

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.  
Petitioner

v.

CAPELLA PHOTONICS, INC.  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2014-01166  
Patent RE42,368

---

**PATENT OWNER RESPONSE TO THE PETITION**

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. BACKGROUND ..... 9

    A. Optical Circulators Limited the Scalability of Optical Switches ..... 9

    B. The '368 Patent Discloses a Scalable ROADM with Multiple Ports .11

    C. Claims ..... 14

III. CLAIMS 1-6, 9-11, 13, AND 15-22 ARE NOT OBVIOUS OVER THE COMBINATION OF BOUEVITCH, SMITH, AND LIN..... 16

    A. Petitioner Improperly Conflates Two Disparate Embodiments of Bouevitch—Modifying Means 150 and MEMS Array 50—Without Providing *KSR* Rationale..... 17

    B. A POSA Would Not Have Combined Bouevitch and Smith..... 22

        1. Bouevitch Modifying Means is Based on Polarization, such that Adding Smith’s Mirrors Would Disrupt Switching..... 25

        2. Using Smith’s Tilttable Mirrors in Bouevitch Would Disrupt Bouevitch’s Explicit Teaching of Parallel Alignment..... 26

        3. A POSA Would Not Have Used a More Complex Two-Axis Mirror to Achieve the Same Function as a Simpler One-Axis Mirror Absent Reliance on Hindsight..... 30

    C. Bouevitch Does Not Teach or Suggest “Input Port,” “Output Port,” and “One or More [Other Ports]” as Recited in Independent Claims 1, 15, and 16. .... 31

        1. Proper Meaning of the Term “Port” as Recited in the '368 Patent..... 33

        2. The '368 Patent Clearly Disavows Circulator Ports from Meeting the Claimed Ports..... 34

3.	Dr. Marom Understood the Meaning of the Term “Port” as Recited in the Claims .....	39
4.	Bouevitch at Most has Two Ports .....	40
D.	The Applied References Do Not Teach or Suggest Beam-Deflecting Elements that are Continuously Controllable in Two Dimensions as Recited in Independent Claims 1, 15, 16, and 17 .....	41
1.	Petitioner Concedes that Bouevitch Does Not Teach or Suggest Beam-Deflecting Elements that are Continuously Controllable in Two Dimensions .....	42
2.	Smith’s Linear Applied Force Does Not Meet the Claimed Continuously Controllable in Two Dimensions .....	43
3.	Lin’s One-Axis Mirror Does Not Meet the Claimed Continuously Controllable in Two Dimensions .....	46
4.	Petitioner Fails to Provide <i>KSR</i> Rationale for Combining Smith and Lin .....	50
5.	Bouevitch does not Teach “Imaging Each of Said Spectral Channels onto a Corresponding Beam Deflecting Element” as Recited in Claim 17. ....	51
IV.	PETITIONER HAS NOT MET ITS BURDEN OF SHOWING THE CLAIM ELEMENT “CONTROLLING . . . BEAM-DEFLECTING ELEMENTS . . . SO AS TO COMBINE SELECTED ONES OF SAID SPECTRAL CHANNELS INTO AN OUTPUT . . . SIGNAL” AS RECITED IN INDEPENDENT CLAIM 17 .....	52
V.	A POSA WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN MOTIVATED TO USE DUECK’S DIFFRACTION GRATING IN BOUEVITCH .....	52
VI.	DEPENDENT CLAIMS.....	55
A.	Smith Fails to Teach the Servo Control and Spectral Monitory Features of Dependent Claims 3 and 22, and Even if Taught, Combining Smith’s Control with Bouevitch is Not Obvious .....	55

B. Bouevitch fails to teach the “focusing” feature of claims 11 and 22..55

VII. SMITH IS NOT PRIOR ART TO THE '368 PATENT BECAUSE THE PORTIONS OF SMITH PETITIONER RELIES ON ARE NOT ENTITLED TO SMITH'S EARLIEST § 102(E) DATE .....56

VIII. CISCO FAILS TO DISCLOSE ALL REAL PARTIES IN INTEREST .....59

IX. CONCLUSION.....59

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

Cases

*Alloc, Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n*,  
342 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2003) ..... 34, 35

*Application of Lund*, 376 F.2d 982 (CCPA 1967) .....58

*Boston Scientific Scimed, Inc. v. Cordis Corp.*,  
554 F.3d 982 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....17

*In re Chaganti*,  
554 F. App’x 917 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....17

*KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*,  
550 U.S. 398 (2007).....17

*Nat’l Envm’t Prods. Ltd v. Dri-Steem Corp.*,  
IPR2014-01503 (P.T.A.B. 2015).....17

*SciMed Life Sys., Inc. v. Advances Cardiovascular Sys., Inc.*,  
242 F.3d F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....34

*Securus Techs, Inc. v. Global Tel\*Link Corp.* Case IPR2015-00153  
(PTAB May 1, 2015) .....56

Statutes

§ 102(e) .....56

§ 119(e) .....56

35 U.S.C. § 120 .....56

35 U.S.C. § 312 .....59

Other Authorities

M.P.E.P. § 211 .....56

# 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.