

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

FOCAL IP, LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2016-01254  
Patent 8,457,113 B2

---

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY, JONI Y. CHANG, and  
BARBARA A. PARVIS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

PARVIS, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION  
Denying Patent Owner's Request for Rehearing  
*37 C.F.R. § 42.71*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Focal IP, LLC (“Patent Owner”) filed a Request for Rehearing of the Decision to Institute (Paper 15, “Dec.”) an *inter partes* review as to claims 38 and 65 of U.S. Patent 8,457,113 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’113 patent”). Paper 17, “Req. Reh’g.” For the reasons that follow, the Request for Rehearing is *denied*.

## II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

A party requesting rehearing bears the burden of showing that the decision should be modified. 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d). The party must identify specifically all matters we misapprehended or overlooked, and the place where each matter was previously addressed in a motion, an opposition, or a reply. *Id.* When reconsidering a decision on institution, we review the decision for an abuse of discretion. 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(c). An abuse of discretion may be determined if a decision is based on an erroneous interpretation of law, if a factual finding is not supported by substantial evidence, or if the decision represents an unreasonable judgment in weighing relevant factors. *Star Fruits S.N.C. v. U.S.*, 393 F.3d 1277, 1281 (Fed. Cir. 2005); *Arnold P’ship v. Dudas*, 362 F.3d 1338, 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2004); *In re Gartside*, 203 F.3d 1305, 1315-16 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

## III. ANALYSIS

Patent Owner contends that we misapprehended or overlooked Patent Owner’s arguments in connection with the claim language regarding the term “switching facility” recited in claims 38 and 65. Req. Reh’g at 1–5.

Patent Owner also contends that we misapprehended or overlooked Patent Owner’s arguments regarding the teachings of the invention and disclaimers disclosed in the Specification as to the claim construction of the terms “switching facility” and “call processing system.” *Id.* at 5–15.

We are not persuaded by Patent Owner’s contentions that we misapprehended or overlooked its arguments in connection with the claim language regarding “switching facility.” *Id.* at 1–5. In its Preliminary Response (Paper 8, “Prelim. Resp.”), apart from the reproduction of a portion of claim 1, Patent Owner merely provides a single conclusory statement without any explanation—“[t]he independent Challenged Claims explicitly recite the functionality the ‘switching facility’ and ‘edge switch’ must have, and expressly distinguish that a ‘switching facility’ is not an ‘edge switch.’” *Id.* at 33–34. Patent Owner for the first time in its Request for Rehearing presents additional arguments regarding the claim language. Req. Reh’g 4–5. A request for rehearing is not an opportunity to submit new arguments. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d). We could not have misapprehended or overlooked arguments that were not made previously in Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response.

Furthermore, the portion of the claim language reproduced by Patent Owner in the Preliminary Response misleadingly emphasizes a subset of the recitation—“[t]he preamble states that ‘edge switches’ are ‘for **routing calls from and to subscribers** within a local geographic area,’ and ‘switching facilities’ are ‘for routing calls to other **edge switches or other switching facilities** local or in other geographic areas.’” Prelim. Resp. 34 (citing

Ex. 1001, 15:30–38) (emphasis added by Patent Owner). The claim language, in contrast, recites that “switching facilities” are for routing calls “to *other* edge switches” or “other switching facilities *local* or in other geographic areas.” Ex. 1001, 15:37–38 (emphases added). In its Preliminary Response, Patent Owner proffers no explanation as to the recitation in its entirety, and Patent Owner’s argument ignores certain words in the claim language to support its allegation that the term “switching facilities” excludes “edge switches” and “edge devices.” Prelim. Resp. 34.

Moreover, Patent Owner admits that Applicants introduced “switching facility”—a term that was not used in the original Specification—into the claims by Amendment to indicate that “switching facility” has *broader* scope than “tandem switch.” *Id.* at 36; Ex. 2005, 62, 82. Patent Owner, however, attempts to import from the prosecution history a negative limitation into the claims, i.e., that “switching facility” “is not itself an edge switch or edge device” (Prelim. Resp. 37–38) without taking into account “access tandem” and “hybrid switch” specifically identified in that prosecution history as being examples of the narrower term “tandem switch” (Ex. 2005, 82). As we indicated in our Decision on Institution, we have considered all of Patent Owner’s arguments presented in the Preliminary Response regarding the claim term “switching facility,” and determine that the broadest reasonable interpretation of the term is “any switch in the communication network,” consistent with Applicants’ remarks filed with that Amendment. Dec. 8–10; Ex. 2005, 82.

We also are not persuaded that we misapprehended or overlooked Patent Owner's arguments regarding the teachings of the invention and disclaimers disclosed in the Specification. Req. Reh'g 5–15. In its Request for Rehearing, Patent Owner repeats the same arguments as those in the Preliminary Response (*compare* Req. Reh'g 5–15 *with* Prelim. Resp. 11–39), as well as presents new arguments, for example, regarding the description in the '113 patent of making calls using Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) technology (*see, e.g.*, Reh'g Req, 10–11). A request for rehearing is not an opportunity to express disagreement with a decision on previously made arguments. Furthermore, we cannot have misapprehended or overlooked newly made arguments. During trial, Patent Owner has an opportunity to resubmit in its Response arguments previously made in its Preliminary Response, as well as its arguments newly made in the Rehearing Request, along with any other new arguments, explanations, and supporting evidence. As noted in the Scheduling Order, any arguments for patentability not raised in the Response will be deemed waived. Paper 16, 3.

For the foregoing reasons, Patent Owner has not demonstrated that we abused our discretion in construing the terms of claims 38 and 65 for purposes of the Decision on Institution and, consequently, Patent Owner's Request for Rehearing is *denied*.

# 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.