

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

**AMC, LLC AND DELL INC.,
Petitioners**

v.

**CHRIMAR SYSTEMS, INC.
Patent Owner**

**Case No. IPR2016-00569
U.S. Patent No. 8,942,107**

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(A)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Authorities	v
Patent Owner’s Exhibit List	vii
Introduction and Summary of Arguments	1
Background	3
A. Status of Related Litigation	3
B. Chrimar	4
C. The ’107 Patent	6
D. Person of Ordinary Skill	11
Arguments and Authorities	11
A. Legal Standards	11
1. <i>Inter Partes</i> Review	11
2. Obviousness	12
B. Claim Construction	16
1. Prior Claim Constructions from the District Court Litigation	16
2. “pair of contacts”	18
C. The Petition should be denied because Petitioners have not met their burden of proof.	19
1. <u>Ground 1</u> : Petitioners have not made a <i>prima</i> <i>facie</i> case that the ’107 Patent is obvious in view of the De Nicolo references.	19
a. The De Nicolo References	21
i. The ’666 Patent discloses a method and apparatus for allocating power among processor cards in a closed, modular system.	21
ii. The ’468 Patent discloses a system for powering Ethernet-based telephones.	24

b. Petitioners have not attempted to show that the '107 Patent's claims read on their alleged combination of the De Nicolo references.	27
c. Petitioners force the Board to guess which elements of the De Nicolo references might allegedly be combined to meet the limitations of the '107 Patent claims.	29
d. Petitioners do not assert that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the De Nicolo references to achieve the apparatus claimed by the '107 Patent.. . . .	34
e. Petitioners offer only a conclusory statement that a person of ordinary skill would have known how to combine the De Nicolo references.	38
f. Petitioners do not contend that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success	43
2. <u>Ground 2</u> : Petitioners have not made a <i>prima facie</i> case that the '107 Patent is obvious in view of the DP83840 Datasheet, the IEEE Standard 802.3u-1995, and the IEEE Standard 802.3-1993.	44
a. Petitioners do not identify "first and second pairs of contacts" disclosed by the autonegotiation references.. . . .	48
b. There is no evidence to support Petitioners' allegation that the proposed R+/R- path draws different magnitudes of DC current.. . . .	55
c. Under Petitioners' theory, the alleged different magnitudes of DC current on the	

imagined R+/R- path do not result from a condition applied to a contact.	58
d. Petitioners do not allege that magnitudes of DC current on the proposed R+/R- path convey information about the Ethernet device.	60
e. The autonegotiation references, themselves, disprove Petitioners' contention that the disclosed system would work if the Ethernet device is powered off.	62
Conclusion	63
Certificate of Compliance with Word Count	65
Certificate of Service.	66

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc.,
694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 28, 37, 40, 43, 57

Comaper Corp. v. Antec, Inc.,
596 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2010) 28

Dome Patent L.P. v. Lee,
799 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2015) 15

Duro-Last, Inc. v. Custom Seal, Inc.,
321 F.3d 1098 (Fed.Cir.2003) 28

Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat'l Graphics, Inc.,
800 F. 3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015) 12

In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.,
676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 15

In re Fine,
837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988) 29, 49

In re Kahn,
441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006) 12, 13, 14

Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.,
— F.3d —, 2016 WL 2620512 (Fed. Cir. May 9, 2016) 16, 43

Kroy IP Holdings, LLC v. Safeway, Inc.,
107 F. Supp. 3d 656 (E.D. Tex. 2015) 27

KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007) 13, 14, 28

Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.,
789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015) 16

Perfect Web Techs., Inc. v. InfoUSA, Inc.,
587 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2009) 14

Phillips v. AWH Corp.,
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc) 54

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.