

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

ARISTA NETWORKS, INC.  
Petitioner

v.

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2016-00309  
Patent 7,224,668

---

**PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

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

**Table of Contents**

I. Introduction.....1

II. The Board should exercise its discretion and deny institution under § 325(d).  
.....2

A. The Board correctly rejected Petitioner’s first and second challenges  
to the ’668 patent.....5

B. The present Petition presents substantially the same arguments and  
prior art as in the first Petition.....7

C. Petitioner provides no reason to institute using the same art and  
arguments of a previously denied Petition.....9

D. The Board should find that the third Petition improperly uses the ’974  
Institution Decision as a roadmap.....11

III. The ’668 patent presents a novel internetworking device that provides  
improved security and Quality of Service (QoS). .....13

A. Denial of Service (DoS) attacks have been a significant problem for  
networks. ....13

B. Existing approaches to address DoS attacks had serious limitations..14

C. The novel solution provided by the ’668 patent.....15

IV. Claim construction.....20

A. The Board should reject Petitioner’s means-plus-function analysis...20

1. “means for configuring a plurality of physical network interface  
ports” (claim 37). ....22

2. “means for processing packets originating at a plurality of  
physical ports” (claim 38).....23

3. “means for passing packets through the control plane port,  
rather than directly from the physical ports to individual control  
plane processes” (claim 38). ....23

4.	“means for configuring the control plane port services as an entity separate from physical port services” (claim 54). .....	24
V.	Ground 1: Petitioner fails to show that claims 1–6, 8, 9, 15–22, 24–27, 33–40, 42, 51–58, 60–63, and 69–72 are obvious over Amara and CoreBuilder. ....	25
A.	Amara’s packet-forwarding device. ....	25
B.	CoreBuilder’s Administration Console. ....	27
C.	Petitioner fails to show that the combination of Amara and CoreBuilder teaches or suggests all of the elements of the challenged independent claims. ....	28
1.	Petitioner fails to show that the combination of Amara and CoreBuilder discloses “ <i>a plurality of physical network interface ports... for providing a physical connection point to a network... the ports being configurable by control plane processes</i> ” (elements 1.1/19.1/37.1/55.1) or “ <i>the port services... as defined by control plane configurations</i> ” (elements 1.2/19.2/37.2/55.2) .....	28
2.	Petitioner fails to show that the combination of Amara and CoreBuilder teaches or suggests “[ <i>executing</i> ] port services, [ <i>] on packets entering and exiting the physical network interface ports, the port services providing an ability to control and monitor packet flows</i> ” (elements 1.2/19.2/37.2/55.2). ....	31
3.	Petitioner fails to show that the combination of Amara and CoreBuilder teaches or suggests “[ <i>operat[e][ing] on packets received from specific, predetermined physical ports and destined to the collection of control plane processes</i> ” (elements 1.5/19.5/37.5/55.5). ....	34
VI.	Ground 2: Petitioner fails to show that claims 7, 23, 41, and 59 are obvious in view of Amara, CoreBuilder, and Moberg under 35 U.S.C § 103. ....	35
A.	The invention of Moberg. ....	36

B. The combination of Amara, CoreBuilder, and Moberg does not teach or suggest distributing control plane processes across multiple processors. ....37

VII. Ground 3: Petitioner fails to show that claims 10, 12, 13, 28, 30, 31, 43, 48, 49, 64, 66, and 67 are obvious in view of Amara, CoreBuilder, and Subramanian under 35 U.S.C § 103. ....39

VIII. Ground 4: Petitioner fails to show that claims 10, 12, 13, 28, 30, 31, 43, 48, 49, 64, 66, and 67 are obvious in view of Amara, CoreBuilder, and Hendel under 35 U.S.C § 103. ....39

A. The Board should reject Ground 4 because this ground is redundant to Ground 3. ....40

B. Petitioner fails to show that the combination of Amara, CoreBuilder, and Hendel discloses applying distributed control plane port services only to packets received from specific, pre-determined physical ports. ....41

IX. Conclusion. ....42

**Table of Authorities**

**Cases**

*Arista Networks, Inc. v. Cisco Systems, Inc.*,  
IPR2015-01710, slip op. at 10 (PTAB Feb. 16, 2016) .....2

*Butamax Adv. Biofuels v. GEVO, Inc.*,  
IPR2014-00581, 2014 WL 5299385 (PTAB Oct. 14, 2014).....13

*Conopco v. The Procter & Gamble Co.*,  
IPR2014-00628, 2014 WL 5388116 (PTAB Oct. 20, 2014)..... 10, 11

*Conopco v. The Procter & Gamble Co.*,  
IPR2014-00628, 2015 WL 1265489 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2015).....3, 13

*HTC Corp. v. NFC Tech., LLC*,  
Case IPR2015-00384, 2015 WL 4149068 (PTAB July 6, 2015) ..... 10, 11

*Illumina, Inc. v. The Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York*,  
IPR2012-00006 (Paper 43, May 10, 2013).....40–41

*Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casualty Ins. Co.*,  
Case CBM2012-00003, 2012 WL 10911393 (PTAB Oct. 10, 2012) .....40

*Medtronic, Inc. v. NuVasive, Inc.*,  
IPR2014-00487, 2014 WL 4594734 (PTAB Sept. 11, 2014) .....9, 11

*PNC Bank, N.A. v. Secure Axxess, LLC*,  
CBM2015-00039, slip op at 17 (PTAB July 10, 2015) .....4, 12, 13

*Roche Molecular Systems, Inc. v. Illumina, Inc.*,  
IPR2015-01091, slip op. at 15 (PTAB Oct. 30, 2015) .....11

*Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd. et al. v. Rembrandt Wireless Tech., LP*,  
IPR2015-00555, Decision Denying Institution (Paper 20, June 19, 2015).....4

*Schrader-Bridgeport Int’l, Inc. v. Continental Automotive Sys. US, Inc.*,  
IPR2013-00014, 2013 WL 8705607 (PTAB Apr. 10, 2013). .....41

# 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.