

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

LG ELECTRONICS, INC. *et al.*  
Petitioner,

v.

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

---

Case IPR2015-00198  
Patent 6,009,469

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE  
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a)**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. Introduction & Summary of Arguments.....	1
II. The Petition Is Statutorily Barred.....	4
A. The Petition May Not Be Instituted Because Petitioner Hulu Previously Filed A Civil Action Challenging The Validity Of ’469 Patent Claims .....	4
B. The Petition May Not Be Granted Because It Was Filed More Than One Year After Service Of Straight Path’s ITC Complaint .....	7
1. Straight Path’s ITC Complaint Was Served On LG, Toshiba, and Vizio More Than A Year Before They Filed Their Petition.....	8
2. The Petition Is Untimely And Barred Under Section 315(b).....	10
III. The Petition Does Not Establish The Required Reasonable Likelihood That Petitioners Will Prevail In Showing That The Challenged Claims Are Unpatentable .....	15
A. Background And Overview Of The ’469 Patent.....	19
1. The Problems And Solutions Identified By The ’469 Patent.....	19
a. How To Determine (1) Whether A Network Application Is Available On-line; and (2) If So, That Application’s Address on the Network.....	19
b. Interface Elements For Facilitating The Creation Of Point- To-Point Communications Between Processes .....	22
2. The Challenged ’469 Patent Claims .....	24
3. The ’469 Patent’s Prosecution History .....	25
a. The Original Prosecution .....	26
b. The <i>Ex Parte</i> Reexaminations.....	26
4. The ’469 Patent’s Relevant Litigation History .....	27
B. Petitioners Fail To Provide The Necessary Support For The Proposed Combination Of Pinard With WINS And NetBIOS That Forms The Sole Basis For Their Challenge To Claims 1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 14, 17, 18 .....	28
1. Petitioners Bear The Burden Of Proving Why And How One Of Ordinary Skill In The Art Would Combine Pinard with WINS and NetBIOS .....	29

2.	Petitioners Have Identified No Evidence Sufficient To Meet Their Obviousness Burden .....	31
C.	WINS & NetBIOS Do Not Disclose The “Is Connected To The Computer Network”/”On-Line”/“Accessible Elements Found In Challenged Claims 3, 6, 9, 14, 17, And 18 .....	36
1.	The Correct Claim Construction Analysis of “On-Line” and “Is Connected To The Computer Network” .....	38
a.	The Correct Claim Construction Standard.....	38
b.	Petitioners Have Not Overcome The Heavy Presumption That “On-Line,” “Accessible,” And “Is Connected To The Computer Network” Should Be Given Their Ordinary Meaning.....	40
i.	Petitioners’ Proposed Construction Is Not The Ordinary Meaning Of “Is Connected To the Computer Network”/“On-Line”/ “Accessible” .....	42
ii.	The ’469 Specification Confirms That The Ordinary Meaning Should Apply Here .....	43
iii.	The Prosecution History Confirms That The Ordinary Meaning Should Apply Here .....	47
2.	Under The Correct Claim Construction, WINS & NetBIOS Do Not Disclose The “Is Connected to The Computer Network”/“On-Line”/“Accessible” Elements .....	48
D.	WINS & NetBIOS Do Not Disclose The “Process” Elements Found In Every Challenged Claim.....	51
1.	Petitioners Have Not Overcome The Heavy Presumption That “Process” Should Be Given Its Ordinary Meaning .....	52
a.	Petitioners’ Implicit Construction of “Process” Is Inconsistent With Its Ordinary Meaning And The Claims.....	54
b.	The Applicants Did Not Redefine “Process” In The ’469 Patent’s Specification Or Prosecution History.....	55
2.	Under The Proper Construction, WINS & NetBIOS Do Not Disclose The “Process” Elements Found In All Challenged Claims Because The WINS and NetBIOS References Concern Registering A Computer, Not A “Process” .....	57
IV.	Conclusion .....	59

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Amkor Technology, Inc. v. Tessera, Inc.</i> , Case CBM2013-00242, Paper 98 (PTAB Jan. 31, 2014).....	14
<i>Apple Inc. v. Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute</i> , IPR No. 2014-00320, Paper 12 (PTAB June 12, 2014).....	15
<i>Ariosa Diagnostics v. Verinata Health, Inc.</i> , IPR No. 2013-00276, Paper 43 (PTAB Oct. 23, 2014).....	30
<i>Aventis Pharma S.A. v. Hospira, Inc.</i> , 675 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	39
<i>Callcopy v. Verint Americas</i> , IPR No. 2013-00486, Paper 11 (PTAB Feb. 5, 2014).....	30
<i>Certain Bar Clamps, Bar Clamp Pads, &amp; Related Packaging, Display, &amp; Other Materials</i> , Inv. No. 337-TA-429, Comm’n Op. (Pub. Version) (Feb. 13, 2001) .....	10
<i>Certain Bath Accessories and Component Parts Thereof</i> , Inv. No. 337-TA-306, Order No. 6, 1990 ITC LEXIS 426 (USITC Feb. 22, 1990) .....	8
<i>Certain Integrated Circuit Telecommunication Chips and Products Containing Same, Including Dialing Apparatus</i> , Inv. No. 337-TA-337, Order No. 63, 1992 ITC LEXIS 625 (USITC Aug. 28, 1992) .....	8
<i>Cisco Systems, Inc. v. AIP Acquisition, LLC</i> , IPR No. 2014-00247, Paper 20 (PTAB Jul. 10, 2014).....	38
<i>Dealertrack, Inc. v. Huber</i> , 674 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	17, 30, 32, 35, 40, 45
<i>Hill-Rom Servs. v. Stryker Corp.</i> , 755 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	45

<i>Histologics, LLC v. CDX Diagnostics, Inc.</i> , IPR No. 2014-00779, Paper 6 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2014)	14
<i>Hoechst Aktiengesellschaft v. Quigg</i> , 917 F.2d 522 (Fed. Cir. 1990)	10
<i>In re Chaganeti</i> , 554 Fed. Appx. 917, 922 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	30
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	30, 33
<i>In re Paulsen</i> , 30 F.3d 1475 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	43
<i>In re Rambus</i> , 694 F.3d 42 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	38
<i>Innolux Corp. v. Semiconductor Energy Lab.</i> , IPR No. 2013-00064, Paper 11 (PTAB Apr. 30, 2013)	38
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398, 418 (2007)	29, 30
<i>K-2 Corp. v. Salomon S.A.</i> , 191 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	40
<i>Laryngeal Mask Co. Ltd. v. Ambu</i> , 618 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	39
<i>Linear Tech Corp. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n</i> , 566 F.3d 1049 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	40
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Secure Web Conference Corp.</i> , IPR No. 2014-00745, Paper 12 (PTAB Sept. 29, 2014)	32, 33, 34
<i>NeuLion, Inc. v. Filippo Costanzo</i> , IPR No. 2014-00526, Paper 23 (PTAB Sept. 3, 2014)	32, 35
<i>Norman International, Inc. v. Hunter Douglas Inc.</i> , IPR No. 2014-00282, Paper 8 (PTAB Jun. 20, 2014)	34

# 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.