

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

DELL INC., HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY, and NETAPP, INC.,

Petitioners,

v.

ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS RESEARCH INSTITUTE,

Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2013-00635

Patent No. 6,978,346

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BACKGROUND	3
	A. The '346 Patent.	3
	B. Prosecution History	9
	C. <i>Inter Partes</i> Review No. IPR2014-00100	11
III.	TRIAL SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED	11
	A. Interpretation of the '346 Patent Claims.	12
	1. "Host Computers"	13
	2. "RAID"	15
	3. "RAID Controller"	17
	4. "Connection Unit," "Hub," and "Switch"	18
	5. "Exchanges Information"	19
	B. Trial Should Not be Instituted Regarding Challenge 1, Based on Weygant as Allegedly Anticipatory Prior Art of Claims 1, 5, and 9.	20
	1. Weygant Fails to Disclose "Host Computers," a "RAID," and "RAID Controllers," as Recited in Claim 1	21
	a. Weygant's PC Clients are Not "Host Computers."	21
	b. Weygant's Disks Alone are Not a "RAID."	23
	c. Weygant's Cluster Nodes are Not "RAID Controllers."	24
	2. The Petition Improperly Mixes and Matches Features From Separate Embodiments of Weygant.	25

3.	Weygant Fails to Disclose the “Exchanges Information” Limitations.	28
C.	Trial Should Not be Instituted Regarding Challenges 2-4, Based on Weygant in view of at Least Mylex.	29
1.	Weygant and Mylex Together Fail to Teach or Suggest “Host Computers,” a “RAID,” and “RAID Controllers,” as Recited in Independent Claims 1 and 9.	30
2.	Even With Mylex, the Petition’s § 102 and § 103 Rejections Improperly Mix and Match Features From Separate Embodiments of Weygant.	32
3.	Weygant and Mylex Together Fail to Teach or Suggest the “Exchanges Information” Limitations in Independent Claims 1 and 9.	33
4.	The Weygant-Based § 102 Rejections and the Weygant-Mylex-Based § 103 Rejections are Vertically Redundant.	33
D.	Trial Should Not be Instituted Regarding Challenge 5, Based on Hathorn as Allegedly Anticipatory Prior Art of Claims 1-3 and 5-8.	35
1.	Hathorn Fails to Explicitly or Inherently Teach “RAID Controllers.”	36
2.	Even if Hathorn Teaches a “RAID Controller,” Hathorn Does Not Teach First and Second “RAID Controllers.”	39
3.	Even if Hathorn Somehow Were to Teach Multiple “RAID Controllers,” Hathorn Does Not Teach The “Exchanges Information” Limitations.	42
4.	Hathorn Fails to Disclose a “Hub,” as Required by Claim 5.	43
5.	Challenge 5 is Horizontally Redundant With the Other Challenges.	44
IV.	CONCLUSION.	45

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>In re Arkley</i> , 455 F.2d 586 (C.C.P.A. 1972)	26
<i>Bettcher Indus., Inc. v. Bunzl USA, Inc.</i> , 661 F.3d 629 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	38
<i>Bicon, Inc. v. Straumann Co.</i> , 441 F.3d 945 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	14
<i>Elekta Instrument S.A. v. O.U.R. Sci. Int'l, Inc.</i> , 214 F.3d 1302 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	14
<i>Gubelmann v. Gang</i> , 408 F.2d 758 (C.C.P.A. 1969)	38
<i>Haemonetics Corp. v. Baxter Healthcare Corp.</i> , 607 F.3d 776 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	14
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	32
<i>Karsten Mfg. Corp. v. Cleveland Golf Co.</i> , 242 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	25
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	32
<i>Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casualty Ins. Co.</i> , CBM2012-00003, Paper 7 (Oct. 25, 2012)	34, 35, 44
<i>In re Morris</i> , 127 F.3d 1048 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	12, 15
<i>Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. Verisign, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	26
<i>Oracle Corp. v. Clouding IP, LLC</i> , IPR2013-00088, Paper 13 (June 13, 2013)	34
<i>Perkin-Elmer Corp. v. Computervision Corp.</i> , 732 F.2d 888 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	26
<i>Trintec Indus., Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.</i> , 295 F.3d 1292, 1297 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	38

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102	26
35 U.S.C. § 103	29
35 U.S.C. § 119	9
35 U.S.C. § 311(b)	2
35 U.S.C. § 313	1
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	11, 35

Rules

37 C.F.R. § 42.107	1
--------------------------	---

Other Authorities

INST. OF ELEC. & ELEC. ENG'RS, <i>New IEEE Standard Dictionary of Electrical & Electronic Terms</i> (5th Ed. 1993)	15
MPEP § 2112(IV)	38
<i>Office Patent Trial Practice Guide</i> , 77 Fed. Reg. 48756, 48764 (Aug. 14, 2012)	12

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.