

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SERVICENOW, INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY,

Patent Owner.

---

Case No. IPR2015-00631

U.S. Patent No. 7,392,300

---

**PATENT OWNER RESPONSE  
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.120**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. THE INVENTION OF THE '300 PATENT .....	5
III. OVERVIEW OF THE CITED PRIOR ART REFERENCES .....	14
A. Matheny .....	14
B. XML in a Nutshell (Harold).....	15
C. Hamner .....	15
D. Pitt.....	18
IV. THE CHALLENGED '300 PATENT CLAIMS ARE NON-OBVIOUS BECAUSE CLAIM LIMITATIONS ARE NOT TAUGHT BY THE PRIOR ART.....	19
A. Hamner does not disclose “a network event.” .....	20
1. The term “network event” should be construed as “an action or occurrence within the network that is detected or received by the system.” .....	20
2. The tasks described in Hamner are not “network events” under the proper construction of the term.....	27
3. Hamner does not disclose “a network event” under the Board’s construction of the term. ....	33
B. Neither Matheny nor Hamner alone, nor the combination of Hamner with Pitt, discloses “processing a network event using the network model . . . .” .....	35
1. The claimed “identifying” and “determining” sub-steps must use the network model and the network event must be detected or received before it is processed.....	36

2.	Matheny does not disclose “processing a network event using the network model” under the plain language of the claims. ....	39
3.	Hamner does not disclose “identifying one or more network objects of the plurality of network objects” under the proper reading of the claims. ....	42
4.	Hamner does not disclose “determining an order of operation on the one or more network objects” under the proper reading of the claims. ....	45
5.	Pitt does not disclose “determining an order of operation on the one or more network objects” under the proper reading of the claims. ....	47
C.	Matheny does not disclose “a network model.” ....	50
1.	The claim term “network model” should be construed to mean “computer-based representation of a network comprising the objects in the network and the relationships between them.” ....	51
2.	Matheny does not disclose a “network model” under the proper construction of the term. ....	52
3.	Matheny does not disclose a “network model” under the Board’s construction of the term. ....	54
V.	A PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART WOULD NOT HAVE COMBINED MATHENY WITH HAMNER, OR MATHENY AND HAMNER WITH PITT ....	55
A.	A person of ordinary skill in the art would not have combined Matheny with Hamner. ....	55
B.	A person of ordinary skill in the art would not have combined Matheny and Hamner with Pitt. ....	57
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	60

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page(s)**

**FEDERAL STATUTES**

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) ..... 1  
35 U.S.C. § 316(e) ..... 1, 19

## I. INTRODUCTION

U.S. Patent No. 7,392,300 (the “’300 patent”) is directed to a novel system and method for modeling a network using structured information and using the model in an event-driven system to simulate the effect of network events on the network. ’300 patent (Ex. 1001) at Abstract, 2:51-62. Patent Owner Hewlett-Packard Company (“HP”) respectfully submits that the challenged claims of the ’300 patent are patentable over the cited prior art.

The Board instituted trial on a single ground set forth in the Petition: whether independent claims 1, 10, and 21 and dependent claims 7, 8, and 22 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0161883 to Matheny (“Matheny”) (Ex. 1003) in view of Harold et al., XML in a Nutshell (2001) (“Harold”) (Ex. 1004), U.S. Patent No. 5,796,951 to Hamner (“Hamner”) (Ex. 1005), and U.S. Patent No. 5,717,934 to Pitt (“Pitt”) (Ex. 1007). Although Petitioner also asserted an additional ground of obviousness using the same first three references and substituting U.S. Patent No. 6,256,635 (Ex. 1006) for Pitt, the Board did not institute review on that ground.

Petitioner bears the burden of proving that the ’300 patent is unpatentable by a preponderance of the evidence. 35 U.S.C. § 316(e). Petitioner has failed to demonstrate obviousness for at least four reasons.

# 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.