporation

By: Michael D. Specht (mspecht-PTAB@skgf.com)
Jason D. Eisenberg (jasone-PTAB@skgf.com)
H. Keeto Sabharwal (keetos-PTAB@skgf.com)
Dennies Varughese (dvarughe-PTAB@skgf.com)
Richard M. Bemben (rbemben-PTAB@skgf.com)
Sterne, Kessler, Goldstein & Fox P.L.L.C.
1100 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: (202) 371-2600
Fax: (202) 371-2540

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

RICOH AMERICAS CORPORATION

XEROX CORPORATION

Petitioners

v.

MPHJ TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENTS LLC

Patent Owner

CASE: IPR2013-00302

Patent 7,986,426

REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

II. THE BOARD SHOULD GIVE NO WEIGHT TO MR. WEADOCK’S DECLARATION 2

 A. Mr. Weadock Is Not Qualified To Opine On The ’426 Patent 2

 B. Mr. Weadock Repeatedly Admitted That He Lacked Sufficient Time And/Or Money To Properly Prepare His Declaration..... 3

 C. Mr. Weadock Failed To Apply Proper Patent Law Principles..... 5

 D. Mr. Weadock Contradicted Many Of The Statements In His Declaration During Cross-Examination 6

III. THE BOARD SHOULD REJECT MPJH’S CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BECAUSE IT IS INCONSISTENT WITH THE SPECIFICATION AND MR. WEADOCK’S CROSS-EXAMINATION TESTIMONY 8

 A. “Applications” 8

 B. “Module” 10

 C. “Dynamically Combining” 11

IV. MR. WEADOCK ADMITTED THAT MANY OF THE LIMITATIONS RECITED IN THE INDEPENDENT CLAIMS WERE KNOWN IN THE PRIOR ART 12

V. MPHJ’S POR IS DEVOID OF ANY CREDIBLE ARGUMENT DEMONSTRATING THAT EITHER XNS OR SALGADO FAILS TO ANTICIPATE CLAIMS 1-11 14

VI. CONCLUSION..... 15

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE..... 17

I. INTRODUCTION

The Board properly construed the claims and found that there is a reasonable likelihood that each of XNS and Salgado anticipates claims 1-11 of the '426 Patent. (Paper 8, 22-35.) MPHJ has provided no credible basis to support reversal of this finding. Rather, MPHJ's Patent Owner Response (Paper 30; "POR") and the testimony of MPHJ's expert, Mr. Glenn E. Weadock, further demonstrate that all claims of the '426 Patent should be held unpatentable.

MPHJ failed to demonstrate the validity of the '426 Patent for at least four primary reasons. *First*, MPHJ's POR relied on the hastily prepared Declaration of Glenn E. Weadock (Ex. 2002; "Weadock Decl.") that should be given no weight, and therefore provides no support for the validity of the '426 Patent claims. Mr. Weadock is not qualified to opine on the technology disclosed in the '426 Patent. Moreover, he (1) repeatedly admitted that he had insufficient time and resources to prepare his Declaration, (2) failed to apply proper patent law principles, and (3) contradicted several important aspects of his Declaration. *Second*, MPHJ's arguments that attempt to distinguish over the cited prior art – XNS and Salgado – hinge on constructions of the terms "applications" and "module" that do not comport with the governing broadest reasonable interpretation (BRI) standard. *Third*, Mr. Weadock admitted that all of the structural limitations recited in the claims were known in the prior art; in fact, he even authored a book in 1995 that

disclosed the functional or software aspects of the putative invention. *Fourth*, MPHJ's POR is devoid of any credible argument that rebuts the Board's findings that the claim elements are anticipated by both XNS and Salgado.

II. THE BOARD SHOULD GIVE NO WEIGHT TO MR. WEADOCK'S DECLARATION

A. Mr. Weadock Is Not Qualified To Opine On The '426 Patent

Mr. Weadock is not qualified to serve as an expert in this matter. In fact under Dr. Melen's proposed definition of a person of ordinary skill in the art ("POSA"), Mr. Weadock is not even a POSA. (RIC 1008 ("Melen Decl."), ¶18.)¹ Specifically, since 1985, Mr. Weadock has worked as an IT consultant helping his clients specify and configure hardware and software for their office networks, troubleshoot IT issues, set up help desks, develop websites, and provide assistance in legal matters. (RIC 1013 ("Weadock Depo."), 160:16-163:6.) He does not design hardware or software; he helps his clients configure it. (*Id.* at 163:14-164:10.) In fact, Mr. Weadock has never developed software primarily oriented towards printing, scanning, copying, or facsimile (*id.* at 114:15-116:4); he has

¹ Mr. Weadock has inappropriately and conveniently proposed a POSA definition that is written so broadly as to potentially even cover Mr. Weadock's education and background. (Weadock Decl., ¶15.) The Board should reject this proposed POSA definition.

never written software for a commercial device (*id.* at 116:5-13); and he has never been employed by a scanner or copier company (*id.* at 133:10-12).

And Mr. Weadock is even less experienced in developing hardware. He holds a B.S. Degree in General Engineering – majoring in *energy technologies*. (*Id.* at 123:2-3.) Energy technologies are “oil and gas, nuclear, wind, solar technologies that are used to generate energy sources. That was the focus of [Mr. Weadock’s] major.” (*Id.* at 126:5-9.) Thus, it is not surprising that he never took any courses in circuit design or hardware. (*Id.* at 116:22-117:2.)

By contrast, Petitioners’ Expert, Dr. Roger Melen, is ideally qualified to opine on the technology at issue; he holds a Ph.D. in Electrical Engineering from Stanford University and was developing networked digital scanner/copier technology as the Vice President of R & D at Canon Research Center America from 1990 to 2001, which includes the earliest possible priority date of the ’426 Patent. (Ex. 2003 (“Melen Depo.”), 20:9-21:4; Melen Decl., ¶14, Att. 1.)

B. Mr. Weadock Repeatedly Admitted That He Lacked Sufficient Time And/Or Money To Properly Prepare His Declaration

Mr. Weadock stated at least eight times during his deposition that he lacked sufficient time and/or money to prepare the Declaration he submitted in support of MPHJ’s POR. (Weadock Depo., 181:24-182:2, 195:7-196:2, 196:18-21, 197:5-8, 202:1-21.) Prior to his deposition, Mr. Weadock admitted that he had never seen MPHJ’s POR – the very document his Declaration allegedly supports. (*Id.* at 25:9-

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.