

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.  
Petitioner

v.

CAPELLA PHOTONICS, INC.  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2014-01276  
Patent RE42,678

---

**PATENT OWNER RESPONSE TO THE PETITION**

***Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"***  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. BACKGROUND ..... 8

    A. Optical Circulators Limited the Scalability of Optical Switches ..... 9

    B. The '678 Patent Discloses a Scalable Switch with Multiple Ports ..... 10

    C. Claims ..... 14

III. CLAIMS 1-4, 9, 10, 13, 17, 19-23, 27, 29, 44-46, 53, AND 61-65 ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER THE COMBINATION OF BOUEVITCH, SMITH, AND LIN ..... 15

    A. Petitioner Improperly Conflates Two Disparate Embodiments of Bouevitch—Modifying Means 150 and MEMS Array 50—Without Providing *KSR* Rationale ..... 16

    B. A POSA Would Not Have Combined Bouevitch and Smith ..... 23

        1. Bouevitch Modifying Means is Based on Polarization, such that Adding Smith’s Mirrors Would Disrupt Switching ..... 26

        2. Using Smith’s Tilttable Mirrors in Bouevitch Would Disrupt Bouevitch’s Explicit Teaching of Parallel Alignment ..... 27

        3. Absent Hindsight, a POSA Would Not Have Used a More Complex Two-Axis Mirror to Achieve the Same Function as a One-Axis Mirror ..... 30

    C. Bouevitch Does Not Teach or Suggest “Multiple Fiber Collimators, Providing an Input Port . . . and a Plurality of Output Ports” as Recited in Independent Claims 1, 21, 44, and 61 ..... 32

        1. Proper Meaning of the Phrase “Multiple Fiber Collimators Providing an Input Port . . . and Multiple Output Ports” ..... 34

        2. The '678 Patent Disavows Circulator Ports ..... 35

3.	Dr. Marom Understood the Meaning of the Term “Port” as Recited in the ’678 Patent Claims.....	40
4.	Bouevitch at Most has Two Ports as Recited in the ’678 Patent Claims .....	41
D.	The Bouevitch Figure 11 Configuration Does Not Reflect Light Beams Into the Circulator Ports .....	42
E.	The Applied References Do Not Teach or Suggest Micromirrors Being Pivotal About Two Axes and Being Continuously Controllable as Recited in Independent Claims 1, 44, and 61 .....	43
1.	Petitioner Concedes that Bouevitch Does Not Teach or Suggest Micromirrors Being Pivotal About Two Axes and Being Continuously Controllable.....	44
2.	Smith Does Not Meet the Claimed Micromirrors Being Pivotal About Two Axes and Being Continuously Controllable.....	44
3.	Lin’s One-Axis Mirror Does Not Meet the Claimed Micromirrors Being Pivotal About Two Axes and Being Continuously Controllable.....	49
4.	Petitioner Fails to Provide <i>KSR</i> Rationale for Combining Smith and Lin .....	53
IV.	A POSA WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN MOTIVATED TO USE DUECK’S DIFFRACTION GRATING IN BOUEVITCH .....	54
V.	PETITIONER DOES NOT EXPLAIN HOW OR WHY A POSA WOULD HAVE INCORPORATED SMITH’S SERVO CONTROL INTO BOUEVITCH .....	55
VI.	SMITH IS NOT PRIOR ART TO THE ’678 PATENT BECAUSE THE PORTIONS OF SMITH PETITIONER RELIES ON ARE NOT ENTITLED TO SMITH’S EARLIEST § 102(E) DATE .....	58
VII.	CISCO FAILS TO DISCLOSE ALL REAL PARTIES IN INTEREST .....	60

VIII. CONCLUSION.....60

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

Cases

*Alloc, Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n*,  
342 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2003) ..... 35, 36

*Boston Scientific Scimed, Inc. v. Cordis Corp.*,  
554 F.3d 982 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....16

*Facebook, Inc. v. Software Rights Archive, LLC*,  
IPR2013-00479, Paper 54 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 2, 2015) .....22

*In re Chaganti*,  
554 F. App’x 917 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....16

*In re Lund*,  
376 F.2d 982 (C.C.P.A. 1967) .....59

*JDS Uniphase Corp. v. Fiber, LLC*,  
IPR2013-00318, Paper 45, pp. 36-37 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 5, 2014).....23

*JDS Uniphase Corp. v. Fiber, LLC*,  
IPR2013-00336, Paper 40, pp. 41-46 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 5, 2014).....24

*KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*,  
550 U.S. 398 (2007).....16

*Liebel-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.*,  
358 F. 3d 898 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....46

*Nat’l Envm’t Prods. Ltd v. Dri-Steem Corp.*,  
IPR2014-01503 (P.T.A.B. 2015).....16

*SciMed Life Sys., Inc. v. Advances Cardiovascular Sys., Inc.*,  
242 F.3d F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....35

*Securus Techs, Inc. v. Global Tel\*Link Corp.*,  
IPR2015-00153 (P.T.A.B. May 1, 2015) .....58

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) ..... 58, 59

# 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.