

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAP AMERICA INC.

Petitioner

v.

CLOUDING IP, LLC

Patent Owner

Case IPR 2014-00306

Patent 6,738,799

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO
PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 6,738,799
UNDER 35 USC §§ 311-319 AND 37 CFR §42.100 ET SEQ.**

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Overview of U.S. Patent 6,738,799	2
3. Claim Terms Requiring Construction.....	3
A. Claims 1, 12, 23, and 30 Require that a <i>Command to Copy</i> be Written into the Update.	6
B. Claims 37 and 42 Requires that a Check is Made to Determine Whether a Second Computer <i>Has</i> a Version of a File.	8
C. The Signature List Recited in Claims 1, 12, 23, and 30 is a Representation of a Segment of File.....	10
D. An <i>Update</i> is an Item that Allows a Second Computer to Build a Current Version of a File From a Local Copy of the File.	11
4. Argument.....	13
A. The Present Petition is Redundant in View of IPR2013-00586 and Presents No Issues that Will Not Be Determined in That Proceeding.	13
B. Claims 37 and 42 Are Not Anticipated by Balcha.	14
C. The Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood that at Least One Challenged Claim is Unpatentable Over Balcha When Considered in Combination with Miller.	19
D. The Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood that at Least One Challenged Claim is Unpatentable Over Balcha When Considered in Combination with Miller and Freivald.	30
E. The Petition Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood that Claims 1, 12, 23, 30, 37, and 42 are Unpatentable Over Balcha When Considered in Combination with Freivald.	33
F. The Petition Fails to Establish any Reasonable Likelihood that Claims 1, 12, 23, 24, 30, and 31 are Anticipated by Williams.	35

G. The Petition Fails to Establish any Reasonable Likelihood that Claims 5-10 and 16-21 are Unpatentable in View of Williams When Considered in Combination with Miller. 41

H. The Petition Fails to Establish any Reasonable Likelihood that Claims 37 and 42 are Anticipated by Williams. 44

5. Conclusion 46

Table of Authorities

Cases

<i>Bayer Schering Pharm. AG v. Barr Labs., Inc.</i> , 575 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2009) (Newman, J., dissenting)	26
<i>CCS Fitness, Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.</i> , 288 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	6
<i>Ex parte Levy</i> , 17 USPQ2d 1461 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990)	39
<i>Idle Free Systems, Inc. v. Bergstrom, Inc.</i> , IPR2012-00027 (PTAB June 11, 2013).....	4, 5
<i>In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr.</i> , 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	5
<i>In re Fine</i> , 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	44
<i>In re Yamamoto</i> , 740 F.2d 1569 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	5
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	19, 25, 42
<i>Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	18, 41
<i>Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.</i> , 868 F.2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1989).....	18
<i>SAS Inst., Inc. v. ComplementSoft, LLC</i> , IPR2013-00581 (PTAB Dec. 30, 2013).....	14
<i>Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California</i> , 814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987)	45
<i>W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.</i> , 721 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983), <i>cert. denied</i> , 469 U.S. 851 (1984)	28, 43
<i>ZTE Corp. et al. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00454 (PTAB Sept. 25, 2013).....	13, 14

Statutes

35 USC § 326(d) 4

Other Authorities

157 Cong. Rec. S1375 (daily ed. March 8, 2011) 4

157 Cong. Rec. S1375 (Mar. 8, 2011)..... 1

H.R. Rep. No. 112-98 (part 1) at 47 (2011)..... 1

MPEP § 2112..... 39

MPEP § 2142..... 29

MPEP § 2173.01 10, 11

Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756, 48766 (Aug. 14, 2012)..... 4

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 1.75(d)(1)..... 6

37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c)..... 2

37 C.F.R. § 42.304(b)(4)..... 5

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.