

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SERVICENOW, INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY,

Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2015-00707

U.S. Patent No. 7,925,981

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO ESTABLISH THE AUTHENTICITY OF ANY OF THE COLLABORATE REFERENCES	4
	A. Petitioner offers no direct evidence to authenticate the Collaborate References.	5
	B. The Wayback Machine evidence offered by Petitioner does not authenticate the Collaborate References.	6
III.	THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO ESTABLISH THAT ANY OF THE COLLABORATE REFERENCES WAS PUBLICLY ACCESSIBLE; THEREFORE, THEY DO NOT QUALIFY AS A PRIOR ART “PRINTED PUBLICATION”	12
	A. Petitioner offers no direct evidence of the public accessibility of the Collaborate References before May 14, 2003.....	13
	B. Petitioner relies on inadmissible hearsay evidence to show the public accessibility of the Collaborate References before May 14, 2003.	13
	C. The use and reproduction restrictions in the Collaborate References show that they were not publicly accessible.	19
	D. Petitioner does not offer any evidence that the Collaborate References were indexed by search engines before May 14, 2003.	21
	E. The evidence affirmatively shows that the Collaborate References were, in fact, made publicly available for download <i>after</i> the May 14, 2003 filing date of the ’981 patent.	22
IV.	THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE THE CITED REFERENCES DO NOT DISCLOSE EVERY CLAIM LIMITATION OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS.....	23
	A. The invention of the ’981 patent	23
	B. Claim construction	26
	1. The claim term “Web service” should be construed as “a computing service with a discoverable public interface	

that is accessible using Web protocols through the exchange of messages” (Claims 1 and 22).27

2. The claim term “managed object” should be construed to mean “software that acts as a management representation of a resource and includes at least an interface for accessing management features of the resource” (Claims 1 and 22).....29

3. The claim term “service managed object” should be construed to mean “software that acts as a management representation of a Web service that performs services and includes at least an interface for accessing management features of the Web service” (Claim 1).30

C. The cited references fail to disclose every claim limitation.....31

1. Overview of the Cited References32

2. None of the cited references alone or in combination disclose or suggest “managing a Web service.”33

3. None of the cited references alone or in combination disclose or suggest a “service managed object.”34

4. None of the cited references alone or in combination disclose or suggest a “managed object”37

D. Petitioner fails to establish a reason for combining the Collaborate References with the Fox reference.38

V. CONCLUSION.....39

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
FEDERAL CASES	
<i>Cordis Corp. v. Boston Scientific Corp.</i> , 561 F.3d 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	13
<i>EMC Corp. v. PersonalWeb Techs., LLC</i> , No. IPR2013-00085, 2014 WL 2090664 (P.T.A.B. May 15, 2014)	5, 21
<i>Ethicon, Inc. v. United States Surgical Corp.</i> , 762 F. Supp. 480 (D. Conn. 1991).....	21
<i>In re Cronyn</i> , 890 F.2d 1158 (Fed. Cir. 1989)	12
<i>In re Hall</i> , 781 F.2d 897 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	12
<i>Loussier v. Universal Music Group, Inc.</i> , No. 02 CIV. 2447 (KMW), 2005 WL 5644421 (S.D.N.Y. July 14, 2005).....	18
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , No. IPR2012-00026, 2012 WL 10703131 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 21, 2012).....	32
<i>Northern Telecom, Inc. v. Datapoint Corp.</i> , 908 F.2d 931 (Fed. Cir. 1990)	19
<i>Novak v. Tucows, Inc.</i> , No. 06-CV-1909 (JFB) (ARL), 2007 WL 922306 (E.D.N.Y. Mar. 26, 2007)	17
<i>Osborn v. Butler</i> , 712 F. Supp. 2d 1134 (D. Idaho 2010)	18, 19
<i>Standard Innovation Corp. v. Lelo, Inc.</i> , No. IPR2014-00148, 2015 WL 1906730 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 23, 2015)	5, 14, 15
<i>Toxgon Corp. v. BNFL, Inc.</i> , No. CT-00-5040 (WFN), 2003 WL 25860388 (E.D. Wash. July 7, 2003).....	18

Va. Innovation Scis., Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.,
983 F. Supp. 2d 713 (E.D. Va. 2014)20

Voter Verified, Inc. v. Premier Election Solutions, Inc.,
698 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2012)21

FEDERAL STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 102 12

35 U.S.C. § 314 4

RULES

Federal Rule of Evidence 807 14

REGULATIONS

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)26

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4)..... 32

37 C.F.R. § 42.108 4

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.