

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AMX, LLC,
Petitioner

v.

CHRIMAR SYSTEMS, INC.
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2016-00573
U.S. Patent No. 9,019,838

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Authorities	iv
Patent Owner’s Exhibit List.	vi
Introduction and Summary of Arguments.	1
Background	2
A. Status of Related Litigation	2
B. Chrimar	3
C. The ’838 Patent.	5
D. Person of Ordinary Skill	10
Arguments and Authorities	10
A. Legal Standard	10
B. Claim Construction.	11
1. Prior Claim Constructions from the District Court Litigation	11
C. Petitioner has not shown that Katzenberg is prior art to the ’838 Patent.	13
1. <u>Legal Standard</u> : A provisional application must demonstrate that the patentee possessed the invention when the application was filed.. . . .	14
2. The ’279 Provisional fully discloses the inventions claimed by the ’838 Patent.	15
D. The Petition should be denied because Petitioner has not made a <i>prima facie</i> case that the ’838 Patent’s claims are obvious in view of the De Nicolo references.. . . .	23
1. Obviousness Standard	25
2. The De Nicolo References	28
a. The ’666 Patent discloses a method and apparatus for allocating power among processor cards in a closed, modular system.. . . .	28

b. The '468 Patent discloses a system for powering Ethernet-based telephones.	32
3. Petitioner does 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 '838 Patent.	35
4. Petitioner offers only a conclusory statement that a person of ordinary skill would have known how to combine the De Nicolo references.	39
5. Petitioner does not contend that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success	44
Conclusion	45
Certificate of Compliance with Word Count	47
Certificate of Service.	47

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Alcon Research Ltd. v. Barr Labs., Inc.</i> , 745 F.3d 1180 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	14, 17
<i>Cordis Corp. v. Medtronic AVE, Inc.</i> , 339 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	14, 17
<i>Dome Patent L.P. v. Lee</i> , 799 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	28
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F. 3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	11
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended–Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	28
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	25, 26, 27, 39
<i>Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	17, 19
<i>Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , — F.3d —, 2016 WL 2620512 (Fed. Cir. May 9, 2016)	28, 44
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	26
<i>Lampi Corp. v. Am. Power Prods., Inc.</i> , 228 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	16
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	11
<i>Perfect Web Techs., Inc. v. InfoUSA, Inc.</i> , 587 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	26
<i>Princeton Biochems., Inc. v. Beckman Coulter, Inc.</i> , 411 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	38
<i>Rexnord Corp. v. Laitram Corp.</i> , 274 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	14

Case No. IPR2016-00573
U.S. Patent No. 9,019,838

<i>Securus Techs., Inc. v. Global Tel*Link Corp.</i> , IPR2015-00155, Paper No. 30 (Apr. 7, 2016)	26
<i>Star Sci., Inc. v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.</i> , 655 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	25
<i>Tec Air, Inc. v. Denso Mfg. Mich. Inc.</i> , 192 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	25
<i>Tietex Int’l, Ltd. v. Precision Fabrics Group, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01248, Paper No. 39 (2016)	11
<i>Utter v. Hiraga</i> , 845 F.2d 993 (Fed. Cir. 1988)	15
<i>Wowza Media Sys., LLC v. Adobe Sys. Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00054, Paper No. 12 (Apr. 8, 2013).	27, 39
<i>Zoltek Corp. v. U.S.</i> , 815 F.3d 1302 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	14

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	13
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	1, 11

Rules

37 C.F.R. § 42.8	12
37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c)	1, 11
37 C.F.R. § 42.22	12
37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)(2)	12
37 C.F.R. § 42.23	12
37 C.F.R. § 42.6	12
37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a)	42
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)	16
37 C.F.R. § 42.104	12

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.