

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

TALARI NETWORKS, INC.  
Petitioner

v.

FATPIPE NETWORKS INDIA LIMITED,  
Patent Owner

---

Case No. IPR2016-00976  
Patent 6,775,235 B2

---

**PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. FATPIPE’S CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS ARE IMPROPER.....	1
A. FatPipe’s Narrow Construction Of “ <i>Selects Between Network Interfaces On A Per-Packet Basis</i> ” / “ <i>Make Network Path Selections On A Packet-By-Packet Basis</i> ” Is Legally Flawed .....	2
1. The Specification Does Not Support FatPipe’s Constructions .....	3
2. The Board Should Adopt The Broadest Reasonable Interpretation.....	6
B. FatPipe’s Construction Improperly Narrows “ <i>Dynamic Load-Balancing</i> ” .....	7
1. FatPipe’s Construction Is Unsupported .....	7
2. The Board Should Adopt The Broadest Reasonable Interpretation.....	9
III. CLAIM 4 IS ANTICIPATED OR RENDERED OBVIOUS .....	10
A. Karol Discloses The Claimed “ <i>Packet Path Selector Which Selects Between Network Interfaces On A Per-Packet Basis</i> ” .....	10
B. Karol Discloses The Claimed “ <i>Site Interface</i> ” .....	12
IV. CLAIMS 5 AND 7-15 ARE ANTICIPATED OR RENDERED OBVIOUS.....	15
A. Claim 5 Is Invalid Over Karol Alone Or In Combination With Stallings Which Disclose “ <i>Obtaining At Least Two Known Location Address Ranges Which Have Associated Networks</i> ” .....	16
B. Claim 7 Is Invalid Over Karol Which Discloses “ <i>The Method Of Claim 5, Wherein The Forwarding Step Forwards The Packet Toward The Internet When The Packet’s Destination Address Does Not Lie Within Any Known Location Address Range</i> ” .....	20

C.	Claim 8 Is Invalid Over Karol Which Discloses “ <i>The Method Of Claim 5, Wherein The Destination Address Identifies A Destination Location To Which Only A Single Associated Network Provides Connectivity From The Current Location, And The Forwarding Step Forwards The Packet To That Single Associated Network</i> ” .....	21
D.	Claim 9 Is Invalid Over Karol Which Discloses “ <i>The Method Of Claim 5, Wherein Repeated Instances Of The Selecting Step Make Network Path Selections On A Packet-By-Packet Basis</i> ” .....	22
E.	Claims 11-13 Are Invalid Over Karol Alone Or In Combination With Stallings Which Disclose “ <i>Dynamic Load-Balancing</i> ” .....	23
V.	CLAIM 19 IS ANTICIPATED OR RENDERED OBVIOUS BY THE INSTITUTED GROUNDS.....	24
A.	Karol Discloses The Claimed “ <i>Site Interface</i> ” .....	24
B.	Karol Discloses The Claimed “ <i>A Packet Path Selector Which Selects Between The Network Interfaces On A Per-Session Basis To Promote Load-Balancing</i> ” .....	24
C.	Karol Discloses The Claimed “ <i>Step Of Sending A Packet To The Controller Site Interface Is Repeated As Multiple Packets Are Sent, And The Controller Sends Different Packets Of A Given Message To Different Parallel Networks.</i> ” .....	26
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	26

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Chef America, Inc. v. Lamb-Weston, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	2
<i>Gart v. Logitech, Inc.</i> , 254 F.3d 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....	13
<i>Genentech, Inc. v. Chiron Corp.</i> , 112 F.3d 495 (Fed. Cir. 1997) .....	13
<i>In re Bigio</i> , 381 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	7
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	6
<i>In re Paulsen</i> , 30 F.3d 1475 (Fed. Cir. 1994) .....	4
<i>Oatey Co. v. IPS Corp.</i> , 514 F.3d 1271 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	3
<i>Perreira v. Dep't of Health and Human Serv.</i> , 33 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 1994) .....	9
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) ( <i>en banc</i> ) .....	1
<i>Verizon Servs. Corp. v. Vonage Holdings Corp.</i> , 503 F.3d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	4
<b>OTHER AUTHORITIES</b>	
37 CFR 1.75 .....	22

<b>Exhibit No.</b>	<b>Description</b>
1001	U.S. Patent No. 6,775,235 by Sanchaita Datta and Ragula Bhaskar entitled “Tools and Techniques for Directing Packets Over Disparate Networks” (“the ’235 Patent”)
1002	File History for U.S. Patent No. 6,775,235
1003	U.S. Patent No. 7,406,048 by Sanchaita Datta and Ragula Bhaskar entitled “Tools and Techniques for Directing Packets Over Disparate Networks” (“the ’048 Patent”)
1004	File History for U.S. Patent No. 7,406,048
1005	Declaration of Dr. Kevin Negus
1006	U.S. Patent No. 6,628,617 by Mark John Karol and Malathi Veeraraghavan entitled “Technique for Internetworking Traffic on Connectionless and Connection-Oriented Networks” (“Karol”)
1007	W.R. Stevens, “TCP/IP Illustrated Volume 1, the Protocols,” Addison-Wesley Professional Computing Series, 1994, ISBN-0-201-63346-9 (“Stevens”).
1008	February 1, 2016 Order granting Motion to Transfer to the Western Division of the Eastern District of North Carolina, D.I. 57 in 6:15-cv-00458-RWS in the Eastern District of Texas
1009	U.S. Patent No. 6,748,439 by David R. Monachello et al. entitled “System and Method for Selecting Internet Service Providers from a Workstation that is Connected to a Local Area Network” (“Monachello”)
1010	FatPipe’s Infringement Contentions
1011	William Stallings, “Data and Computer Communications,” Prentice-Hall, 5th Edition, 1997, ISBN-81-203-1240-6, (“Stallings”)
1012	Office Action dated 4/13/2012 for U.S. Application No. 10/034,197
1013	Office Action dated 2/2/2012 for U.S. Application No. 10/034,197
1014	FatPipe’s Proposed Modifications to Claim Construction
1015	U.S. Patent No. 6,317,431 by Terence G. Hodgkinson and Alan W. O’Neill entitled “ATM Partial Cut-Through” (“Hodgkinson”)
1016	Adaptive Private Networking Configuration Editor User’s Guide, APNware Release 2.5 (FATPIPE-001374-1448)
1017	Deposition transcript of Mr. Joel Williams, IPR2016-00976 and IPR2016-00977, May 10, 2017
1018	“Routing Lookups in Hardware at Memory Access Speeds” by Pankaj Gupta, Steven Lin, and Nick McKeown, April 1998
1019	U.S. Patent No. 7,047,313 by Keith Broerman entitled “Method For

# 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.