

**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.

Case No. IPR2016-00496  
Patent No. 7,245,874

---

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

**LIST OF EXHIBITS**

<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Description</b>
Ex. 2001	Excerpt of Peterson & Davie, <i>Computer Networks: A System Approach</i> (2d ed. 2000) (page 412)
Ex. 2002	Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review of claims 1 and 8–12 of U.S. Patent No. 7,245,874 by Petitioner Hughes Network Systems, LLC, IPR2016-00135, Paper No. 1
Ex. 2003	Excerpts of Newton's <i>Telecom Dictionary</i> (14th ed. 1998) (pages 64–65)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	OVERVIEW OF THE '874 PATENT .....	6
III.	SUMMARY OF THE REFERENCES ASSERTED IN THE PETITION .....	10
A.	U.S. Patent No. 6,459,708 to Cox .....	10
B.	PCT Application No. WO 95/29576 to Arimilli .....	13
C.	U.S. Patent No. 6,731,649 to Silverman .....	16
D.	U.S. Patent 7,065,321 to Lim .....	18
IV.	THE LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....	19
V.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	19
A.	“Branch of a Cellular Telephone Network Based on a First Synchronous Data Communication Protocol” .....	20
B.	“Synchronous Data Communications Protocol,” “Asynchronous Data Communications Protocol,” “Central High-Capacity Data Trunking Region,” and “Peripheral Branches of a Telephone Network” .....	22
VI.	PETITIONER HAS NOT SHOWN A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT AT LEAST ONE CLAIM OF THE '874 PATENT IS UNPATENTABLE .....	22
A.	The Petition Lacks Articulated Reasoning Supported by Evidence for Multiple Claim Limitations .....	24
1.	Grounds 1–2: Petitioner Fails to Show that Arimilli Discloses the Claimed “synchronous data protocol [that] allows non-data carrying time slots” .....	27
a)	Arimilli does not disclose time slots and does not use “synchronous” and “asynchronous” as Petitioner construes the terms as used in the '874 Patent .....	28

b)	Arimilli contrasts asynchronous <i>computer</i> data with synchronous <i>computer</i> data, not <i>voice</i> data.....	31
c)	Petitioner Fails to Articulate Reasoning Supported by Evidence to Show Why a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Have Reason to Combine Cox, Silverman, and Arimilli .....	33
2.	Grounds 1–2: Petitioner Fails to Show that Arimilli Discloses “a non-data carrying time slot remover for removing said non-data carrying time slots during conversion into said asynchronous protocol” .....	35
a)	Arimilli does not disclose time slots .....	36
b)	Arimilli does not disclose removing non-data carrying time slots “during conversion into said asynchronous protocol” .....	36
c)	Petitioner Fails to Articulate Reasoning Supported by Evidence to Show Why a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Have Reason to Combine Cox and Silverman With Arimilli .....	37
3.	Grounds 1–2: Petitioner Fails to Show that Cox or Lim Disclose Claim 2’s “[t]he branch of claim 1, being one of peripheral branches of a telephone network” .....	43
a)	Neither Cox nor Lim disclose a peripheral branch of a <i>cellular</i> telephone network.....	44
b)	Lim’s “wireless communications network” does not use a “synchronous data communications protocol” or allow for “non-data carrying time slots” as required by the claimed “peripheral branch[] of a telephone network” .....	46
4.	Grounds 1–2: Petitioner Fails to Show that Cox or Silverman Disclose Claim 2’s “wherein said second, asynchronous protocol is the TCP/IP protocol” .....	47

5. Grounds 1–2: Petitioner Fails to Show that Lim Discloses Claim 2’s “wherein said high capacity trunking region comprises terrestrial high capacity trunking connection in parallel with said satellite connection such that said satellite connection is usable to back up said terrestrial connection” ..... 50

    a) Lim does not disclose the claimed “trunking region” ..... 51

    b) Lim does not disclose a “terrestrial high capacity trunking connection in parallel with said satellite connection” ..... 53

6. Grounds 1–2: Petitioner Fails to Present a *Prima Facie* Case that One of Skill in the Art Would Have Reason to Combine Cox in View of Silverman Further in View of Arimilli or Further in View of Lim..... 54

VII. Ground 2: Petitioner Fails to Show that Claim 3 is Unpatentable Over Cox in View of Silverman Further in View of Arimilli Further in View of Lim Further in View of Henkel ..... 57

VIII. Grounds 1–2: Petitioner Fails to Perform a Proper *Graham* Step-2 Analysis ..... 58

IX. CONCLUSION..... 60

# 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.