

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

FUJITSU NETWORK COMMUNICATIONS, INC.  
Petitioner

v.

CAPELLA PHOTONICS, INC.  
Patent Owner

---

*Inter Partes* Review Case No. IPR2015-00726  
Patent No. RE42,368

---

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

***Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"***  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION .....1

II. RESPONSES TO PATENT OWNER’S ARGUMENTS .....1

A. Patent Owner’s Estoppel Argument Is Erroneous.....1

B. The Use of 2-Axis Mirrors with Angular Misalignment for Power Control Would Have Been Obvious in View of the Combined Teachings of Bouevitch and Either Carr or Sparks .....4

C. Patent Owner Does Not Rebut Petitioner’s Reasons for Combination .....10

D. Patent Owner’s Categorization of Optical Switches Fails to Distinguish the Claims Over Bouevitch, Carr and Sparks .....13

E. Patent Owner’s Attacks on the Combination of Bouevitch with Carr or Sparks Are Erroneous.....14

F. Patent Owner Fails to Deny that Bouevitch, Carr and Sparks Each Disclose Continuous Control.....16

G. Bouevitch, Carr and Sparks Each Disclose the Claimed “Ports.”.....18

H. Petitioner’s Obviousness Showings Concerning the Dependent Claims Are Unrebutted.....22

I. The Testimony of Petitioner’s Expert Is Well-Supported and Patent Owner Has Not Shown any Grounds for Possible Bias .....22

1. Dr. Ford’s Declaration Is His Own Testimony and Capella Examined Dr. Ford .....22

2. There Is No Conflict Between Dr. Ford’s Declaration and a 2006 Article .....25

**I. INTRODUCTION**

The Patent Owner has failed to present any reason for the Board to depart from its determination that Petitioner Fujitsu Network Communications, Inc. ("FNC" or "Petitioner") should prevail on all challenged claims.

**II. RESPONSES TO PATENT OWNER'S ARGUMENTS**

**A. Patent Owner's Estoppel Argument Is Erroneous**

Patent Owner contends that this IPR "should be terminated under 35 U.S.C. § 315(e)(1) as to any claim that is later confirmed in" IPR2014-01166. Resp. at 20. As an initial matter, the Board determined that all challenged claims are unpatentable in IPR2014-01166 and thus Patent Owner's argument should be dismissed as moot since no challenged claim has been confirmed. *See* Ex. 1039 at 43.

Moreover, the estoppel of § 315(e)(1) does not apply to FNC based on IPR2014-01166 because FNC was not a petitioner in that IPR. Section 315(e)(1) states:

*The petitioner in an inter partes review of a claim in a patent under this chapter that results in a final written decision under section 318(a), or the real party in interest or privy of the petitioner, may not request or maintain a proceeding before the Office with respect to that claim on any ground that the petitioner raised or reasonably could have raised during that inter partes review.*

35 U.S.C. § 315(e)(1) (emphasis added).

PTO rules define “petitioner” as “*the party filing a petition requesting that a trial be instituted.*” 37 C.F.R. § 42.2 (emphasis added). FNC was not a party to the filing of the petition requesting institution of the trial in IPR2014-01166. *See Cisco Systems, Inc. v. Capella Photonics, Inc.*, IPR2014-01166, Paper No. 2 (P.T.A.B. July 15, 2014). Rather, more than seven months after the Board instituted the trial in that IPR, *Cisco Systems, Inc. v. Capella Photonics, Inc.*, IPR2014-01166, Paper No. 8 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 30, 2015), FNC was joined by order of the Board. *See Ciena Corp. v. Capella Photonics, Inc.*, IPR2015-00816, Paper No. 12 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 4, 2015). Thus, FNC is not a petitioner in IPR2014-01166 under PTO rules.

The decisions cited by Patent Owner are inapposite and actually confirm that the party must have filed the petition in the earlier IPR before estoppel could attach in a subsequent IPR. Unlike here where FNC did not file the petition in IPR2014-01166, Apotex filed the petitions in both of the IPRs at issue where it was found to be estopped. *Apotex Inc. v. Wyeth LLC*, IPR2015-00873, Paper No. 8 at 1 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 16, 2015). The same was true in the Dell IPRs. *Dell Inc. v. Elecs. & Telecomms. Research, Inst.*, IPR2015-00549, Paper No. 10 at 1 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 26, 2015). Patent Owner has no support for its position that contradicts the PTO Rule. Thus, Patent Owner's premise that FNC qualifies as a petitioner by being

“involved” in an “earlier-filed IPR,” Resp. at 20, is incorrect. *See* 37 C.F.R.

§ 42.2.<sup>1</sup>

In addition, Patent Owner's assumption that the grounds presented in this IPR “reasonably could have [been] raised” in IPR2014-01166 is meritless. Patent Owner draws this conclusion simply because it contends that FNC knew about Bouevitch, Carr, and Sparks at the time. *See* Resp. at 21 (citing Ex. 2029). But as stated above FNC was not a party to the petition filed in IPR2014-01166. *Cisco Systems, Inc. v. Capella Photonics, Inc.*, IPR2014-01166, Paper No. 2 (P.T.A.B. July 15, 2014). Furthermore, Patent Owner has no evidence to show that FNC had any involvement with or even knew about the IPR2014-01166 petition prior to its filing. Thus, FNC had no opportunity to raise the references from this IPR at the time that Cisco prepared and filed the petition in IPR2014-01166.

Moreover, at the time FNC sought to join IPR2014-01166, *Ciena Corp. v. Capella Photonics, Inc.*, IPR2015-00816, Paper No. 1 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 26, 2015), FNC had already filed the petition of the present IPR and IPR2014-01166 had already been instituted. *See* Paper No. 1 (petition filed February 12, 2015); *Cisco*

---

<sup>1</sup> Capella has not alleged and there is no basis to allege that FNC was a real party in interest or privy of the petitioner (Cisco Systems, Inc.) in IPR2014-01166. Thus, the “the real party in interest or privy of the petitioner” provision of § 315(e)(1) is inapplicable.

# 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.