

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

NETAPP INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

CROSSROADS SYSTEMS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-00773
Patent No. 7,051,147

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	1
II.	INSTITUTION OF REVIEW SHOULD BE REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(D) BECAUSE THE PETITION REQUESTS INSTITUTION ON GROUNDS PREVIOUSLY REJECTED BY THE BOARD.....	2
A.	Procedural Background of IPR2015-00773	2
1.	Petitioner Previously Brought the Same Arguments and Evidence in IPR2014-01209	2
2.	The Current Petition Merely Corrects the Deficiencies in the 1209 Petition	5
B.	The Board Should Exercise its Discretion to Deny the Petition Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	5
C.	The Board Routinely Denies Similar Petitions as a “Second Bite at the Apple”	14
1.	<i>Medtronic, Inc. v. NuVasive, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00487, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 11, 2014) (designated as “Informative”).....	15
2.	<i>Butamax Advanced Biofuels LLC v. Gevo, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00581, Paper 8 (PTAB Oct. 14, 2014).....	16
3.	<i>Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., v. Rembrandt Wireless Techs., LP</i> , IPR2015-00118, Paper 14 (PTAB Jan. 28, 2015)	19
4.	<i>Zimmer Holdings, Inc. v. Bonutti Skeletal Innovations LLC</i> , IPR2014-01080, Paper 17 (PTAB Oct. 31, 2014).....	20
5.	<i>Samsung Electronics Co. v. Affinity Labs of Texas, LLC</i> , IPR2015-00820, Paper 12 (PTAB May 15, 2015)	22
6.	<i>Medtronic, Inc. v. Endotach LLC</i> , IPR2014-00695, Paper 18 (PTAB Sept. 25, 2014).....	23
III.	INSTITUTION ON GROUND “A” SHOULD BE REJECTED BECAUSE IT IS SUBSTANTIALLY SIMILAR PRIOR ART AS SUBMITTED IN IPR2014-01226	25

IV. TRIAL SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED ON GROUND “B”
BECAUSE *KIKUCHI* IS NOT PRIOR ART TO THE ’147 PATENT28

V. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE IT FAILS TO
IDENTIFY THE REAL PARTIES IN INTEREST34

VI. CONCLUSION.....39

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Cooper v. Goldfarb</i> , 154 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	29
<i>Fleming v. Escort Inc.</i> , 774 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	29
<i>Gonzalez v. Banco Cent. Corp.</i> , 27 F.3d 751 (1st Cir. 1994).....	38
<i>Griffith v. Kanamaru</i> , 816 F.2d 624 (Fed. Cir. 1987).....	28
<i>Jones v. Evans</i> , 46 F.2d 197 (C.C.P.A. 1931)	29
<i>Keizer v. Bradley</i> , 270 F.2d 396 (C.C.P.A. 1959)	33
<i>Mahurkar v. C.R. Bard, Inc.</i> , 79 F.3d 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	28
<i>Mycogen Plant Science, Inc. v. Monsanto Co.</i> , 252 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	28
<i>Rey-Bellet v. Engelhardt</i> , 493 F.2d 1380 (C.C.P.A. 1974)	29
<i>Thompson v. Dunn</i> , 166 F.2d 443 (C.C.P.A. 1948)	33
<i>Tyco Healthcare Group LP v. Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc.</i> , 774 F.3d 968 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	28

Administrative Cases

<i>Aruze Gaming Macau, LTD. v. MGT Gaming, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01288, Paper 13 (PTAB February 20, 2015)	35
---	----

<i>Butamax Advanced Biofuels LLC v. Gevo, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00581, Paper 8 (PTAB Oct. 14, 2014)	16, 17, 18
<i>Cisco Systems, Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (PTAB Aug. 29, 2014) (informative opinion)	11
<i>CustomPlay, LLC v. ClearPlay, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00783, Paper 9 (PTAB Nov. 7, 2014)	11
<i>First Data Corp v. Cardsoft, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00729, Paper 8 (PTAB October 17, 2014)	36, 38, 39
<i>Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , IPR2013-00324, Paper 19 (PTAB Nov. 21, 2013)	6
<i>Medtronic, Inc. v. Endotach LLC</i> , IPR2014-00695, Paper 18 (PTAB Sept. 25, 2014)	23, 24, 25
<i>Medtronic, Inc. v. NuVasive, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00487, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 11, 2014) (informative opinion)	15
<i>Samsung Electronics Co. v. Affinity Labs of Texas, LLC</i> , IPR2015-00820, Paper 12 (PTAB May 15, 2015)	22, 23
<i>Samsung Electronics, Co., Ltd. v. Rembrandt Wireless Techs., LP</i> , IPR2015-00118, Paper 14 (PTAB Jan. 28, 2015)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Unilever, Inc. v. Procter & Gamble Co.</i> , IPR2014-00506, Paper 17 (PTAB Jul. 7, 2014) (informative opinion)	10
<i>Zimmer Holdings, Inc. v. Bonutti Skeletal Innovations LLC</i> , IPR2014-01080, Paper 17 (PTAB Oct. 31, 2014)	7, 8, 20, 21
<i>ZTE Corp. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00454, Paper 12 (Sept. 25, 2013) (informative opinion)	10, 13

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 103	3, 4
35 U.S.C. § 312	35, 38

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.