

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

FUJITSU NETWORK COMMUNICATIONS, INC.  
Petitioner

v.

CAPELLA PHOTONICS, INC.  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2015-00727  
Patent RE42,678

---

**PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

***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 ..... 5

    A. Optical networks need switches. .... 5

    B. Conventional optical switches were not scalable..... 6

    C. The claimed invention provides a scalable switch (ROADM) with multiple collimator ports..... 7

III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ..... 11

IV. FUJITSU’S PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED AS REDUNDANT TO CISCO’S PETITION, WHICH FUJITSU HAS ALREADY ASKED TO JOIN..... 12

    A. Fujitsu’s petition is one of four petitions that have been filed against the ’678 patent..... 12

    B. Cisco’s IPR resulted in a stay of the co-pending district-court action. .... 16

    C. The Board should deny Fujitsu’s petition because Fujitsu’s references and Cisco’s references are redundant. .... 17

V. THE BOARD SHOULD NOT INSTITUTE TRIAL ON ANY OF FUJITSU’S PROPOSED GROUNDS BECAUSE FUJITSU FAILED TO MEET ITS THRESHOLD SHOWINGS..... 21

    A. Ground 1: Smith Does Not Anticipate Claims 61-65 ..... 21

        1. Fujitsu failed to show that Smith is prior art. .... 21

        2. Smith does not disclose dynamically and continuously controlling said beam-deflecting elements in two dimensions. .... 24

3.	Fujitsu cannot rely on an “analog” embodiment from an earlier-filed provisional application because that embodiment was not carried over into Smith. ....	27
B.	<u>Ground 2: Smith in View of Carr Does Not Render Obvious</u> Claims 1-4, 9, 10, 13, 17, 19-23, 27, 29, 44-46 and 53.....	31
1.	Fujitsu never identified any deficiency in Smith that is allegedly fixed by Carr—as required by <i>Graham</i> . ....	31
2.	The combination of Smith and Carr does not teach or suggest micromirror elements that are continuously controllable in two dimensions. ....	33
C.	<u>Ground 3: Bouevitch in View of Carr Does Not Render Obvious</u> Claims 1, 9, 10, 13, 17, 19, 44, 53, 61, 64 and 65. ....	33
1.	Neither Bouevitch nor Carr discloses micromirrors that are pivotal about two axes and are continuously controllable.....	34
2.	The combination of Bouevitch and Carr fails to teach or suggest the “focuser” element of independent claims 1 and 44 and “focusing” element in independent claim 61. ....	36
3.	Fujitsu never identified any deficiency in Bouevitch that is allegedly fixed by Carr—as required by <i>Graham</i> . ....	38
D.	<u>Ground 4: Bouevitch in View of Sparks Does Not Render Obvious</u> Claims 1-4, 19-23, 27, 29, 44-46 and 61-63.....	39
1.	Neither Bouevitch nor Sparks disclose a spatial array of micromirrors or beam-deflecting element. ....	39
2.	The combination of Bouevitch and Sparks fails to teach or suggest the “focuser” element of independent claims 1, 21, and 44 and “focusing” element in independent claim 61. ....	41

3.	The combination of Bouevitch and Sparks fails to teach or suggest the servo-control and spectral-monitoring features of dependent claims 3, 21, 22, and 46.....	42
4.	Fujitsu never identified any deficiency in Bouevitch that is allegedly fixed by Sparks—as required under <i>Graham</i> . .....	43
E.	<u>Grounds 5, 6, 7, and 8</u> : Tew does not disclose beam-deflecting elements that are continuously controllable in two dimensions.....	44
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	46

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Butamax Advanced Biofuels LLC v. Gevo, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00539, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 4, 2014).....	24
<i>Butamax Advanced Biofuels LLC v. Gevo, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00581, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 14, 2014).....	18
<i>Cisco Systems, Inc. v. Constellation Tech’s LLC</i> , IPR2014-00914, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 2, 2015) .....	23
<i>Conopco, Inc. v. Procter &amp; Gamble Co.</i> , IPR2014-00628, Paper 21 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 20, 2014).....	18
<i>CustomPlay, LLC v. ClearPlay, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00783, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 7, 2014).....	19
<i>Google Inc. v. SimpleAir, Inc.</i> , CBM2014-00170, Paper 13 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 22, 2015) .....	17
<i>Henkel Corp. v. H.B. Fuller Co.</i> , IPR2014-00606, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 11, 2014).....	passim
<i>In re Lund</i> , 376 F.2d 982 (C.C.P.A. 1967).....	31
<i>Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , IPR2013-00324, Paper 19 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 21, 2013).....	17, 18, 20
<i>Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casualty Ins. Co.</i> , CBM2012-00003, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 25, 2012) .....	17, 19, 20
<i>Marvell Semiconductor, Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC</i> , IPR2014-00547, Paper 17 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 3, 2014) .....	24
<i>Medtronic, Inc. v. Robert Bosch Healthcare Sys., Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00436, Paper 17 (P.T.A.B. June 19, 2014) .....	18, 20
<i>Motorola Mobility LLC v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC</i> , IPR2014-00500, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 10, 2014) .....	4, 32, 38, 43

# 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.