

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SERVICENOW, INC.
Petitioner

v.

BMC SOFTWARE, INC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR 2015-01176
Patent No. 5,978,594
Filed March 6, 1997
Issued November 2, 1999

Title: System for managing computer resources across a distributed
computing environment by first reading discovery information about how to
determine system resources presence

Filed electronically via the Patent Review Processing System (PRPS) on
February 22, 2016

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. OVERVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 5,978,594.....	1
A. Background of the Technology.....	1
B. The '594 Patent Inventions Revolutionized Enterprise Management.....	3
C. Overview of the Claimed Invention of the '594 Patent	8
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	12
A. Claim 1 of the '594 Patent	12
B. Determine.....	13
C. Discovery Information	15
D. Uninterpreted Form.....	16
E. Interpreting the instructions and Interpretable high-level computer programming language	19
IV. CLAIM 1 OF THE '594 PATENT IS NOT OBVIOUS OVER THE PRIOR ART.....	20
A. Legal Standards.....	20
B. Overview of the Alleged Prior Art.....	23
1. U.S. Patent No. 5,410,681 ("Jessen").....	23
2. Stephen Coffin, UNIX System V, Release 4: The Complete Reference (1990) ("Coffin").....	31
C. It Would Not Have Been Obvious To A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art in 1994 to Combine Jessen, Coffin and Inside Macintosh to Achieve the Invention of Claim 1 of the '594 Patent	32
D. Jessen fails to suggest "discovery information about how to determine whether the resource is present on the computer system"	33
1. The Jessen command line invocation is not "discovery information" because there is no teaching of commands that could referred to for discovering the presence of resources.	33

2.	The Jessen command line invocation is not “discovery information” because it does not refer to any instructions regarding “how to” discover the presence of resources.....	36
E.	Jessen fails to suggest “finding, on the storage device, instructions that are referred to in the discovery information.”.....	41
F.	Jessen in view of Coffin fails to suggest “reading, from a storage device . . . , discovery information.”.....	41
1.	Jessen does not disclose “reading, from a storage device . . . , discovery information.”.....	41
2.	There is no motivation to combine Coffin with Jessen.....	41
3.	Jessen teaches away from the combination of Coffin and Jessen.	44
G.	Jessen fails to suggest “interpreting the instructions for the purpose of collecting data for use in determining whether the resource is present on the computer system.”.....	45
H.	Jessen fails to suggest “determining, responsive to the collected data, whether the resource is present on the computer system.”.....	46
I.	Secondary Considerations.....	52
1.	Commercial Success.....	52
2.	Copying.....	55
3.	Praise by Others.....	57
4.	Long-Felt Need and Failure of Others.....	58
V.	CONCLUSION.....	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>BMC Software, Inc. v. ServiceNow, Inc.</i> , No. 2:14-cv-903 (E.D. Tex.).....	55
<i>Dominion Dealer Solutions, LLC v. Autoalert, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00223	23
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	21, 32
<i>Heart Failure Tech. v. Cardiokinetix, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00183	22
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	21
<i>In re Dow Chem. Co.</i> , 837 F.2d 469 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	21
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	22
<i>In re Rambus, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 42 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	12
<i>In re Wright</i> , 866 F.2d 422 (Fed. Cir. 1989).....	21
<i>Intri-Plex Techs. v. St. Gobain</i> , IPR2014-00309	21
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	22, 32
<i>Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.</i> , 774 F.2d 1082 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	21
<i>Power Integrations, Inc. v. Lee</i> , 797 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	12
<i>Sony Corp. of Am. v. Network-1 Sec. Solutions, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00092	22

...

Square, Inc. v. J. Carl Cooper,
IPR2014-0015712

Star Scientific, Inc. v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.,
655 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....22

Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptoronic, Inc.,
90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....19

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 103.....1, 20, 32, 59

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.