

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE INC.
Petitioner

v.

Patent of AT HOME BONDHOLDERS' LIQUIDATING TRUST
Patent Owner

Case IPR2015-00658

U.S. Patent No. 6,286,045

Title: INFORMATION STORAGE AND DELIVERY OVER A COMPUTER
NETWORK USING CENTRALIZED INTELLIGENCE TO MONITOR AND
CONTROL THE INFORMATION BEING DELIVERED

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.107**

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	1
A.	Summary of the 045 Patent	1
B.	The invention of the 045 Patent was acknowledged as a solution to a long-felt, but poorly understood, problem	5
C.	The invention of the 045 Patent was widely adopted by the industry	10
D.	Petitioner’s declarations do not make a prima facie case of invalidity.....	11
II.	Patent Owner’s claim constructions should be adopted.....	14
A.	“banner” (claims 18 and 34-41)	15
B.	“best suited server” (claims 7 and 9).....	16
C.	“content general request signal” (claim 4)	18
D.	“content specific request signal” (claim 5)	19
III.	Patent Owner’s definition of a person of ordinary skill in the art should be adopted	20
IV.	[GROUND 1] The Petition fails to show that claims 1-6, 12, 14, 15, 17-19, 34, 35 and 40 unpatentable based on Angles (GOOG 1012) and Merriman (GOOG 1013).....	20
A.	Angles and Merriman do not disclose all of the elements of independent claims 1 and 34.....	20
(i)	Neither Angles nor Merriman contain any mention of caching, much less disclose the claimed request signal that includes information to prevent the signal from being blocked due to caching.....	20
(ii)	Neither Merriman nor Angles teach or suggest the use of two requests to retrieve a banner	26

B.	A POSA would not modify Angles and Merriman in a way that results in the claimed invention.....	31
C.	The Petition fails to demonstrate that dependent claims 2-6, 12, 14, 15, 17-19, 35 and 40 are obvious	32
V.	[GROUND 2] The Petition fails to show that claims 7-11, 16 and 39 are unpatentable based on Angles (GOOG 1012), Merriman (GOOG 1013), and Garland (GOOG 1009).....	33
A.	The cited references do not disclose all of the elements of the claims.....	33
(i)	Garland does not teach or suggest selecting a “best suited server” as required by claims 7-10 under Petitioner’s construction	33
(ii)	Garland does not teach or suggest “making one of the secondary servers a new primary server if the original primary server becomes inaccessible” as described in claim 11	35
B.	The Petitioner fails to sufficiently identify why a POSA would modify Angles and Merriman in view of Garland in a way that results in the claimed invention.....	36
VI.	[GROUND 3] The Petition fails to demonstrate that claim 42 is unpatentable based on Angles (GOOG 1012), Merriman (GOOG 1013), and Davis (GOOG 1014).....	37
VII.	[GROUND 4] The Petition fails to demonstrate that claims 36-38 and 41 are unpatentable based on Angles (GOOG 1012), Merriman (GOOG 1013), and HTTP1.0 (GOOG 1008).....	38
VIII.	[GROUND 5] The Petition fails to demonstrate that claims 1-6, 12, 14-18, and 34-42 are unpatentable based on Wexler (GOOG 1007) and HTTP1.0 (GOOG 1008)	40
A.	Wexler and HTTP1.0 do not disclose all of the elements of independent claims 1 and 34	40

(i)	Neither Wexler nor HTTP1.0 teach or suggest the use of two requests to retrieve a banner	40
(ii)	Neither Wexler nor HTTP1.0 teach or suggest the step of “determining which specified banner will be served to the computer” in Claim 34.....	44
(iii)	Neither Wexler nor HTTP1.0 teach or suggest “causing a first request signal to be transmitted from the terminal to primary server requesting a location address for said second portion of information” of claim 1.....	44
B.	A POSA would not modify Wexler and HTTP1.0 in a way that results in the claimed invention.....	45
C.	The Petition fails to demonstrate that dependent claims 2-6, 12, 14-18, and 35-42 are obvious.....	46
IX.	[GROUND 6] The Petition fails to demonstrate that claim 19 is unpatentable based on Wexler (GOOG 1007), HTTP1.0 (GOOG 1008), and Meeker (GOOG 1010).....	49
X.	[GROUND 7] The Petition fails to demonstrate that claims 7-11 are unpatentable based on Wexler (GOOG 1007), HTTP1.0 (GOOG 1008), and Garland (GOOG 1009).....	51
A.	The cited references do not disclose all of the elements of the claims.....	51
(i)	Garland does not teach or suggest selecting a “best suited server” as required by claims 7-10 under Petitioner’s construction	51
(ii)	Garland does not teach or suggest “making one of the secondary servers a new primary server if the original primary server becomes inaccessible” as described in claim 11	52
B.	The Petitioner fails to sufficiently identify why a POSA modify Wexler and HTTP1.0 in view of Garland in a way that results in the claimed invention	52

XI. CONCLUSION.....53

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.