

Filed: August 26, 2016

Filed on behalf of:

Patent Owner Voip-Pal.com Inc.

By: Kerry Taylor

John M. Carson

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

2040 Main Street, 14th Floor

Irvine, CA 92614

Tel.: (858) 707-4000

Fax: (858) 707-4001

Email: BoxDigifonica @knobbe.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

UNIFIED PATENTS INC.

Petitioner,

v.

VOIP-PAL.COM INC.,

Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2016-01082

U.S. Patent 8,542,815

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. ARGUMENT.....	2
A. Introduction to Claimed Subject Matter.....	2
B. The Petition and Declaration are flawed and inadequate.....	7
1. The Declaration Is Simply A Copy Of The Petition, And Should Be Accorded No Weight.....	8
2. The Petition’s Claim Constructions Are Devoid Of Explanation	9
3. The Claim Charts Fall Well Below the Requirement to Explain Its Ground of Unpatentability “With Particularity”	10
C. Ground 1 fails because Turner does not disclose every element of Claim 1	15
1. Overview of Turner.....	16
a. Turner’s Routing Method for an Intra-Gateway Call.....	21
b. Turner’s Routing Method for an Inter-Gateway Call.....	25
2. Turner fails to disclose determining whether “calling attributes match[] at least a portion of [the] callee identifier” as in claim element [1c].....	27
3. Turner fails to disclose the “classifying” features in claim element [1d]	30
a. Turner’s decision to classify a call as an inter-gateway call is not a disclosure of “classifying the call as a public network call when said match meets public network classification criteria”	30

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(cont'd)

	Page No.
b. Turner’s decision to classify a call as an internal (intra-gateway) call is not a disclosure of “classifying the call as a private network call when said match meets private network classification criteria”	35
4. Turner’s disclosure of prefix digits fails to anticipate claim elements [1b], [1c], [1d], and [1f].....	37
a. The Petition improperly combines two distinct call flows	38
b. Turner’s prefix digit is not equivalent to the claimed “calling attributes”	43
c. The Petition fails to show that Turner’s prefix digit feature separately discloses “when the call is classified as a private network call, producing a private network routing message” as recited in Claim 1	46
D. Ground 2 fails because the combination of Kaczmarczyk and Turner does not disclose all claim elements and because the combination is not obvious	47
1. Overview of Kaczmarczyk	47
2. The Petition Fails to Articulate a Plausible Reason to Combine Kaczmarczyk with Turner.....	58
3. The Petition Fails to Demonstrate That All Elements of Claim 1 are Rendered Obvious by Modifying Kaczmarczyk in view of Turner.....	61
a. Kaczmarczyk fails to disclose “public network classification criteria ... and ... private network classification criteria ...”	62

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(cont'd)

	Page No.
b. Petitioner Misstates the Deficiencies of Kaczmarczyk in Erroneously Asserting that Turner Remedies These Deficiencies	66
c. The Petition Fails to Explain How Kaczmarczyk and Turner’s Teachings Could be Combined In View of their Significant Differences	68
III. CONCLUSION.....	70

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page No(s).

<i>A.C. Dispensing Equipment Inc. v. Prince Castle LLC</i> , IPR2014-00511, Paper 16 (PTAB Sep. 10, 2014).....	12
<i>InfoBionic, Inc. v. Braemer Mfg., LLC</i> , IPR2015-01704, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 16, 2016).....	9
<i>Kinetic Techs., Inc. v. Skyworks Solutions, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00529, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 23, 2014).....	8
<i>KSR Intern. Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	7, 58
<i>Nautilus Hyosung Inc. v. Diebold Inc.</i> , Case IPR2016-00633 (PTAB Aug. 22, 2016)	13, 14
<i>Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	12, 38, 39
<i>Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.</i> , 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989).....	16, 46
<i>Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California</i> , 814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987)	15

OTHER AUTHORITIES

35 U.S.C. § 102	1, 15, 38
35 U.S.C. § 312	7, 10, 12, 15
35 U.S.C. § 313	16
35 U.S.C. § 314	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.22	7, 11

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.