

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

RARITAN AMERICAS, INC. D/B/A RARITAN COMPUTER, INC.,
Petitioner

v.

SERVER TECHNOLOGY, INC.,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2015-01597

U.S. Patent No. 7,043,543
Title: Vertical-Mount Electrical Power Distribution Plugstrip
Filed: August 15, 2001
Issued: May 9, 2006

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

Mail Stop Patent Board
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page:</u>
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS IN DISPUTE.....	viii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND OF THE '543 PATENT	3
III. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY THE PETITION IN ITS ENTIRETY BECAUSE EACH OF THE GROUNDS ARE DUPLICATIVE AND THE FACTS JUSTIFY EXERCISING DISCRETION UNDER § 325(d)	6
IV. THE BOARD SHOULD REJECT THE PETITION BECAUSE IT DOES NOT SHOW A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF PREVAILING BY FAILING TO ANALYZE THE PRIORITY DATE AND QUALIFY THE REFERENCES AS “PRIOR ART”	18
A. Raritan’s Petition Fails to Allege a Credible Priority Date for the '543 Patent Claims.....	18
B. Raritan’s Petition Fails to Qualify the Cited References as Prior Art.....	23
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	32
A. Electrical Power Distribution Plugstrip	32
1. Characterization of the claimed electrical power distribution plugstrip as a one-piece design is consistent with the specification of the '543 Patent	34
2. The dependent claims further support the proper construction of the claimed electrical power distribution plugstrip as a one-piece design.....	36
B. Current-related Information Display Does Not Encompass a Single LED	37
1. To construe an LED as a “current-related information display” is inconsistent with the plain meaning of the term “display”	37

2.	To construe an LED as a “current-related information display” is inconsistent with the specification of the ’543 Patent.....	38
C.	Intelligent Power Section/Module	40
VI.	THE BOARD SHOULD REJECT THE INSTANT PETITION BECAUSE RARITAN FAILS TO ESTABLISH A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT THE CLAIMS CHALLENGED ARE UNPATENTABLE.....	40
A.	Petitioner’s Proposed Anticipation Rejection in Ground 3 and Proposed Obviousness Rejection in Ground 1 Is Based on Improper Interpretation of Claim Terms.....	41
B.	Petitioner Does Not Provide a Proper Basis for Combining Lee With the MSVM Literature in Ground 2	42
C.	The Petition Does Not Provide a Proper Basis for Combining McNally With Liu	46
D.	The Petition Does Not Provide a Proper Basis for Combining Ewing ‘974 With Wiebe and Lee	48
E.	The Petition Does Not Provide a Proper Basis for Combining the Baytech Literature With Lee.....	50
VII.	THE BOARD SHOULD DENY AT LEAST SOME—IF NOT ALL—OF THE PETITION GROUNDS BECAUSE EACH IS HORIZONTALLY REDUNDANT AND MERELY CUMULATIVE.....	52
VIII.	OBJECTIVE INDICIA OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS	60
IX.	CONCLUSION	60
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	61

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s):</u>
<u>CASES</u>	
<i>Actavis, Inc. v. Research Corporation Technologies, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01126, Paper 22 (Jan. 9, 2015)	30
<i>Amkor Tech., Inc. v. Tessera, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00242, Paper 37 (Oct. 11, 2013).....	54, 56, 58
<i>Artsana USA, Inc. v. Kolcraft Enterprises, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01053, Paper 14 (Dec. 19, 2014)	25, 28
<i>Baxter Healthcare Corp. v. Millenium Biologix, LLC</i> , IPR2013-00583, Paper 9 (Mar. 21, 2014).....	22, 23
<i>BLD Servs. LLC v. LMK Techs. LLC</i> , IPR2015-00723, Paper 7 (Aug. 24, 2015).....	9
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc., v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (Aug. 29, 2014).....	25
<i>Cisco Sys. v. Constellation Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2014-01085, Paper 11 (Jan. 9, 2015)	25
<i>Coalition for Affordable Drugs (ADROCA) LLC v. Acorda Therapeutics, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00720, Paper 15 (Aug. 24, 2015).....	23
<i>Conopco, Inc. dba Unilever v. The Procter & Gamble Company</i> , IPR2014-00628, Paper 21 (Oct. 20, 2014).....	7, 10, 16
<i>CoreLogic, Inc. v. Boundary Solutions, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00219, Paper 6 (May 21, 2015)	7, 8, 12
<i>Corning Glass Works v. Sumitomo Elec. U.S.A., Inc.</i> , 868 F.2d 1251 (Fed. Cir. 1989).....	33
<i>Crystal Semiconductor Corp. v. TriTech Microelecs. Int’l, Inc.</i> , 246 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	34

<i>Dell et al. v. Selene Commc'n</i> , IPR2014-01411, Paper 23 (Feb. 26, 2015).....	27
<i>Eiselstein v. Frank</i> , 52 F.3d 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	21
<i>Globus Medical Inc. v. Depuy Synthes Products LLC</i> , IPR2015-00099, Paper 15 (May 1, 2015)	27
<i>Illumina, Inc. v. Trustees of Columbia Univ.</i> , IPR2012-00006, Paper 43 (May 10, 2013)	55
<i>In re Cronyn</i> , 890 F.2d 1158 (Fed. Cir. 1989).....	24, 27, 29
<i>In re Hall</i> , 781 F.2d 897 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	23
<i>In re Klopfenstein</i> , 380 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	23
<i>Integrated Global Concepts, Inc. v. Advanced Messaging Technologies, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01027, Paper 16 (Dec. 22, 2014)	7, 15
<i>Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc., v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , IPR2013-00324, Paper 19 (Nov. 21, 2013).....	10
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	43, 48, 50
<i>L-3 Commc'n Holdings, Inc. v. Power Survey, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00832, Paper 9 (Nov. 14, 2014).....	23
<i>Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casualty Ins. Co.</i> , CBM2012-00003, Paper 8 (Oct. 25, 2012)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Medtronic, Inc. v. Nuvasive, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00487, Paper 8 (Sep. 11, 2014).....	9
<i>Medtronic, Inc. v. Robert Bosch Healthcare Sys., Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00436, Paper 17 (June 19, 2014)	8, 9, 15

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.