

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

ARISTA NETWORKS, INC.  
Petitioner

v.

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2015-00974  
Patent 7,224,668

---

**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. The '668 Patent presents a novel internetworking device that provides improved security and Quality of Service. .... 2

    A. Denial of Service (DoS) attacks have been a significant problem for networks. .... 2

    B. Existing approaches to address DoS attacks had serious limitations.... 3

    C. The novel solution provided by the '668 patent. .... 4

III. Claim Construction..... 8

    A. “Port Services” apply to each packet entering into or exiting from a port, for operating on packets entering and exiting the physical network interface ports..... 9

    B. The Board should reject Petitioner’s construction for the term “specific, predetermined ports” because the term is unambiguous and requires no construction. .... 14

    C. The Board should reject Petitioner’s means-plus-function analysis... 15

        1. “means for configuring a plurality of physical network interface ports” (claim 37). .... 16

        2. “means for processing packets originating at a plurality of physical ports” (claim 38)..... 17

        3. “means for passing packets through the control plane port, rather than directly from the physical ports to individual control plane processes” (claim 38). .... 18

        4. “means for configuring the control plane port services as an entity separate from physical port services” (claim 54). .... 18

IV. Ground 1A: Petitioner fails to show that claims 1-6, 8, 9, 15-22, 24-27, 33-40, 42, 45-47, 51-58, 60-63, and 69-72 are anticipated by Amara. .... 19

A. Amara’s packet-forwarding device. ....19

B. Petitioner fails to show that Amara discloses all of the elements of the challenged independent claims as arranged in the claim. ....22

1. Petitioner fails to show that Amara discloses “a plurality of physical network interface ports . . . the ports being configurable by control plane processes” (elements 1.1/19.1/37.1/55.1). ....22

2. Petitioner fails to show that Amara discloses “[executing] port services, [] on packets entering and exiting the physical network interface ports” (elements 1.2/19.2/37.2/55.2). ....25

3. Petitioner fails to show that Amara discloses “the port services . . . as defined by control plane configurations” (elements 1.2/19.2/37.2/55.2). ....28

4. Petitioner fails to show that Amara discloses “control plane processes for providing high-level control and configuration of the ports and the port services” (elements 1.3/19.3/37.3/55.3).  
.....32

5. Petitioner fails to show that Amara discloses “operat[e][ing] on packets received from specific, predetermined physical ports and destined to the collection of control plane processes” (elements 1.5/19.5/37.5/55.5). ....32

C. Petitioner fails to show that Amara discloses identifying packets destined to the control plane “using information specified in configuration of the internetworking device” as recited in dependent claims 3, 21, 39 and 57.....34

D. Petitioner fails to show that Amara discloses identifying and forwarding Layer 2 control packets to the control plane port as recited in dependent claims 5, 26, 46, and 62. ....37

E. Petitioner fails to show that Amara expressly or inherently discloses identifying and forwarding Layer 3 control packets to the control plane port as required by dependent claims 6, 27, 47, and 63. ....38

F. Petitioner fails to show that Amara discloses controlling and/or configuring “control plane port services as [a unique] entity separate from physical [port] services” as recited in claims 18, 36, 54, and 72. ....41

V. Ground 2A: Petitioner fails to show that claims 7, 23, 41, and 59 are obvious in view of Amara and Moberg under 35 U.S.C § 103.....42

A. The invention of Moberg.....43

B. The combination of Amara and Moberg does not disclose distributing control plane processes across multiple processors. ....44

VI. Ground 3A: Petitioner fails to show that claims 10, 12, 13, 28, 30, 31, 43, 48, 49, 64, 66, and 67 are obvious in view of Amara and Subramanian under 35 U.S.C § 103.....46

VII. Ground 4A: Petitioner fails to show that claims 10, 12, 13, 28, 30, 31, 43, 48, 49, 64, 66, and 67 are obvious in view of Amara and Hendel under 35 U.S.C § 103.....46

A. The Board should reject ground 4A because this ground is redundant to Ground 3A.....47

B. Petitioner fails to show that the combination of Amara and Hendel discloses applying distributed control plane port services only to packets received from specific, pre-determined physical ports. ....48

VIII. Petitioner fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for Grounds 1B, 2B, 3B, 4B.....49

IX. Conclusion. ....53

**Table of Authorities**

**Cases**

*Biotec Biologische Naturverpackungen GmbH & Co. KG v. Biocorp, Inc.*,  
249 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2001)..... 14

*CallCopy v. Verint Am.*,  
IPR2013-00486 (Paper 11, February 5, 2013)..... 52

*Cat Tech LLC v. Tube-Master Inc.*,  
528 F.3d 871 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... 15, 33

*Elekta Instrument S.A. v. O.U.R. Scientific Int’l Inc.*,  
214 F.3d 1302 (Fed. Cir. 2000)..... 15, 33

*Google v. EveryMD*,  
IPR2014-00347 (Paper 9, May 22, 2014)..... 52

*Illumina, Inc. v. The Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York*,  
IPR2012-00006 (Paper 43, May 10, 2013)..... 47, 48

*In re Chaganti*,  
2014 WL 274514 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 50

*In re Kahn*,  
441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)..... 50

*In re Morris*,  
127 F.3d 1048 (Fed. Cir. 1997)..... 10

*In re Robertson*,  
169 F.3d 743 (Fed. Cir. 1999)..... 23, 40

*Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casualty Ins. Co.*,  
CBM2012-00003 (Paper 7, October 10, 2012)..... 47, 52

*SanDisk Corp. v. Memorex Products, Inc.*,  
415 F. 3d 1278 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 13

# 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.