

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

LG ELECTRONICS, INC., TOSHIBA  
CORPORATION, AND VIZIO, INC.  
Petitioners

v.

STRAIGHT PATH IP GROUP, INC.  
Patent Owner

---

*INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,009,469  
Case IPR No.: *To Be Assigned*

---

PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,009,469  
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-19 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.100 *et seq.*

---

Filed on behalf of Petitioners

By: Rajeev Gupta, Reg. No. 55,873  
Darren M. Jiron, Reg. No. 45,777  
**FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.**  
901 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001-4413  
Telephone: 202-408-4000  
Facsimile: 202-408-4400

**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 ..... 2

        3. Lead and Back-up Counsel ..... 4

        4. Power of Attorney and Service Information ..... 5

    B. Proof of Service ..... 5

    C. Grounds for Standing ..... 5

III. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(B)..... 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) ..... 9

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

    E. U.S. Patent No. 5,341,477 (“Pitkin”) (Exhibit 1015) ..... 11

V. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART ..... 12

VI. SUMMARY OF THE ’469 PATENT ..... 12

    A. Point-to-Point Communications ..... 18

    B. Look-Up Tables ..... 19

    C. Prior Proceedings..... 20

        1. Prosecution of the ’469 Patent..... 20

        2. The Sipnet *Inter Partes* Review ..... 21

VII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ..... 22

    A. “point-to-point communication[s]” (claims 1, 5) / “point-to-point communication link” (claims 2-3, 9) ..... 22

B.	“network protocol address” (Claims 1, 5, 9) .....	24
C.	“connected to the computer network” (claims 3, 6) / “connection to the computer network” (claim 5) / “on-line status” (claim 9).....	25
D.	“accessible” (claim 9).....	31
E.	“determining the currently assigned network protocol address of the first process upon connection to the computer network” (claims 1, 5) .....	32
F.	“unique identifier” (claim 1).....	33
VIII.	THERE IS A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT PETITIONER WILL PREVAIL WITH RESPECT TO AT LEAST ONE CLAIM OF THE ’469 PATENT.....	33
IX.	DETAILED EXPLANATION OF GROUNDS FOR UNPATENTABILITY OF CLAIMS 1-3, 5-6, 9-10, 14, AND 17- 18.....	34
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. ....	34
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. ....	43
C.	Ground 3: Claims 1, 9, and 14 are obvious under § 103 over the Microsoft Manual in view of NetBIOS, Palmer, and Pinard .....	48
D.	Ground 4: The Microsoft Manual in view of NetBIOS, Palmer, Pinard, and Pitkin renders claims 3, 6, and 9 obvious under § 103 .....	52
X.	CONCLUSION.....	54

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page**

**CASES**

*Ex parte Papst-Motoren*  
1 USPQ2d 1655 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1986) .....22

*KSR Int'l Co. v Teleflex Inc.*  
550 U.S. 398 (2007) ..... 35, 52

**STATUTES**

35 U.S.C. § 102.....passim

35 U.S.C. § 103.....passim

35 U.S.C. § 311..... 5, 54

35 U.S.C. § 311-319..... 1

**OTHER AUTHORITIES**

37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e)..... 5

37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)..... 1

37 C.F.R. § 42.22 .....34

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) .....22

37 C.F.R. § 42.101 .....54

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)..... 5

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b) ..... 5

M.P.E.P. § 2143 .....52

**TABLE OF EXHIBITS**

<b>EXHIBIT</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
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)

# 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.