

Filed on Behalf of NETWORK-1 TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

By: Charles R. Macedo (Reg. No. 32,781)
Brian A. Comack (Reg. No. 45,343)
Amster, Rothstein & Ebenstein LLP
90 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10016
Telephone: (212) 336-8074
Facsimile: (212) 336-8001
cmacedo@arelaw.com
N1-Google-IPR@arelaw.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

NETWORK-1 TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-00345
Patent 8,205,237

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO THE PETITION
FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,205,237 UNDER 35
U.S.C. § 313 PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

Table of Contents

I. Introduction..... 1

II. Overview of the ‘237 Patent..... 3

III. Claim Constructions. 5

 A. “non-exhaustive search.” 5

 B. “sublinear.” 9

 C. “neighbor” / “near neighbor.” 10

 D. “nearest neighbor.” 11

 E. “approximate nearest neighbor search” 12

IV. Ground 1: Anticipated by Iwamura (Ex. 1012) fails..... 13

 A. Overview of Iwamura..... 13

 B. Ground 1 fails because Iwamura does not disclose the claimed
 “non-exhaustive,” “sublinear,” and “approximate nearest”
 search limitations..... 14

 1. Iwamura does not disclose the claimed non-exhaustive,
 sublinear, or approximate nearest elements but rather
 teaches an exhaustive, linear search. 14

 2. Response to Petitioner’s arguments..... 16

V. Ground 4: Anticipated by Ghias (Ex. 1010) fails..... 20

 A. Overview of Ghias..... 20

 B. Ground 4 fails because Ghias does not disclose the claimed
 sublinear limitations found in each challenged independent
 claim. 21

VI. Ground 5: Anticipated by Wood (Ex.1015) fails. 25

 A. Overview of Wood..... 25

 B. Ground 5 fails because Wood does not disclose the claimed
 “approximate nearest neighbor search.” 26

VII. Ground 2: Obvious over Levy (Ex. 1013) in view of Arya (Ex. 1006)
fails..... 29

A.	Overview of Levy.....	29
B.	Overview of Arya.....	32
C.	Ground 2 fails because the references fail to teach claim elements and teach away from the proposed combination.	34
1.	Levy and Arya teach away from combining these references.	35
2.	The two asserted motivations to combine Levy and Arya presented in the Petition both fail.	40
VIII.	Ground 3: Obvious Iggulden (Ex. 1011) in view of Böhm (Ex. 1007) fails.....	43
A.	Overview of Iggulden.....	43
B.	Overview of Böhm.	45
C.	Ground 3 fails because Iggulden and Böhm teach away from the proposed combination.	46
1.	Iggulden and Böhm teach away from combining the references.	47
2.	Petitioner's asserted motivations to combine Iggulden and Böhm presented in the Petition fail.....	51
IX.	Ground 6: Obvious over Iwamura (Ex. 1012) in view of Chen (Ex. 1008) fails.	53
X.	Ground 7: Obvious over Levy (Ex. 1013) in view of Arya (Ex. 1006) and Chen (Ex. 1008) fails.	54
XI.	Conclusion.	55

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>CallCopy, Inc. v. Verint Americas, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00492, Paper 14 (PTAB Feb. 5, 2014)	54
<i>Glaxo Group Ltd. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 376 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	31
<i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....	36
<i>International Securities Exchange v. Chicago Board Options Exchange</i> , IPR2014-00097, Paper 12 (PTAB May 22, 2014)	<i>passim</i>
<i>McGinley v. Franklin Sports, Inc.</i> , 262 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	36, 48
<i>Nystrom v. Trex Co.</i> , 424 F.3d 1136 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	11
<i>Smart Modular Technologies v. Netlist, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01371, Paper 12 (PTAB March 13, 2015).....	8
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 312.....	12
35 U.S.C. § 316(e).....	35
Regulations	
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3)	12
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4)	3

Exhibit List

EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Exhibit 2001	“Brute-force search”— http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Brute-force_search (3/19/2015)
Exhibit 2002	U.S. Patent No. 8,447,762 (Brendel)
Exhibit 2003	U.S. Patent No. 7,167,984 (Graveman)

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.