

Filed on behalf of: Google Inc.

By:  
James J. Elacqua  
james.elacqua@skadden.com  
(650) 470-4510

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  
U.S. Patent 8,205,237

---

**PETITIONER'S REPLY TO**  
**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO PETITION**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
Table of Authorities .....	iii
Exhibit List.....	iv
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Claim Interpretation.....	2
A. Patent Owner Misinterprets the Board's Construction of "Sublinear Search" .....	2
B. An "Approximate Nearest Neighbor Search" Need Not Be "Sublinear" .....	4
1. The Specification Does Not Demand Sublinearity.....	4
2. The Claims Confirm that Sublinearity Is Not Required .....	5
III. Ground A: Iwamura Anticipates Claims 1, 3–5, 7–9, 11–13, 15, 16, 21–25, 29, 30, 33, 37, and 38 .....	6
A. Iwamura Discloses "Non-Exhaustive Search" .....	7
1. Iwamura Explicitly Identifies Its Search as Non- Exhaustive .....	7
2. Iwamura Does Not Consider All "Possible Matches" .....	8
(a) The "Possible Matches" in Iwamura Are Melody Segments, Not Full Songs .....	9
(b) Iwamura Does Not Consider All Melody Segments, and Therefore Discloses Non- Exhaustive Search.....	12
B. Iwamura Discloses "Approximate Nearest Neighbor Search" .....	13
C. Iwamura Discloses "Sublinear Search" .....	15

1.	Contrary to the Arguments Raised in Network-1's Response, Iwamura Discloses "Sublinear Search" .....	16
2.	Petitioner's Arguments Regarding "Sublinear Search" Are Both Timely and Responsive .....	18
IV.	Ground B: Ghias Anticipates Claims 9–11, 13–15, and 23–24 .....	20
A.	Ghias Discloses "Approximate Nearest Neighbor Search" .....	20
1.	Ghias's Subsequent Searches Do Not Always Consider the Closest Match.....	21
2.	Ghias Cannot Always Identify the <i>Closest</i> Match in a Group of <i>Close</i> Matches .....	22
V.	Ground C: Iwamura and Chen Render Obvious Claims 26, 27, 34, and 35 .....	24
A.	Dr. Karypis's Testimony Includes Attorney Argument Which Should Be Given Little Weight.....	24
VI.	Conclusion .....	25

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page**

**CASES**

*Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC*,  
610 Fed. Appx. 997 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....19

*Digital-Vending Services International., LLC v. University of Phoenix, Inc.*,  
672 F.3d 1270 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....6

*Facebook, Inc. v. PragmaTV, LLC*,  
582 F. App'x 864 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....5

*Gateway Equipment Corp. v. United States*,  
247 F. Supp. 2d 299 (W.D.N.Y. 2003).....25

*Phillips v. AWH Corp.*,  
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....5

*Ramirez v. Salvation Army*, No. C06-0631,  
2008 WL 670153 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 6, 2008) .....25

*Renishaw PLC v. Marposs Societa' per Azioni*,  
158 F.3d 1243 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....5

**INTER PARTES REVIEWS**

*Canon Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC*,  
IPR2014-00631, Paper 50 (August 19, 2015) .....19

*Nintendo of America Inc. v. Motion Games, LLC*,  
IPR2014-00164, Paper 51 (May 15, 2015) .....19

...

**EXHIBIT LIST**

- 1001** U.S. Patent No. 8,205,237 to Cox
- 1002** Prosecution History of U.S. Patent No. 8,205,237
- 1003** Visual Summary of Petition Grounds
- 1004** December 3, 2014 Declaration of Dr. Pierre Moulin
- 1005** Curriculum Vitae of Dr. Pierre Moulin
- 1006** Sunil Arya, et al., "An Optimal Algorithm for Approximate Nearest Neighbor Searching in Fixed Dimensions" ("Arya")
- 1007** Christian Böhm, et al., "Efficient Similarity Search in Digital Libraries" ("Böhm")
- 1008** U.S. Patent No. 7,444,353 ("Chen")
- 1009** U.S. Patent No. 6,970,886 ("Conwell")
- 1010** U.S. Patent No. 5,874,686 ("Ghias")
- 1011** U.S. Patent No. 6,597,405 ("Iggulden")
- 1012** U.S. Patent No. 6,188,010 ("Iwamura")
- 1013** U.S. Patent No. 6,505,160 ("Levy")
- 1014** U.S. Patent No. 6,098,106 ("Philyaw")
- 1015** U.S. Patent No. 7,743,092 ("Wood")
- 1016** Prosecution History of U.S. Patent App. No. 09/438,469
- 1017** Timo Raita, "Tuning the Boyer–Moore–Horspool String Searching Algorithm"
- 1018** Aristides Gionis, et al., "Similarity Search in High Dimensions via Hashing"
- 1019** Plaintiff Network-1 Technologies, Inc.'s Responses to Defendants Google, Inc. and YouTube, LLC's First Set of Interrogatories (Nos.

# 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.