

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
Petitioner

v.

BRADIUM TECHNOLOGIES LLC,  
Patent Owner

---

CASE IPR2015-01434  
Patent 7,908,343

---

**PATENT OWNER BRADIUM TECHNOLOGIES LLC'S  
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §42.107**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. THE REQUIREMENTS TO INSTITUTE AN INTER PARTES REVIEW .....	2
III. GROUNDS 1 AND 2 ARE FATALLY FLAWED BECAUSE THE PETITION DOES NOT ESTABLISH THAT EITHER LINDSTROM OR POTMESIL IS PRIOR ART .....	3
A. Petitioner Has Not Shown that Lindstrom Qualifies as Prior Art.....	4
B. Petitioner Has Not Shown that Potmesil Qualifies as Prior Art .....	9
IV. EVERY GROUND FAILS BECAUSE THE PETITION DOES NOT IDENTIFY THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE CLAIMS AND THE ASSERTED REFERENCES .....	12
A. An Obviousness Analysis That Fails To Identify Any Difference Between A Claim And Any Asserted Reference Is Fatally Flawed .....	12
B. Ground 1 .....	14
1. Claim 1 .....	14
2. Claim 13.....	16
C. Ground 2 .....	17
D. Ground 3 .....	17
1. Claim 1 .....	18
2. Claim 13.....	19
E. Grounds 4 and 5 .....	19
V. EVERY GROUND FAILS BECAUSE THE PETITION FAILS TO ARTICULATE REASONS WITH RATIONAL UNDERPINNING SUFFICIENT TO SUPPORT A CONCLUSION OF OBVIOUSNESS.....	20
A. An Obviousness Analysis Must Explain Why A POSITA Would Have Had Reason To Modify An Asserted Reference In Light Of A Particularly Identified Teaching Of Another Reference.....	20
B. Ground 1 .....	21
1. Claim 1 .....	21
2. Claim 13.....	24
C. Ground 2 .....	26
D. Ground 3 .....	26

..

1.	Claim 1 .....	26
2.	Claim 13 .....	30
E.	Grounds 4 and 5 .....	31
VI.	THE BOARD SHOULD DENY THE ENTIRE PETITION BECAUSE IT DOES NOT RELATE THE ACTUAL CLAIM LANGUAGE TO THE ASSERTED REFERENCES .....	31
A.	The Petition Omits The Language Of All The Claims And Fails To Map Each Claim Element To A Particular Teaching Of Any Asserted Reference .....	32
B.	The Petition Incorrectly Summarizes/Mischaracterizes the References.....	41
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	47

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>2Wire, Inc. v. TQ Delta LLC</i> IPR2015-00239 (P.T.A.B. May 29, 2015).....	passim
<i>Apple Inc. v. DSS Tech. Mgmt., Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00369 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 12, 2015).....	6, 7, 9, 10
<i>Cisco Systems, Inc., v. C-Cation Technologies, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00454 (P.T.A.B. August 29, 2014); .....	21, 23
<i>Dish Network L.L.C. v. Dragon Intellectual Property, LLC</i> , IPR2015-00499 (P.T.A.B. July 17, 2015) .....	6, 8, 11
<i>Google Inc. v. ART+COM InnovationPool GmbH</i> , IPR2015-00788 (P.T.A.B. September 2, 2015),.....	passim
<i>Google, Inc. v. Everymd.com LLC</i> , IPR2014-00347(P.T.A.B. May 22, 2014).....	13, 34
<i>Gracenote, Inc. v. Iceberg Industries LLC</i> , IPR2013-00552 (P.T.A.B. March 7, 2014).....	42
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	passim
<i>Hopkins ManufacturingCorp. v. Cequent Performance Products, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00616 (P.T.A.B. August 17, 2015) .....	3, 23, 30, 34
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	20, 22, 29, 30
<i>In re Lister</i> , 583 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	4, 7, 11
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith &amp; Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	12, 15, 18
<i>KSR Int’l v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	20, 29

<i>Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casualty Ins. Co.</i> , CBM-2012-00003 (Order) (P.T.A.B. November 26, 2012) .....	13, 15, 16, 18
<i>Plant Science, Inc. v. The Andersons, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00939 (P.T.A.B. December 14, 2014).....	21, 24, 29, 30
<i>Volkswagen Group Of America, Inc. v. Signal IP, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00968 (P.T.A.B. August 25, 2015) .....	22
<i>Whole Space Industries Ltd. v. Zipshade Industrial (B.V.I.) Corp.</i> , IPR2015-00488 (P.T.A.B. July 24, 2015) .....	passim

## Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) .....	12
35 U.S.C. § 102(b) .....	4, 5
35 U.S.C. § 314(a) .....	2
35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 311(b) .....	4
AIA § 102(a) and (b).....	5

## Rules

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4).....	passim
37 C.F.R. § 42.107 .....	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.20(c).....	3
37 C.F.R. § 42.22 .....	34
37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)(2).....	passim
37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(3).....	1, 6
37 C.F.R. § 42.62(a).....	10
37 C.F.R. § 42.65 .....	11
37 C.F.R. §42.24(a)(1)(i) .....	23, 29, 33
37 C.F.R. 42.104(b)(5).....	4
FRE 602 .....	7, 11
FRE 702 .....	11

# 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.