

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

VERIZON SERVICES CORP. and VERIZON BUSINESS NETWORK
SERVICES INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

STRAIGHT PATH IP GROUP, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-01406
Patent 6,108,704 C1

Before KALYAN K. DESHPANDE, TRENTON A. WARD, and
BART A. GERSTENBLITH, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

DESHPANDE, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Institution of *Inter Partes* Review
37 C.F.R. § 42.108

I. INTRODUCTION

Verizon Services Corp. and Verizon Business Network Services Inc. (collectively, "Petitioner") filed a Petition requesting an *inter partes* review of claims 1, 11, 12, 14, 16, 19, 22, 23, 27, 30, and 31 of U.S. Patent No. 6,108,704 C1 (Ex. 1001, "the '704 patent"). Paper 1

(“Pet.”). With the Petition, Petitioner filed a Motion for Joinder (Paper 3, “Mot.”), seeking to join this case with *LG Elecs., Inc. v. Straight Path IP Grp., Inc.*, Case IPR2015-00209. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a), which provides that an *inter partes* review may not be instituted “unless . . . there is a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition.” After considering the Petition and associated evidence, we conclude that Petitioner has demonstrated a reasonable likelihood that it would prevail in showing unpatentability of all the challenged claims. Thus, we authorize institution of an *inter partes* review of claims 1, 11, 12, 14, 16, 19, 22, 23, 27, 30, and 31 of the ’704 patent.

A. Related Proceedings

Petitioner indicates that the ’704 patent is the subject of *Straight Path IP Grp., Inc. v. Verizon Comm’ns, Inc.*, No. 1:14-cv-07798 (S.D. N.Y.). Pet. 6. Petitioner also indicates that the ’704 patent is the subject of *Certain Point-to-Point Network Commc’n Devices and Prods. Containing Same*, Inv. No. 337-TA-892 (USITC). *Id.* at 7. Petitioner indicates that the ’704 patent is also the subject of *Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Straight Path IP Grp., Inc.*, Case IPR2014-01366 (PTAB), *LG Elecs., Inc. v. Straight Path IP Grp., Inc.*, and Case IPR2015-00209 (PTAB). *Id.* at 4–5. The ’704 patent was the subject of *Sipnet EU S.R.O. v. Straight Path IP Grp., Inc.*, Case IPR2013-00246 (PTAB) (“*Sipnet*”). *Id.* at 5.

Petitioner further indicates that the ’704 patent is related to U.S. Patent No. 6,131,121 (“the ’121 patent”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,009,469 (“the ’469 patent”). *Id.* at 4–5. The ’121 patent and the ’469 patent are the subject of *Samsung Elecs., Co. v. Straight Path IP Grp., Inc.*, Case IPR2014-

IPR2015-01406
Patent 6,108,704 C1

01367 (PTAB), and *Samsung Elecs., Co. v. Straight Path IP Grp., Inc.*, Case IPR2014-01368 (PTAB), *LG Elecs., Inc. v. Straight Path IP Grp., Inc.*, Case IPR2015-00196 (PTAB), and *LG Elecs., Inc. v. Straight Path IP Grp., Inc.*, Case IPR2015-00198 (PTAB). *Id.* at 5.

B. Illustrative Claim

Petitioner challenges claims 1, 11, 12, 14, 16, 19, 22, 23, 27, 30, and 31 of the '704 patent. Pet. 37–60. Independent claim 1 is illustrative of the claims at issue and follows:

1. A computer program product for use with a computer system, the computer system executing a first process and operatively connectable to a second process and a server over a computer network, the computer program product comprising:
 - a computer usable medium having program code embodied in the medium, the program code comprising:
 - program code for transmitting to the server a network protocol address received by the first process following connection to the computer network;
 - program code for transmitting, to the server, a query as to whether the second process is connected to the computer network;
 - program code for receiving a network protocol address of the second process from the server, when the second process is connected to the computer network; and
 - program code, responsive to the network protocol address of the second process, for establishing a point-to-point communication link between the first process and the second process over the computer network.

C. The Alleged Grounds of Unpatentability

The information presented in the Petition sets forth Petitioner’s contentions of unpatentability of claims 1, 11, 12, 14, 16, 19, 22, 23, 27, 30, and 31 of the ’704 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as follows (*see* Pet. 34–60):

References	Claims Challenged
WINS ¹ and NetBIOS ²	1
WINS, NetBIOS, and Pinard ³	11, 12, 14, 16, 19, 22, 23, 27, 30, and 31

II. ANALYSIS

Petitioner argues that claim 1 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over WINS and NetBIOS and claims 11, 12, 14, 16, 19, 22, 23, 27, 30, and 31 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over WINS, NetBIOS, and Pinard. Pet. 34–60. Petitioner submits arguments and evidence identical to those submitted in IPR2015-00209. Mot. 2. Petitioner proposes the same claim construction and argues the same rationale of unpatentability of claims 1, 11, 12, 14, 16, 19, 22, 23, 27, 30, and 31 as presented in IPR2015-00209. Pet. 34–60; *LG Elecs., Inc. v Straight Path IP Grp., Inc.*, Case IPR2015-00209, Paper 1, 36–60. Petitioner further relies on the same Declaration by Dr. Bruce M. Maggs in

¹ MICROSOFT WINDOWS NT SERVER VERSION 3.5, TCP/IP USER GUIDE, © 1994 Microsoft Corporation (Ex. 1003, “WINS”).

² TECHNICAL STANDARD PROTOCOLS FOR X/OPEN PC INTERWORKING: SMB, VERSION 2, THE OPEN GROUP, © September 1992, X/Open Company Limited (Ex. 1004, “NetBIOS”).

³ U.S. Patent No. 5,533,110, issued July 2, 1996 (Ex. 1020, “Pinard”).

support of the alleged grounds of unpatentability. Pet. 34–60; Ex. 1002. Petitioner filed a proposed order defining the parameters of joinder. See Mot. 8–9. Patent Owner did not file a Preliminary Response.

We determined that the petitioner in IPR2015-00209, LG Electronics, Inc., Toshiba Corp., VIZIO, Inc., and Hulu, LLC (collectively, “LG”), demonstrated a reasonable likelihood of prevailing in establishing the unpatentability of claims 1, 11, 12, 14, 16, 19, 22, 23, 27, 30, and 31 of the ’704 patent. *LG Elecs., Inc. v Straight Path IP Grp., Inc.*, Case IPR2015-00209, slip op. at 9–23 (PTAB May 15, 2015) (Paper 20). We granted that petition and instituted an *inter partes* review of claim 1 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over WINS and NetBIOS and claims 11, 12, 14, 16, 19, 22, 23, 27, 30, and 31 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over WINS, NetBIOS, and Pinard. *Id.* at 23.

Accordingly, we incorporate our previous analysis, including our claim interpretation analysis (*see id.* at 9–14) and our analysis regarding this asserted ground of unpatentability (*see id.* at 14–23), from IPR2015-00209, and we determine that Petitioner has demonstrated a reasonable likelihood that it would prevail in establishing the unpatentability of claims 1, 11, 12, 14, 16, 19, 22, 23, 27, 30, and 31 of the ’704 patent in this Petition for the same reasons discussed in our Decision instituting *inter partes* review in IPR2015-00209.

III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, we determine that the information presented in the Petition establishes that there is a reasonable likelihood that Petitioner would prevail in establishing unpatentability of claims 1, 11, 12, 14, 16, 19, 22, 23, 27, 30, and 31 of the ’704 patent.

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.