

DOCKET NO: 1152975-00249US2

Filed on behalf of Cisco Systems, Inc. and AVAYA Inc. by:

Lead Counsel	David L. Cavanaugh, Reg. No. 36,476 Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP 1875 Pennsylvania Avenue NW Washington, DC 20006 Tel: (202) 663-6000 Fax: (202) 663-6363 Email: david.cavanaugh@wilmerhale.com
Backup Counsel	Jason D. Kipnis, Reg. No. 40,680 [see firm contact information above] Email: jason.kipnis@wilmerhale.com
Backup Counsel for AVAYA	Joseph C. Kirincich, Reg. No. 38,734 AVAYA Inc. 211 Mt. Airy Road Basking Ridge, NJ 07920 Tel: (908) 953-8623 Fax: (203) 564-0222 Email: jckirincich@avaya.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC. and AVAYA INC.
Petitioner,

v.

STRAIGHT PATH IP GROUP, INC.
Patent Owner

IPR Trial No. IPR2015-1007

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 6,009,469
CHALLENGING CLAIMS 1-3, 5-6, 9-10, 14, and 17-18
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND
37 C.F.R. §§ 42.1-80, 42.100 *et seq.***

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. COMPLIANCE WITH FORMAL REQUIREMENTS 1

 A. Mandatory Notices Under 37 C.F.R. 42.8(b)..... 1

 1. Real Parties-in-Interest..... 1

 2. Related Matters 1

 3. Lead and Back-up Counsel 5

 4. Power of Attorney and Service Information..... 6

 B. Proof of Service..... 6

 C. Grounds for Standing 6

III. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGES UNDER 37 6

IV. OVERVIEW OF THE PRIOR ART 7

 A. Microsoft Windows NT Server version 3.5 TCPIP.HLP (“Microsoft Manual”) (Exhibit 1012) 7

 B. Technical Standard: Protocols for X/Open PC Interworking: SMB, Version 2 (“NetBIOS”) (Exhibit 1014)..... 8

 C. U.S. Pat. No. 5,375,068 (“Palmer”) (Ex. 1020)..... 10

 D. U.S. Pat. No. 5,533,110 (“Pinard”) (Ex. 1021)..... 10

 E. U.S. Patent No. 5,341,477 (“Pitkin”) (Exhibit 1015) 12

V. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART 13

VI. SUMMARY OF THE ’469 PATENT 13

 A. Point-to-Point Communications..... 19

 B. Look-Up Tables..... 21

 C. Prior Proceedings 22

 1. Prosecution of the ’469 Patent 22

 2. The Sipnet Inter Partes Review..... 24

VII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 24

 A. “point-to-point communication[s]” (claims 1, 5) / “point-to-point communication link” (claims 2-3, 9) 25

B.	“network protocol address” (Claims 1, 5, 9).....	27
C.	“connected to the computer network” (claims 3, 6) / “connection to the computer network” (claim 5) / “on-line status” (claim 9)	28
D.	“accessible” (claim 9).....	35
E.	“determining the currently assigned network protocol address of the first process upon connection to the computer network” (claims 1, 5).....	35
F.	“unique identifier” (claim 1)	36
VIII.	THERE IS A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT PETITIONER WILL PREVAIL WITH RESPECT TO AT LEAST ONE CLAIM OF THE ’469 PATENT	37
IX.	DETAILED EXPLANATION OF GROUNDS FOR UNPATENTABILITY OF CLAIMS 1-3, 5-6, 9-10, 14, AND 17-18.....	37
A.	Ground 1: Claims 1-3, 5-6, and 9 are invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as rendered obvious by the Microsoft Manual in view of NetBIOS	37
B.	Ground 2: Claims 9, 10, 14, 17, and 18 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over the Microsoft Manual in view of NetBIOS and Palmer	48
C.	Ground 3: Claims 1, 9, and 14 are obvious under § 103 over the Microsoft Manual in view of NetBIOS, Palmer, and Pinard.....	54
D.	Ground 4: The Microsoft Manual in view of NetBIOS, Palmer, Pinard, and Pitkin renders claims 3, 6, and 9 obvious under § 103.....	58
X.	CONCLUSION.....	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Ex parte Papst-Motoren</i> , 1 USPQ2d 1655 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1986).....	25
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	39, 58
<i>Straight Path IP Group, Inc., v. Bandwidth.com, Inc., et al.</i> , 1:13-cv-932 (E.D. Va.)	26
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 102.....	7
35 U.S.C. § 102(b).....	12
35 U.S.C. § 103.....	<i>passim</i>
35 U.S.C. § 311.....	7, 60
35 U.S.C. § 311-19.....	1
Regulations	
37 C.F.R. § 42.1 <i>et seq.</i>	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e).....	6
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b).....	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.22.....	38
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b).....	25
37 C.F.R. § 42.101.....	60
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a).....	6
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b).....	7

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION
1001	U.S. Patent No. 6,009,469
1002	File History for U.S. Patent No. 6,009,469
1003	File History for Reexamination Control No. 90/010422
1004	Declaration of Henry Houh, Ph.D.
1005	Intentionally Omitted
1006	Declaration of Robert Cowart
1007	Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review of U.S. Patent No. 6,108,704, filed by Sipnet EU S.R.O.
1008	Institution Decision in Sipnet EU S.R.O. v. Straight Path IP Group, Inc., IPR No. 2013-00246 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 11, 2013)
1009	Markman Order, <i>Innovative Communications Technologies, Inc. v. Stalker Software, Inc.</i> , 2:12-cv-00009-RGD-TEM, ECF No. 48 (E.D. Va. Oct. 26, 2012)
1010	Markman Order, <i>Straight Path IP Group, Inc. v. Bandwidth.com, Inc.</i> , et al., 1:13-cv-00932-AJT-IDD, Docket No. 107 (E.D. Va. Feb. 25, 2014)
1011	Deposition Transcript of Shane Mattaway from Net2Phone v. eBay et al. (2-06-cv-02469 (D.N.J.))
1012	Microsoft Windows NT version 3.5 TCPIP.HLP
1013	Droms, R., Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol, RFC 1541 (Oct. 1993)
1014	Technical Standard: Protocols for X/Open PC Interworking: SMB, Version 2
1015	U.S. Patent No. 5,341,477 (“Pitkin”)
1016	Comer, D.E., “Internetworking with TCP/IP, Vol. 1, Principles, Protocol, and Architecture, Second Edition,” (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1991)
1017	Postel, J., Ed., Transmission Control Protocol, DARPA Internet Program Protocol Specification, RFC 793 (September 1981)
1018	Postel, J., Ed., Internet Protocol, DARPA Internet Program Protocol Specification, RFC 791 (September 1981)
1019	Declaration of Sandy Ginoza
1020	U.S. Patent No. 5,375,068 (Palmer)
1021	U.S. Patent No. 5,533,110 (Pinard)
1022	File history for Reexamination Control No. No. 90/010416
1023	“Patent Owner’s Response Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.120,” in Case

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.