

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SONY CORPORATION

Petitioner

v.

INNOVATIVE COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

(now STRAIGHT PATH IP GROUP, INC.)

Patent Owner

Patent No. 6,108,704

Filing Date: September 25, 1995

Issue Date: August 22, 2000

Title: POINT-TO-POINT INTERNET PROTOCOL

---

*Inter Partes* Review No. IPR2014-00230, Filing Date December 5, 2013

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE  
TO PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                                                                                                                                                   |    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| INTRODUCTION .....                                                                                                                                                                | 1  |
| I. THE '704 PATENT .....                                                                                                                                                          | 2  |
| II. THE '704 PATENT <i>EX PARTE</i> REEXAMINATION .....                                                                                                                           | 3  |
| III. PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW .....                                                                                                                    | 6  |
| IV. LEGAL STANDARD .....                                                                                                                                                          | 8  |
| ARGUMENT .....                                                                                                                                                                    | 10 |
| I. PETITIONER'S PROPOSED CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS ARE UNSUPPORTED AND CONTRADICTED BY THE CLEAR DISCLOSURES OF THE '704 PATENT.....                                                    | 10 |
| A. Each Challenged Claim Requires a Query into the On-Line Status of a Second Process, Rather than a Query into Whether a Process Has Registered with a Server .....              | 11 |
| 1. Petitioner's Suggestion That "On-Line" Means "Registered with a Server" Has No Basis in the Claims or Specification.....                                                       | 15 |
| 2. Petitioner's Alternative Constructions for "Query" Have No Basis in the Claims or Specification .....                                                                          | 23 |
| B. Petitioner's Construction for "A Network Protocol Address Received [ ] Following Connection to the Computer Network" Eliminates Claim 1's Dynamic Addressing Requirement ..... | 26 |
| II. PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO DEMONSTRATE THAT EACH LIMITATION OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS IS FOUND IN THE ASSERTED PRIOR ART .....                                                   | 29 |
| A. The Challenged Claims Require a Query Into On-Line Status, and Are Therefore Patentable over the Microsoft Manual, Alone or in Combination with Palmer or Pinard .....         | 31 |

|    |                                                                                                                                                                                                    |    |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1. | The Microsoft Manual Does Not Teach a Query into On-Line Status of a Process and Therefore Does Not Anticipate Claim 1 .....                                                                       | 32 |
| 2. | The Microsoft Manual in Combination with Either Palmer or Pinard Does Not Teach a Query into On-Line Status of a Process and Therefore Does Not Render Obvious Claims 11-12, 19, 22-23, or 30..... | 37 |
| B. | The Claims Require a Query into On-Line Status or Dynamic Addressing, and are Therefore Patentable over VocalChat, Alone or in Combination with Pinard or RFC 1541 .....                           | 39 |
| 1. | The Asserted References Do Not Disclose a Query into the On-Line Status of a Process .....                                                                                                         | 39 |
| a. | VocalChat Does Not Teach the Required Query into the On-Line Status of a Process .....                                                                                                             | 40 |
| b. | VocalChat in Combination with Pinard Does Not Render Obvious the Required Query into On-Line Status of Claims 11-12, 19, 22-23, or 30.....                                                         | 46 |
| 2. | The Asserted References Do Not Render Obvious the Dynamic Address Allocation of Claim 1 .....                                                                                                      | 47 |
| a. | VocalChat Does Not Disclose Dynamic Addressing .....                                                                                                                                               | 47 |
| b. | Petitioner Has Not Established the Obviousness of Combining VocalChat with RFC 1541 .....                                                                                                          | 48 |
| C. | Little-1994 in Combination with RFC 791, RFC 1541, Little-1993, or Pinard Does Not Teach the Required Point-to-Point Communication with a Second Process .....                                     | 51 |
| 1. | Petitioner Has Admitted that Little-1994 Should Not Be Considered by the Board.....                                                                                                                | 52 |
| 2. | The Asserted References Do Not Teach the Required Connection Between Two Processes, Receiving the Network Protocol Address of the Second Process, or                                               |    |

|                                                                                                                                          |    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Establishing Communication Responsive to the Network Protocol Address .....                                                              | 53 |
| a. Little-1994 Does Not Teach a Point-to-Point Communication with a Second Process .....                                                 | 53 |
| b. Little-1994 in Combination with RFC 791, Little-1993, Pinard, or RFC 1541 Do Not Disclose a Connection Between Two Processes .....    | 57 |
| 3. Petitioner Has Not Established the Obviousness of Combining Little-1994 with RFC 1541 to Utilize Dynamically Assigned Addresses ..... | 58 |
| CONCLUSION.....                                                                                                                          | 60 |

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

|                                                                                                         |           |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <i>Bayer Healthcare Pharms., Inc. v. Watson Pharms., Inc.</i> ,<br>713 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2013) ..... | 9         |
| <i>CFMT, Inc. v. YieldUp Int’l Corp.</i> ,<br>349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....                      | 9         |
| <i>In re Bond</i> ,<br>910 F.2d 831 (Fed. Cir. 1990) .....                                              | 10        |
| <i>In re Robertson</i> , 169 F.3d 743<br>(Fed. Cir. 1999) .....                                         | 44        |
| <i>In re Suitco Surface, Inc.</i> ,<br>603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....                             | 10        |
| <i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> ,<br>550 U.S. 398 (2007) .....                                    | 9, 50, 59 |
| <i>Verizon Servs. Corp. v. Cox Fibernet Va., Inc.</i> ,<br>602 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....         | 9         |
| <b>Statutes</b>                                                                                         |           |
| 35 U.S.C. § 314(a) .....                                                                                | 2, 8      |
| <b>Regulations</b>                                                                                      |           |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) .....                                                                             | 10        |

# 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.