

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

\_\_\_\_\_  
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD  
\_\_\_\_\_

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC. AND QUANTUM CORPORATION,  
Petitioners,

v.

CROSSROADS SYSTEMS, INC.,  
Patent Owner  
\_\_\_\_\_

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW**

**OF**

**U.S. PATENT NO. 7,051,147**

CROSSROADS EXHIBIT 2127  
Oracle Corp. v. Crossroads Systems, Inc.  
IPR2015-008

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|      |  |    |
|------|--|----|
| I.   | Mandatory Notices.....   | 1  |
| A.   | Real Party-in-Interest.....  | 1  |
| B.   | Related Matters.....   | 1  |
| C.   | Lead and Back-up Counsel and Service Information.....  | 2  |
| II.  | Grounds for Standing.....  | 2  |
| III. | Relief Requested.....  | 2  |
| IV.  | The Reasons for the Requested Relief.....  | 3  |
| A.   | Summary of Reasons .....   | 3  |
| B.   | The '147 Patent.....   | 4  |
| 1.   | Overview .....   | 4  |
| 2.   | Prosecution History.....   | 8  |
| C.   | Identification of Challenges .....   | 8  |
| 1.   | Challenged Claims .....  | 8  |
| 2.   | Statutory Grounds for Challenges .....   | 9  |
| 3.   | Claim Construction.....  | 9  |
| i.   | “maps between the device and the remote storage devices” ..  | 10 |
| ii.  | “native low level block protocol” .....  | 12 |
| iii. | “remote” .....   | 13 |
| 4.   | Identification of How the Claims Are Unpatentable.....   | 14 |
| i.   | Challenge: Claims 1-14, 16-33, 35-50 and 53 are obvious over<br>the CRD Manual in view of the HP Journal ..... | 14 |
| V.   | Conclusion.....  | 60 |

**I. Mandatory Notices**

**A. Real Party-in-Interest**

The real parties-in-interest are Cisco Systems, Inc. and Quantum Corporation (“Petitioners”).

**B. Related Matters**

Petitions for Inter Partes Review, IPR2014-01207, filed July 25, 2014, and IPR2014-01209, filed July 25, 2014; *Crossroads Systems, Inc. v. Quantum Corporation*, 1-14-cv-00150, TXWD, filed February 18, 2014; *Crossroads Systems, Inc. v. NetApp, Inc.*, 1-14-cv-00149, TXWD, filed February 18, 2014; *Crossroads Systems, Inc. v. Cisco Systems, Inc.*, 1-14-cv-00148, TXWD, filed February 18, 2014; *Crossroads Systems, Inc. v. Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd. et al.*, 1-13-cv-01025, TXWD, filed November 26, 2013; *Crossroads Systems, Inc. v. Oracle Corporation*, 1-13-cv-00895, TXWD, filed October 7, 2013. Also, (i) case nos. IPR2014-01197 (filed July 23, 2014) and IPR2014-01226 (filed July 31, 2014) have been filed against U.S. Patent No. 6,425,035, which is related to the ’147 patent; and (ii) case nos. IPR2014-01177 (filed July 18, 2014) and IPR2014-01463 (filed Sept. 8, 2014) have been filed against U.S. Patent No. 7,934,041, which is related to the ’147 patent. Additionally, this petition refers to a claim construction order from *Crossroads Systems, Inc. v. 3PAR, Inc., et al.*, no. 1-10-cv-00652 (W.D. Tex. 2010), which is one of the district court litigations involving U.S. Patent No. 6,425,035, which is related to the ’147 patent.

### C. Lead and Back-up Counsel and Service Information

#### Lead Counsel

David L. McCombs  
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP  
2323 Victory Ave. Suite 700  
Dallas, TX 75219

Phone: (214) 651-5533  
Fax: (214) 200-0853  
david.mccombs.ipr@haynesboone.com  
USPTO Reg. No. 32,271

#### Back-up Counsel

Andrew S. Ehmke  
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP  
2323 Victory Ave. Suite 700  
Dallas, TX 75219

Phone: (214) 651-5116  
Fax: (214) 200-0853  
andy.ehmke.ipr@haynesboone.com  
USPTO Reg. No. 50,271

Scott T. Jarratt  
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP  
2323 Victory Ave. Suite 700  
Dallas, TX 75219

Phone: (972) 739-8663  
Fax: (214) 200-0853  
scott.jarratt.ipr@haynesboone.com  
USPTO Reg. No. 70,297

## II. Grounds for Standing

Petitioners certify that they are not estopped or barred from requesting *inter partes* review of the '147 Patent. Petitioners were each served with a complaint asserting infringement of the '147 Patent on February 18, 2014, which is not more than one year before the filing of this Petition. Neither petitioner has initiated a civil action challenging the validity of any claim of the '147 Patent. Petitioners also certify that the '147 Patent is eligible for *inter partes* review.

## III. Relief Requested

Petitioners ask that the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“the Board”) review the accompanying prior art and analysis, institute a trial for *inter partes* review of claims 1-39 (all claims) of the '147 Patent, and cancel those claims as invalid.

#### **IV. The Reasons for the Requested Relief**

The full statement of the reasons for the relief requested is as follows:

##### **A. Summary of Reasons**

In short, the claims of the '147 Patent simply recite obvious combinations of network storage components with functionality that was well-known at the time of the '147 Patent invention. For example, each of the '147 Patent's seven independent claims generally include limitations directed to (i) mapping workstations on one side of a storage router to specific storage devices on the other side of the storage router, and (ii) routing block-level data between the workstations and the storage devices based on the mapping so that the workstations may only access the particular storage devices to which they are mapped. The '147 Patent's claims require the workstations and storage devices to be connected via Fibre Channel links. In one embodiment of the '147 Patent, the block-level data flowing between the workstations and storage devices conforms to the SCSI protocol. CQ-1001, 5:46-56; 6:31-56.

These elements were well known in the prior art. For example, in 1996, CMD Technologies sold a storage router, the CRD-5500 SCSI RAID Controller, that performed the functions recited in the claims. According to the CRD-5500 user's manual, the CRD-5500 Controller (i) allows users to map hosts on one side of the controller to specific storage devices on the other side of the controller and then (ii) routes SCSI commands from hosts to storage devices based on the map,

# 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.