

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

HUGHES NETWORK SYSTEMS, LLC,  
Petitioner,

v.

ELBIT SYSTEMS LAND AND C4I LTD.,  
Patent Owner.

IPR2016-00142  
Patent No. 6,240,073

---

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

**LIST OF EXHIBITS**

<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Description</b>
Ex. 2001	Corrected Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review of Claims 2-8, 28, and 29 of U.S. Patent No. 6,240,073 by Petitioner Hughes Network Systems, LLC, IPR2016-00141, Paper No. 6

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	1
<b>II.</b>	<b>OVERVIEW OF THE ‘073 PATENT</b> .....	6
<b>III.</b>	<b>SUMMARY OF THE DOCUMENTS CITED IN THE PETITION</b> .....	9
	<b>A.</b> U.S. Patent No. 5,673,259 to Quick (“Quick”) (Ex. 1005) .....	9
<b>IV.</b>	<b>THE LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART</b> .....	11
<b>V.</b>	<b>CLAIM CONSTRUCTION</b> .....	12
	<b>1.</b> “Multiple Access Communications System for use in a Satellite Communications Network” .....	13
	<b>2.</b> “Switching Means” / “Means For Switching” .....	15
<b>VI.</b>	<b>THE PETITIONER HAS NOT SHOWN A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT AT LEAST ONE CLAIM OF THE ‘073 PATENT IS UNPATENTABLE</b> .....	17
	<b>A.</b> Ground 1: The Petition Fails to Demonstrate That Claim 28 is Anticipated by Quick.....	17
	<b>1.</b> Quick does not disclose a “multiple access communications system for use in a satellite communications network” .....	17
	<b>2.</b> Quick does not disclose a “switching means within said plurality of user terminals” .....	21
	<b>B.</b> Grounds 2-6: The Petition Fails to Demonstrate that Claims 2-8, 28, or 29 are Unpatentable Over Quick in view of Kou, Nakamura, Beal, and/or Wilkinson.....	24
	<b>1.</b> The Petition Lacks Articulated Reasoning Supported by Evidence for Multiple Claim Limitations.....	26
	<b>2.</b> The Petition Fails to Perform a Proper <i>Graham</i> Analysis .....	53
<b>VII.</b>	<b>CONCLUSION</b> .....	55

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases and Board Decisions</b>	
<i>CallCopy, Inc. v. Verint Americas, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00492, Paper 14 (PTAB Feb. 5, 2014).....	3, 18, 29
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC</i> , IPR2014-00454, Paper 12 (PTAB Aug. 29, 2014).....	26
<i>Corning Glass Works v. Sumitomo Elec. U.S.A., Inc.</i> , 868 F.2d 1251 (Fed. Cir. 1989) .....	13
<i>Eaton Corp. v. Rockwell Int’l Corp.</i> , 323 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	14
<i>Fidelity Nat’l Info. Servs., Inc. v. Datatrans Corp.</i> , IPR2014-00489, Paper 9 (PTAB Aug. 13, 2014).....	45
<i>General Elec. Co. v. TAS Energy Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00163, Paper 11 (PTAB May 13, 2014) .....	5
<i>Genetics Inst., LLC v. Novartis Vaccines and Diagnostics, Inc.</i> , 655 F.3d 1291 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	28
<i>Georgia-Pacific Corp. v. United States Gypsum Co.</i> , 195 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....	14
<i>Google Inc. v. Everymd.com LLC</i> , IPR2014-00347, Paper 9 (PTAB May 22, 2014) .....	27, 53
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	6, 25
<i>InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGO Commc’ns, Inc.</i> , 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	28, 31, 36, 45, 48, 52
<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC</i> , 793 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	12

<i>In re Donaldson Co.</i> , 16 F.3d 1189 (Fed. Cir. 1994) .....	16
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....	26
<i>In re Translogic Tech., Inc.</i> , 504 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	12
<i>Johns Manville Corp. v. Knauf Insulation, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01633, Paper 10 (PTAB Jan. 4, 2016) .....	4
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	4, 26
<i>Nautique Boat Co. v. Malibu Boats, LLC</i> , IPR2014-01045, Paper 13 (PTAB Nov. 26, 2014).....	5, 53
<i>Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.</i> , 545 F. 3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	4
<i>Pitney Bowes, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , 182 F.3d 1298 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....	13
<i>Shopkick, Inc. v. Novitaz, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00277, -00278, Paper 7 (PTAB May 29, 2015).....	27, 41
<i>Tempur Sealy Int'l, Inc. v. Select Comfort Corp.</i> , IPR2014-01419, Paper 7 (PTAB Feb. 17, 2015).....	53
<i>Torrent Pharm. Ltd. v. Merck Frosst Canada &amp; Co.</i> , IPR2014-00559, Paper 8 (PTAB Oct. 1, 2014).....	28, 43, 47
<i>Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California</i> , 814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987) .....	4
<i>VirnetX, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> , 767 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	17
<b>Statutes</b>	
35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 6 .....	15
35 U.S.C. § 314.....	6

# 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.