

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SONY CORPORATION

Petitioner

v.

INNOVATIVE COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

(now STRAIGHT PATH IP GROUP, INC.)

Patent Owner

Patent No. 6,009,469

Filing Date: September 25, 1996

Issue Date: December 28, 1999

Title: GRAPHIC USER INTERFACE FOR  
INTERNET TELEPHONY APPLICATION

---

*Inter Partes* Review No. IPR2014-00231, Filing Date December 5, 2013

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

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	1
I. THE '469 PATENT .....	2
II. THE '469 PATENT <i>EX PARTE</i> REEXAMINATION .....	3
III. PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW .....	5
IV. LEGAL STANDARD .....	7
ARGUMENT .....	8
I. PETITIONER'S PROPOSED CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS ARE UNSUPPORTED AND CONTRADICTED BY THE CLEAR DISCLOSURES OF THE '469 PATENT.....	8
A. The Challenged Claims Require Either Querying into On-Line Status of a Second Process, Dynamic Addressing, or Forwarding a Unique Identifier of a Process to a Server.....	9
B. Petitioner's Suggestion that "On-Line" Means "Registered with a Server" Is Improper .....	14
C. Petitioner's Suggestion that "Accessible" Means "Registered with a Server" Is Baseless .....	21
D. Petitioner's Alternative Constructions for "Query" Have No Basis in the Claims or Specification .....	22
E. Petitioner's Construction for "Determining the Currently Assigned Network Protocol Address [] Upon Connection to the Computer Network" Eliminates Claim 1's Dynamic Addressing Requirement .....	25
II. PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO DEMONSTRATE THAT EACH LIMITATION OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS IS FOUND IN THE ASSERTED PRIOR ART .....	29
A. The Challenged Claims are Patentable over the Microsoft Manual in View of Either Palmer or Pinard.....	30

1.	The Microsoft Manual Only Discloses a Database of Registered Computer Names, and Does Not Query the On-Line Status of a Process .....	31
2.	The Microsoft Manual in Combination with Palmer Does Not Render Obvious Claims 3, 9-10, and 17-18 Because the References Do Not Teach a Query into the On-Line Status of a Process.....	35
3.	The Microsoft Manual in Combination with Palmer and Pinard Does Not Render Obvious Claims 9-10 and 17-18 Because the References Do Not Teach a Query into the On-Line Status of a Process .....	37
4.	The Microsoft Manual in Combination with Palmer Does Not Render Obvious Claims 1-3 Because the References Do Not Teach Transmitting a Unique Identifier of a Process.....	38
B.	The Claims Require Either a Query into On-Line Status or Dynamic Addressing, and are Therefore Patentable over VocalChat, Alone or in Combination with Pinard or RFC 1541 .....	40
1.	VocalChat Does Not Teach a Query into On-Line Status of a Process .....	41
2.	VocalChat, Alone or in Combination with Pinard, Does Not Render Obvious the Query into On-Line Status of Claims 3, 9-10, and 17-18.....	47
3.	VocalChat, Alone or in Combination with RFC 1541, Does Not Render Obvious the Dynamic Addressing or Unique Identifier Requirement of Claims 1-3 .....	47
a.	The VocalChat References Do Not Render Obvious Claims 1-3 Because VocalChat Does Not Teach Dynamic Addresses or Unique Identifiers.....	48
b.	Petitioner Has Not Established the Obviousness of Combining RFC 1541 with VocalChat .....	50

C.	Little-1994 in Combination with RFC 791, RFC 1541, Little-1993, or Pinard Does Not Teach the Required Point-to-Point Communication with a Second Process .....	53
1.	Petitioner Has Admitted that Little-1994 Should Not Be Considered by the Board.....	54
2.	The Asserted References Do Not Teach the Required Connection Between Two Processes .....	54
a.	Little-1994 Does Not Teach a Point-to-Point Communication with a Second Process, Receiving the Network Protocol Address of a Second Process, or Establishing a Communication Responsive to the Network Protocol Address .....	55
b.	Little-1994 in Combination with RFC 791, RFC 1541, Little-1993, or Pinard Do Not Render Obvious Claims 1-3, 9-10, or 17-18 Because the References Do Not Teach Communication with a Second Process .....	58
3.	Little-1994 in Combination with RFC 791 and RFC 1541 Does Not Render Obvious Claims 1-3 Because Petitioner Has Not Established the Obviousness of Combining RFC 1541 with Little-1994 .....	59
	CONCLUSION .....	60

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>CFMT, Inc. v. YieldUp Int'l Corp.</i> , 349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	7
<i>In re Bond</i> , 910 F.2d 831 (Fed. Cir. 1990) .....	8
<i>In re Robertson</i> , 169 F.3d 743 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....	45
<i>In re Suitco Surface, Inc.</i> , 603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	8
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007) .....	8, 52, 60
<i>Verizon Servs. Corp. v. Cox Fibernet Va., Inc.</i> , 602 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	7

### Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 314(a) .....	2, 7
--------------------------	------

### Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) .....	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.