

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 Number: 8,457,113

---

**PATENT OWNER FOCAL IP, LLC'S RESPONSE TO PETITION  
FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	1
III.	DISCUSSION OF THE PSTN AND OVERVIEW OF THE '113 PATENT .....	3
A.	Overview of the PSTN .....	3
B.	The '113 Patent.....	8
IV.	The '113 Patent Contains an Unmistakable Disclaimer of Subject Matter and Claim Scope for Call Controllers Connected to an Edge Switch or Edge Device.....	10
A.	Disparaging the Prior Art is Sufficient to Disclaim Claim Scope.....	10
B.	Disclaimer in the '113 Patent .....	13
C.	The Prosecution History Confirms and Reinforces the Disclaimer and Does Not Provide a Basis to Rescind the Plain Disclaimer from the Specification .....	19
D.	Scope of General Disclaimer .....	27
V.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	28
A.	Legal Standards for Claim Construction - Broadest Reasonable Interpretation (“BRI”).....	28
B.	“Switching Facility” .....	29
C.	“Call Processing System” .....	34
VI.	SUMMARY OF THE REFERENCES.....	34

A.	State of the Art.....	34
B.	Summary of Burger .....	35
C.	Summary of Archer .....	38
VII.	ARGUMENTS.....	40
A.	Burger and Archer Do Not Disclose That the Web-Enabled Processing System Establishes Voice Communication Between the Calling Party and the Called Party.....	40
1.	Burger Does Not Disclose Establishing Voice Communication Across Both the Circuit-Switched Network and the Packet Network.....	41
2.	Archer Does Not Disclose that the Web-Enabled Processing System Establishes Voice Communication .....	44
B.	Petitioner Has Not Met Its Burden under Grounds 1 and 2 Because Burger and Alexander Do Not Show a Processing System Coupled to a Switching Facility.....	48
1.	Petitioner’s Theory No. 1 .....	49
2.	Petitioner’s Theory No. 2 .....	51
3.	Petitioner’s Theory No. 3 .....	53
4.	Petitioner’s Theory No. 4 .....	53
5.	Petitioner’s Theory No. 5 .....	54
C.	Petitioner Has Not Met Its Burden under Grounds 3 and 4 Because Archer and Chang Do Not Show a Processing System Coupled to a Switching Facility.....	57

1.	Petitioner’s Theory No. 1 .....	57
2.	Petitioner’s Theory No. 2 .....	59
3.	Petitioner’s Theory No. 3 .....	60
4.	Petitioner’s Theory No. 4 .....	61
VIII.	CONCLUSION .....	62

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases:

<i>Akamai Techs., Inc. v. Limelight Networks, Inc.</i> , 629 F.3d 1311 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	13
<i>Akamai Techs., Inc. v. Limelight Networks, Inc.</i> , 419 F. App'x 989 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	13
<i>Akamai Techs., Inc. v. Limelight Networks, Inc.</i> , 805 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	13
<i>Ariosa Diagnostics v. Verinata Health, Inc.</i> , 805 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	48
<i>Bicon, Inc. v. Straumann Co.</i> , 441 F.3d 945 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	30
<i>Biogen, Inc. v. Berlex Labs., Inc.</i> , 318 F.3d 1132 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	13
<i>Chi. Bd. Options Exch., Inc. v. Int'l Secs. Exch., LLC</i> , 677 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	10-11
<i>Edmund Optics, Inc. v. Semrock, Inc.</i> , Case IPR2014-00599, Paper 72 (PTAB Sept. 16, 2015).....	10
<i>Epistar Corp. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 556 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	12
<i>GE Lighting Solutions, LLC v. AgiLight, Inc.</i> , 750 F.3d 1304 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	28
<i>Hakim v. Cannon Avent Grp., PLC</i> , 479 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	25
<i>Honeywell Int'l, Inc. v. ITT Indus., Inc.</i> , 452 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	12-13

# 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.