

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AMX, LLC and
Dell Inc.,

Petitioners

v.

ChriMar Systems, Inc.,

Patent Owner

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,942,107**

Case No. IPR2016-00569

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

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Compliance with Requirements for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review	1
A.	Mandatory Notices (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(1)).....	1
1.	Real Party-in-Interest (§ 42.8(b)(1))	1
2.	Related Matters (§ 42.8(b)(2))	1
3.	Designation of Lead and Back-up Counsel and Service Information (37 C.F.R. §§ 42.8(b)(3)-(4)).....	2
B.	Fee for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review (37 C.F.R. § 42.103).....	2
C.	Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a))	3
III.	Relevant Background on the '107 Patent	3
A.	Level of Ordinary Skill	3
B.	Description of the Alleged Invention of the '107 Patent	4
C.	Priority Claims in the '107 Patent	5
D.	Priority Date of the '107 Patent.....	6
IV.	State of the Art.....	8
V.	Claim Construction.....	11
A.	“BaseT” (claim 5).....	12
B.	“path coupled across” (claims 1, 104).....	12
VI.	Identification of Challenge (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)) and Reasonable Likelihood that the Challenged Claims Are Unpatentable.....	13
A.	Ground 1: The challenged claims are obvious based on the De Nicolò references.....	14
1.	The De Nicolò References	14

2.	Reasons to Combine the De Nicolo References	14
3.	Independent Claim 1	17
a.	“A piece of Ethernet terminal equipment”	17
b.	“an Ethernet connector comprising first and second pairs of contacts used to carry Ethernet communication signals”	17
c.	“at least one path for the purpose of drawing DC current”	18
d.	“the at least one path coupled across at least one of the contacts of the first pair of contacts and at least one of the contacts of the second pair of contacts”	19
e.	“the piece of Ethernet terminal equipment to draw different magnitudes of DC current flow via the at least one path”	19
f.	“the different magnitudes of DC current flow to result from at least one condition applied to at least one of the contacts of the first and second pairs of contacts”	23
g.	“wherein at least one of the magnitudes of the DC current flow to convey information about the piece of Ethernet terminal equipment”	27
4.	Dependent Claim 5: “wherein the Ethernet communication signals are BaseT Ethernet communication signals”	28
5.	Dependent Claim 31: “wherein the DC current comprises a predetermined range of magnitudes”	29
6.	Dependent Claim 43: “wherein the information to distinguish the piece of Ethernet terminal equipment from at least one other piece of Ethernet terminal equipment”	30

7.	Dependent Claim 53: “wherein a duration of at least one of the different magnitudes of the DC current to comprise a predetermined range”	31
8.	Dependent Claim 58: “wherein impedance within the at least one path changes”	33
9.	Dependent Claim 70: “wherein the DC current to comprise first magnitude of DC current for a first interval followed by a second magnitude of DC current for a second interval, wherein the second magnitude is greater than the first magnitude”	34
10.	Dependent Claim 72: “wherein at least one magnitude of the DC current is part of a detection protocol”	35
11.	Dependent Claim 75: “wherein the electrical component is a resistor”	35
12.	Dependent Claim 83: “wherein the piece of Ethernet equipment comprises a controller”	36
13.	Dependent Claim 84: “wherein the controller comprises firmware”	36
14.	Dependent Claim 103: “wherein the piece of Ethernet of [sic] terminal equipment is a piece of powered-off Ethernet terminal equipment”	37
15.	Independent Claim 104	39
16.	Dependent Claim 107: “wherein the at least one condition comprises an impedance condition”	39
17.	Dependent Claim 111: “wherein the information to distinguish the powered-off end device from at least one other end device”	40
18.	Dependent Claim 123: “wherein at least one of the magnitudes is part of a detection protocol”	40

19.	Dependent Claim 125 (across 104, 111, and 123): “wherein the powered-off end device is a powered-off Ethernet end device”	40
B.	Ground 2: The challenged claims are obvious based on the Auto-Negotiation references.	41
1.	Auto-Negotiation References.....	41
2.	Reasons to Combine the Auto-Negotiation References	42
3.	Independent Claim 1	43
a.	“A piece of Ethernet terminal equipment”	43
b.	“an Ethernet connector comprising first and second pairs of contacts used to carry Ethernet communication signals”	44
c.	“at least one path for the purpose of drawing DC current”	45
d.	“the at least one path coupled across at least one of the contacts of the first pair of contacts and at least one of the contacts of the second pair of contacts”	45
e.	“the piece of Ethernet terminal equipment to draw different magnitudes of DC current flow via the at least one path”	46
f.	“the different magnitudes of DC current flow to result from at least one condition applied to at least one of the contacts of the first and second pairs of contacts”	49
g.	“wherein at least one of the magnitudes of the DC current flow to convey information about the piece of Ethernet terminal equipment”	50

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.