

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SONY CORPORATION
Petitioner

v.

STRAIGHT PATH IP GROUP, INC.
(FORMERLY KNOWN AS INNOVATIVE COMMUNICATIONS
TECHNOLOGIES, INC.)
Patent Owner

INTER PARTES REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,009,469
Case IPR No.: *To Be Assigned*

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,009,469
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.100 *et seq.***

Filed on behalf of Petitioner

By: Michael N. Rader, Reg. No. 52,146
Edmund J. Walsh, Reg. No. 32,950
Randy J. Pritzker, Reg. No. 35,986
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
600 ATLANTIC AVE.
BOSTON, MA 02210
(617) 646-8000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	MANDATORY NOTICES.....	4
	A. Real Parties-in-Interest	4
	B. Related Matters.....	4
	C. Counsel and Service Information	6
III.	NOTICE OF FEES PAID	6
IV.	CERTIFICATION OF GROUNDS FOR STANDING	7
V.	IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE UNDER 37. C.F.R. § 42.104(B) AND RELIEF REQUESTED	7
	A. Background of the ‘469 Patent	7
	1. The Disclosure of the ‘469 Patent	7
	2. Prosecution History of the ‘469 Patent.....	9
	B. Prior Post-Grant Proceedings Involving the ‘469 Patent	9
	1. The Prior <i>Ex Parte</i> Reexamination.....	9
	2. Related Litigations	10
	3. The Sipnet <i>Inter Partes</i> Review	10
	C. Patents and Printed Publications Relied Upon Herein	11
	1. Microsoft Windows NT™ Version 3.5 TCPIP.HLP (“Microsoft Manual”) (Ex. 1014).....	11
	2. U.S. Patent No. 5,375,068 (“Palmer”) (Ex. 1015)	11
	3. The VocalChat References (Exs. 1021-25).....	12
	4. U.S. Patent No. 5,533,110 (“Pinard”) (Ex. 1016)	12
	5. Little et al., “ <i>Client-Server Metadata Management for the Delivery of Movies in a Video-On-Demand System,</i> ” 1st Intl. Workshop on Services in Distributed & Networked Environments, June 27-28, 1994 (“Little-1994”) (Ex. 1017).....	13
	6. Little et al., “ <i>A Digital On-Demand Video Service Supporting Content-Based Queries,</i> ” Proc. 1st ACM Intl. Conf. on Multimedia, Aug. 1993 (“Little-1993”) (Ex. 1018)	13
	7. Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol, RFC 1541 (Oct. 1993) (“RFC 1541”) (Ex. 1019)	13

;

8.	Internet Protocol, RFC 791 (Sept. 1981) (“RFC 791”) (Ex. 1020)	14
D.	Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	14
E.	Statutory Grounds for Challenge.....	15
F.	Claim Construction.....	16
1.	“point-to-point communications” (Claim 1) / “point-to-point communication link” (Claims 2, 9, 10)	16
2.	“computer readable code means” (Claim 1).....	17
3.	“network protocol address” (Claims 1, 9, 10)	17
4.	“unique identifier” (Claim 1).....	18
5.	“program code for determining the currently assigned network protocol address of the first process upon connection to the computer network” (Claim 1).....	18
6.	“connected to the computer network” (Claim 3) / “on-line” (Claim 9)	19
7.	“accessible” (Claim 9)	20
8.	“transmitting, from the first process to the server process, a query as to whether the second process is connected to the computer network” (Claim 3) / “guerving [sic: querying] the server process to determine if the first callee process is accessible” (Claims 9, 10)	21
9.	“caller process” and “callee process” (Claims 9, 10)	23
10.	“associating the element representing the first callee process with the element representing the first communication line” (Claims 9, 10)	25
VI.	THRESHOLD REQUIREMENT FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW.....	26
VII.	CLAIM-BY-CLAIM EXPLANATION OF GROUNDS FOR UNPATENTABILITY OF CLAIMS 1-3, 9-10, AND 17-18	26
A.	Ground 1: Claims 1-3, 9-10, and 17-18 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over the Microsoft Manual in view of Palmer.	26
B.	Ground 2: Claims 9-10, and 17-18 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over the Microsoft Manual in view of Palmer and Pinard.	35
C.	Ground 3: Claims 1-3, 9-10, and 17-18 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over the VocalChat References.	37

D. Ground 4: Claims 1-3 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over the VocalChat References in view of RFC 1541.	45
E. Ground 5: Claims 9-10 and 17-18 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over the VocalChat References in view of Pinard.	47
F. Ground 6: Claims 1-2 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Little-1994 in view of RFC 791.	47
G. Ground 7: Claim 3 is obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Little-1994 in view of RFC 791.	52
H. Ground 8: Claims 1-3 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Little-1994 in view of RFC 791 and RFC 1541.....	54
I. Ground 9: Claims 9-10 and 17-18 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Little-1994 in view of Little-1993 and RFC 791.	55
J. Ground 10: Claims 9-10 and 17-18 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Little-1994 in view of Pinard and RFC 791.....	59
VIII. CONCLUSION.....	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Ex Parte ePlus Inc.</i> , Appeal No. 2010-007804, 2011 WL 1918594 (B.P.A.I. May 18, 2011).....	12
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	36, 47, 60

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.