

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

**DELL INC.,
Petitioner**

v.

**CHRI MAR SYSTEMS, INC.
Patent Owner**

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

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO THE PETITION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Authorities	vi
Patent Owner’s Exhibit List	ix
I. Introduction and Summary of Arguments.	1
II. Background	2
A. Status of Related Litigation	2
B. The ’107 Patent	3
C. Person of Ordinary Skill	8
III. Arguments and Authorities	9
A. Priority	9
1. Legal Standards	10
a. Burden	10
b. Written-Description Requirement.	11
c. Corroboration	12
2. The ’279 Provisional Application fully discloses the inventions claimed by the ’107 Patent.	13
3. The inventors of the ’107 Patent conceived their invention before the priority dates of the De Nicolo references and diligently reduced it practice.	17
a. Chrimar and EtherLock I.	17
a. Conception of the New Inventions— EtherLock II and ELID	19
b. Diligence in Reduction to Practice	22
2. The inventors’ testimony is fully corroborated.	25
3. Clyde Boenke is not an inventor.	27
B. Claim Construction.	29
1. Prior Claim Constructions from the District Court Litigation	29

2. Prior Claim Constructions from the Board	31
C. The challenged claims are not obvious in view of the De Nicolo references.	32
1. Legal Standard.	32
2. The De Nicolo References	36
a. De Nicolo '666 discloses a method and apparatus for allocating power among processor cards in a closed, modular system.. . . .	36
b. De Nicolo '468 discloses a system for powering Ethernet-based telephones.. . . .	39
3. Petitioner has not shown a motivation to combine the De Nicolo references.	43
a. There was no motivation to combine the De Nicolo references to solve the problem facing the inventors of the '107 Patent.	43
b. There was no motivation to combine the De Nicolo references to solve the hypothetical problem posed by Petitioner.. . . .	47
i. There would have been no reason to determine the maximum power requirement of remote devices in De Nicolo '468.	47
ii. Neither of the De Nicolo references teaches using a unique power signal.	48
iii. De Nicolo '468 teaches away from selectively powering Ethernet devices.	49
i. Both of the De Nicolo references already include power management.	50
2. Petitioner has not shown that a person of ordinary skill would have had a reasonable expectation of success.	51

3. Petitioner’s proposed De Nicolo combination does not meet every limitation of the challenged claims.	52
a. <u>Claim 1</u> : the proposed De Nicolo combination does not disclose at least three limitations of claim 1.	52
i. The proposed De Nicolo combination does not disclose “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.”	52
ii. The proposed De Nicolo combination does not disclose a piece of Ethernet terminal equipment in which different magnitudes of DC current flow “result from at least one condition applied to at least one of the contacts of the first and second pairs of contacts.”	58
iii. The proposed De Nicolo combination does not disclose a piece of Ethernet terminal equipment in which at least one magnitude of DC current flow “convey[s] information about the piece of Ethernet terminal equipment.”	61
b. <u>Claim 53</u> : The proposed De Nicolo combination does not disclose “the piece of Ethernet terminal equipment of claim 1 wherein a duration of at least one of the different magnitudes of the DC current to comprise a predetermined range.”	63
c. <u>Claim 103</u> : The proposed De Nicolo combination does not disclose “the piece of Ethernet terminal equipment of any one of claims 1-102, wherein the piece of Ethernet	

terminal equipment is a piece of powered-off Ethernet terminal equipment.”	65
d. Claim 104.	68
e. Claim 125.	68
IV. Conclusion	68
Certificate of Compliance with Word Count	70
Certificate of Service.	70

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.