

**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**

---

**Case No. IPR2016-00574  
U.S. Patent No. 8,902,760**

---

**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 . . . . .	3
A. Status of Related Litigation . . . . .	3
B. Chrimar . . . . .	4
C. The ’760 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
1. “pairs of conductors” . . . . .	18
C. The Petition should be denied because Petitioners have not made a <i>prima facie</i> case that the ’760 Patent’s claims are obvious in view of the De Nicolo references.. . . .	19
1. The De Nicolo References. . . . .	21
a. The ’666 Patent discloses a method and apparatus for allocating power among processor cards in a closed, modular system.. . . .	21
b. The ’468 Patent discloses a system for powering Ethernet-based telephones.. . . .	24

2. 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 system claimed by the '760 Patent. . . . .	26
3. Petitioners offer only a conclusory statement that a person of ordinary skill would have known how to combine the De Nicolo references. . . . .	31
4. Petitioners do not contend that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success . . . . .	36
D. <u>Ground 2</u> : Petitioners have not made a <i>prima facie</i> case that the '760 Patent is obvious in view of the autonegotiation references. . . . .	37
a. Petitioners wrongly assume that the '760 Patent claims autonegotiation. . . . .	40
b. Petitioners have not shown that the autonegotiation references disclose a path configured to draw DC current through a loop formed over at least one conductor of a first pair of conductors and at least one conductor of a second pair of conductors. . . . .	41
c. There is no evidence to support Petitioners' unsupported inference that their proposed paths draw different magnitudes of <u>DC</u> current. . . . .	46
d. The autonegotiation references, themselves, disprove Petitioners' contention that the disclosed autonegotiation system would work if the Ethernet device is powered off. . . . .	48
Conclusion . . . . .	49
Certificate of Compliance with Word Count . . . . .	51
Certificate of Service. . . . .	51

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Cases**

<i>Dome Patent L.P. v. Lee</i> , 799 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2015) . . . . .	15
<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). . . . .	15
<i>In re Fine</i> , 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988) . . . . .	42
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006) . . . . .	12, 13, 14, 31
<i>Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , — F.3d —, 2016 WL 2620512 (Fed. Cir. May 9, 2016). . . . .	16, 36, 41
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007) . . . . .	13, 14
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015). . . . .	16
<i>Perfect Web Techs., Inc. v. InfoUSA, Inc.</i> , 587 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2009). . . . .	14
<i>Princeton Biochems., Inc. v. Beckman Coulter, Inc.</i> , 411 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2005) . . . . .	30
<i>Securus Techs., Inc. v. Global Tel*Link Corp.</i> , IPR2015-00155, Paper No. 30 (Apr. 7, 2016) . . . . .	14
<i>Star Sci., Inc. v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.</i> , 655 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2011) . . . . .	13
<i>Tec Air, Inc. v. Denso Mfg. Mich. Inc.</i> , 192 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 1999) . . . . .	12
<i>Tietex Int’l, Ltd. v. Precision Fabrics Group, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01248, Paper No. 39 (2016) . . . . .	12

*Wowza Media Sys., LLC v. Adobe Sys. Inc.*,  
IPR2013-00054, Paper No. 12 (Apr. 8, 2013). . . . . 14, 31

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) . . . . . 20  
35 U.S.C. § 313 . . . . . 10  
35 U.S.C. § 314(a) . . . . . 8, 18

**Rules**

37 C.F.R. § 42.8 . . . . . 19  
37 C.F.R. § 42.107 . . . . . 10  
37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c) . . . . . 8, 18  
37 C.F.R. § 42.22. . . . . 19  
37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)(2) . . . . . 19  
37 C.F.R. § 42.23. . . . . 19  
37 C.F.R. § 42.6 . . . . . 19  
37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a) . . . . . 43  
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) . . . . . 23  
37 C.F.R. § 42.104 . . . . . 19

**Other Authorities**

*Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary* (1983). . . . . 26

# 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.