

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LG ELECTRONICS, INC., TOSHIBA CORP.,
VIZIO, INC., and HULU, LLC,
Petitioners,

v.

STRAIGHT PATH IP GROUP, INC.
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2015-00209
U.S. Patent No. 6,108,704

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	The Petition is Statutorily Barred	2
	A. This <i>Inter Partes</i> Review Should Not Have Been Instituted Because Hulu Previously Filed A Civil Action Challenging The Validity Of The '704 Patent Claims.....	2
	B. This Inter Partes Review Should Not Have Been Instituted Because The Petition Was Filed More Than One Year After Service Of Straight Path's ITC Complaint.....	3
	1. Straight Path's ITC Complaint Was Served On Petitioners More Than A Year Before They Filed Their Petition	4
	2. The Petition is Untimely and Barred Under Section 315(b)	5
III.	Background And Overview Of The '704 Patent	6
	A. The Problems And Solutions Identified By The '704 Patent	8
	1. The '704 Patent Also Describes the Use of a Display Screen and Various Interface Elements.....	11
	B. The Challenged '704 Patent Claims.....	12
	1. The challenged claims concern application programs, not computer operating systems.....	12
	2. The challenged claims concern the determination of whether a process is currently connected to the computer network, not whether it was previously connected.....	14
	3. All But One of the Challenged Claims Also Concern User Interface Elements.....	14
	C. The '704 Patent's Prosecution History	15
	1. The Original Prosecution	15
	2. The <i>Ex Parte</i> Reexaminations	15

IV.	The WINS and NetBIOS References	16
A.	NetBIOS and WINS Both Disclose a Name Server for Registering the Name of a Computer, Not a Computer Application	18
B.	Neither NetBIOS nor WINS Discloses a Means for Determining Whether a Computer is Actually Connected to the Network at the Time Another Computer Seeks to Communicate With It.....	19
V.	Claim Constructions	22
A.	The Material Claim Construction Issues Facing The Board.....	22
B.	The Correct Claim Construction Analysis Under The District Court Standard.....	23
VI.	The Petition Fails To Identify the “Process” Claim Elements in any of the References.....	26
A.	The Plain And Ordinary Meaning of the Term “Process” means “A Running Instance of a Computer Program or Application”	27
1.	Petitioner’s Do Not Construe the Term Process, Yet Use The Term Contrary to Its Ordinary Meaning	30
B.	Petitioner Failed To Prove That WINS and/or NetBIOS Disclose the Claimed “Process” Elements.....	31
VII.	Petitioners’s References Do Not Disclose The “Is Connected To The Network”/”On-Line Status” Elements	36
A.	Petitioner Has Not Overcome The Heavy Presumption That “Is Connected to the Computer Network” And “On-line Status” Should Be Given Their Ordinary Meaning.....	37
1.	The Ordinary Meaning of “Is Connected To The Computer Network” And “On-line Status” Does Not Include Registered With a Server	38
a.	The ordinary meaning of on-line and connected is “connected to the computer network,” not registered with a server	38
b.	The ordinary meanings of “is” and “status” provide a temporal requirement that is ignored by Petitioner’s proposed construction	39

2.	Petitioner And Its Expert Admit That The Patentees Did Not Disclaim Or Specially Define The Ordinary Meaning of “On-Line Status” or “Is Connected To The Computer Network”	42
a.	The Specification Confirms That The Ordinary Meaning Should Apply.....	43
b.	The Prosecution History Confirms That The Ordinary Meaning Should Apply	46
B.	Petitioner Failed To Prove That NetBIOS and WINS Disclose The “Is Connected To The Network” And “On-Line Status” Elements.	48
VIII.	Petitioner’s References Do Not Disclose the “Interface Element Representing a First Callee Process” Limitations Found in Challenged Claims 11, 12, 14, 16, 19, 22, 23, 27, 30, and 31.....	52
A.	Petitioners Bear The Burden Of Proving Why And How One Of Ordinary Skill In The Art Would Combine Pinard with WINS and NetBIOS	52
B.	Pinard Cannot Remedy WINS and NetBIOS’s Failure to Disclose the “Interface Element Representing a Second Callee Process”	54
IX.	Petitioner’s Remaining Proposed Constructions Are Not Material To The IPR.....	58
X.	Conclusion	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

505 Games, Inc. v. Babbage Holdings, Inc.,
IPR2014-00954, Paper No. 17 (PTAB Aug. 22, 2014).....3

ACTV, Inc. v. Walt Disney Company,
346 F.3d 1082 (Fed. Cir. 2003)41

Ariosa Diagnostics v. Verinata Health, Inc.,
IPR2013-00276, Paper No. 43 (PTAB Oct. 23, 2014).....53

Aventis Pharma S.A. v. Hospira, Inc.,
675 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2012)24, 25

Callcopy v. Verint Americas, et al.,
IPR2013-00486, Paper No. 11 (PTAB Feb. 5, 2014).....53

*Certain Integrated Circuit Telecommunication Chips and Products
Containing Same, Including Dialing Apparatus*,
Inv. No. 337-TA-337, Order No. 63, 1992 ITC LEXIS 625,
(U.S.I.T.C. Aug. 28, 1992)...4

Cisco Systems, Inc. v. AIP Acquisition, LLC,
IPR2014-00247, Paper No. 20 (PTAB Jul. 10, 2014)23

Dealertrack, Inc. v. Huber,
674 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2012)25

Histologics, LLC v. CDX Diagnostics, Inc.,
IPR2014-00779, Paper No. 6 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2014).....6

Hockerson-Halberstadt, Inc. v. Converse, Inc.,
183 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 1999)41

In re Chaganti,
554 Fed. Appx. 917 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....53, 55

In re Kahn,
441 F.3d 997 (Fed. Cir. 2006)53, 55

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.