

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

**DELL INC.,  
Petitioner**

**v.**

**CHRIMAR SYSTEMS, INC.  
Patent Owner**

---

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

---

**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 ’760 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 ’760 Patent. . . . .	13
3. The inventors of the ’760 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
b. Conception of the New Inventions— EtherLock II and ELID . . . . .	18
c. Diligence in Reduction to Practice . . . . .	21
4. The inventors’ testimony is fully corroborated. . . . .	24
5. Clyde Boenke is not an inventor. . . . .	27
B. Claim Construction. . . . .	28
1. Prior Claim Constructions from the District Court Litigation . . . . .	28

2. Prior Claim Constructions from the Board . . . . .	30
C. The challenged claims are not obvious in view of the De Nicolo references. . . . .	31
1. Legal Standard. . . . .	31
2. The De Nicolo References . . . . .	35
a. De Nicolo '666 discloses a method and apparatus for allocating power among processor cards in a closed, modular system.. . . .	35
b. De Nicolo '468 discloses a system for powering Ethernet-based telephones.. . . .	38
3. Petitioner has not shown a motivation to combine the De Nicolo references. . . . .	42
a. There was no motivation to combine the De Nicolo references to solve the problem facing the inventors of the '760 Patent.. . . .	42
a. There was no motivation to combine the De Nicolo references to solve the hypothetical problem posed by Petitioner.. . . .	46
i. There would have been no reason to determine the maximum power requirement of remote devices in De Nicolo '468. . . . .	46
ii. Neither of the De Nicolo references teaches using a unique power signal. . . . .	47
iii. De Nicolo '468 teaches away from selectively powering Ethernet devices. . . . .	48
iv. Both of the De Nicolo references already include power management. . . . .	49
4. Petitioner has not shown that a person of ordinary skill would have had a reasonable expectation of success. . . . .	50

5. Petitioner’s proposed De Nicolo combination does not meet every limitation of the challenged claims. . . . .	51
a. <u>Claim 1</u> : the proposed De Nicolo combination does not disclose at least two limitations of claim 1. . . . .	51
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.” . . . . .	51
ii. The proposed De Nicolo combination does not disclose a piece of central BaseT Ethernet equipment that “detect[s] at least two different magnitudes of current flow.” . . . . .	57
b. <u>Claim 37</u> : The proposed De Nicolo combination does not disclose “the BaseT Ethernet system of claim 1 wherein one or more magnitudes of the current flow through the loop represent information about the piece of BaseT Ethernet terminal equipment.” . . . . .	59
c. <u>Claim 58</u> : The proposed De Nicolo combination does not disclose “the BaseT Ethernet system of claim 1 wherein the piece of central BaseT Ethernet equipment to detect current flow through the loop via voltage.” . . . . .	60
d. <u>Claim 72</u> : The proposed De Nicolo combination does not disclose “the BaseT Ethernet system according to any one of the claims 1 . . . wherein the piece of BaseT	

Ethernet terminal equipment is a powered-off piece of BaseT Ethernet equipment.” . . . . .	61
e. Claims 73, 112, and 145 . . . . .	63
IV. Conclusion . . . . .	63
Certificate of Compliance with Word Count . . . . .	65
Certificate of Service. . . . .	65

# 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.