

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONIC CO., LTD.,
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC. &
SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC,
CISCO SYSTEMS, INC., and AVAYA, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

STRAIGHT PATH IP GROUP, INC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2014-01367¹
U.S. Patent No. 6,009,469 C1

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.120

¹ IPR 2015-01007 has been joined with this proceeding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction..... 1

II. Background And Overview Of The '469 Patent2

A. The Problems And Solutions Identified By The '469 Patent3

 1. The Problem Identified By The '469 Patent3

 2. The '469 Patent's Solution.....4

 3. The '469 Patent Also Describes the Use of a Display
 Screen and Various Interface Elements.8

B. The Challenged '469 Patent Claims.....8

 1. The challenged claims concerns computer programs, not
 computers.9

 2. Challenged claims require the determination of whether a
 process is currently connected to the computer network,
 not whether it was previously connected.10

 3. Challenged claims also require “a user interface element
 representing a first callee process.”11

 4. Challenged claim 1 also requires transmitting to the
 server a “unique identifier of the first process.”12

C. The '469 Patent's Prosecution History12

 1. The Original Prosecution12

2.	The <i>Ex Parte</i> Reexaminations	13
III.	The Microsoft Manual and NetBIOS References	14
A.	NetBIOS and Microsoft Manual both disclose a name server for registering the name of a computer, not a computer application.	14
B.	Neither NetBIOS nor Microsoft Manual discloses a means for determining whether a computer is actually connected to the network at the time another computer seeks to communicate with it.....	16
IV.	Claim Constructions	21
A.	The Material Claim Construction Issues Facing The Board.....	21
B.	The Correct Claim Construction Analysis Under The District Court Standard.....	22
V.	Samsung’s References Do Not Disclose The “Process” Elements	24
A.	Samsung Has Not Overcome The Heavy Presumption That “Process” Should Be Given Its Ordinary Meaning.....	25
1.	Samsung’s Construction of “Process” Is Inconsistent With Its Ordinary Meaning And The Claims	26

2.	The Applicants Did Not Redefine Or Disclaim “Process” In The ’469 Patent’s Specification Or Prosecution History.....	27
B.	Samsung Failed To Prove That The Microsoft Manual and NetBIOS Disclose the Claimed “Process” Elements	29
VI.	Samsung’s References Do Not Disclose The “Is Connected To The Network”/”On-Line Status”/”Accessible” Claim Elements	35
A.	Samsung Has Not Overcome The Heavy Presumption That “Is Connected to the Computer Network” And “On-line Status” Should Be Given Their Ordinary Meaning	35
1.	The Ordinary Meaning “Is Connected To The Computer Network” And “On-line Status” Does Not Included Registered With a Server	37
2.	Samsung And Its Expert Admit That The Patentees Did Not Disclaim Or Specially Define The Ordinary Meaning	41
B.	Samsung Failed To Prove That NetBIOS and the Microsoft Manual Disclose The “Is Connected To The Network,” “Is Accessible,” And “On-Line Status” Elements	46

VII.	Samsung’s References Do Not Disclose The “Interface Element Representing A First Callee Process” Limitations Found In Challenged Claims 9, 10, 14, 17, and 18.....	50
A.	Samsung Has Not Overcome The Heavy Presumption That “Representing” Should Be Given Its Ordinary Meaning.....	51
B.	Ground 1: Samsung Has Failed To Prove That The Microsoft Manual & NetBIOS Disclose an “Interface Element Representing A First Callee Process.”	52
C.	Ground 2: Palmer Cannot Remedy The Microsoft Manual & NetBIOS’s Failure To Disclose The “Interface Element Representing A Second Callee Process”	53
VIII.	Samsung Has Failed to Prove That NetBIOS And WINS Disclose The “unique identifier” Required By Claim 1.....	56
IX.	Samsung’s Remaining Proposed Constructions Are Not Material To The IPR.....	57
X.	Conclusion	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.