UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,
Petitioner

v.

BRADIUM TECHNOLOGIES LLC,
Patent Owner

CASE IPR2016-00449
Patent 8,924,506 B2

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

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. BACKGROUND 3

A. The Requirements to Institute an *Inter Partes* Review 3

B. Petitioner Proposes a Single Obviousness Challenge to Claims 1–21. 6

III. THE BOARD SHOULD EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION TO REJECT THE PETITION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(D) 6

A. The Second Petition Was Improperly Filed to Cure the Deficiencies of Microsoft's Rejected Original Petition 8

B. Petitioner Does Not Present Any Reason that It Could Not Have Previously Presented the Art and Arguments in the Petition 11

C. The Petition Should Be Rejected Because Its Arguments Are Substantially the Same as Those Denied in the First Petition 13

IV. THE PETITION DOES NOT ESTABLISH THAT REDDY IS PRIOR ART 16

V. THE PETITION DOES NOT IDENTIFY DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE CLAIMS AND THE ASSERTED REFERENCES AS REQUIRED FOR THE *GRAHAM* OBVIOUSNESS ANALYSIS 22

A. Claim 1 24

B. Dependent Claims 2–7 25

C. Dependent Claims 9–14 26

D. Dependent Claims 16–21 26

VI. THE PETITION DOES NOT EXPLAIN WHY A POSITA WOULD COMBINE REDDY WITH HORNBACKER IN THE MANNER ALLEGED 27

A. Petitioner's Conclusory Reasons for Combining the Asserted References Are Insufficient 28

B. The Petition Fails to Analyze the References as a Whole 31

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

VII. THE PETITION DOES NOT MATCH ACTUAL CLAIM LANGUAGE TO THE DISCLOSURES OF THE ASSERTED REFERENCES 38
A. Claim 1 39
B. Dependent Claims 2–7 41
C. Claim 8 54
D. Dependent Claims 9–14 57
E. Claim 15 57
F. Dependent Claims 16–21 58
VIII. CONCLUSION 58

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Table of Authorities

Page(s)

Cases

ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc.,
694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 27, 29, 44, 47

Apple Inc. v. DSS Tech. Mgmt., Inc.,
IPR2015-00369, Paper 14 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 12, 2015) 16, 20, 21

Arista Networks, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.,
IPR2015-01710, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 16, 2016) 11

Bradium Techs., LLC v. Microsoft Corp.,
Case No. 15-cv-031 (D. Del. Feb. 3, 2016)..... viii, 8

Butamax Advanced Biofuels LLC v. Gevo, Inc.,
IPR2014-00581, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 14, 2014).....9

Conopco, Inc. v. Procter & Gamble Co.,
IPR2014-00506, Paper 25 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 10, 2014).....5

Conopco, Inc. v. Procter & Gamble Co.,
IPR2014-00628, Paper 21 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 20, 2014).....13

CustomPlay, LLC v. ClearPlay, Inc.,
IPR2014-00783, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 7, 2014) 9

Dish Network L.L.C. v. Dragon Intellectual Prop., LLC,
IPR2015-00499, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. July 17, 2015).....17, 20

Ericsson v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC,
IPR2014-00527, Paper 41 (P.T.A.B. May 18, 2015).....21

Google, Inc. v. ART+COM Innovationpool GmbH,
IPR2015-00788, Paper 7 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 2, 2015) 18

Google, Inc. v. Everymd.com LLC,
IPR2014-00347, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. May 22, 2014).....22

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Graham v. John Deere Co.,
383 U.S. 1 (1966) 22, 23, 40

Hopkins Mfg. Corp. v. Cequent Performance Prods., Inc.,
IPR2015-00613, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 7, 2015) 4, 30

In re Gurley,
27 F.3d 551 (Fed. Cir. 1994) 33, 49

In re Kahn,
441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006) 28

In re Lister,
583 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2009) ..... passim

Infobionic, Inc. v. Braemer Mfg., LLC,
IPR1015-01704, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 16, 2016) 44, 46

Jiawei Tech Ltd. v. Richmond,
IPR2014-00937, Paper 22 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 16, 2014).....43, 45, 55

Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.,
688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 23

Kinetic Techs., Inc. v. Skyworks Solutions, Inc.,
IPR2014-00529, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 23, 2014) 28

KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007) 5, 27, 40

Liberty Ammunition, Inc. v. United States,
119 Fed. Cl. 368, 396 (2014).....30

Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.,
CBM-2012-00003, Paper 7 (Order) (P.T.A.B. Nov. 26, 2012) 23

Micron Tech., Inc. v. Limestone Memory Sys. LLC,
IPR2016-00094, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 12, 2016) 26, 29

Microsoft Corp. v. Bradium Techs., LLC,
IPR2015-01435, Paper 14 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 28, 2015).....39

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.