

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

YMAX CORPORATION,

Petitioner

v.

FOCAL IP, LLC,

Patent Owner

Case IPR2016-01260
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	4
A.	Overview of the PSTN	4
B.	The '113 Patent	9
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.....	14
C.	The Prosecution History Confirms and Reinforces the Disclaimer, and Does Not Provide a Basis to Rescind the Plain Disclaimer from the Specification.....	21
D.	Scope of General Disclaimer	29
V.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	30
A.	Legal Standards for Claim Construction - Broadest Reasonable Interpretation (“BRI”).....	30
B.	“Switching Facility”.....	31
C.	“Coupled To”	36
VI.	SUMMARY OF THE REFERENCES.....	39

A.	State of the Art	39
B.	Summary of Shtivelman	43
C.	Summary of O’Neal	45
VII.	ARGUMENTS	49
A.	Shtivelman Does Not Disclose Claim 8.	50
1.	Shtivelman Does Not Anticipate Claim 8 Because the Control Criteria Are Not Provided to the Web Server.	50
2.	Shtivelman Does Not Disclose Claim 8 Because It Does Not Disclose That the Control Criteria Are Used to Partially Route the Call Over a Packet Network.....	53
B.	The Challenged Claims of Ground 1 Are Not Anticipated by Shtivelman.....	54
1.	Shtivelman Does Not Anticipate the Challenged Claims of Ground 1 Because It Does Not Disclose a Call Processing System Coupled to a Switching Facility.	55
2.	Dependent Claim 17 Is Not Anticipated by Shtivelman.	56
3.	Dependent Claims 18 and 19 Are Not Anticipated by Shtivelman.....	57
C.	The Challenged Claims of Ground 2 are Not Anticipated by O’Neal.....	57
1.	O’Neal Connects the First and Second Calls Independently of Establishing Voice Communication Between the Calling Party/Called Party.	58

2.	The Challenged Claims of Ground 2 Are Not Anticipated by O’Neal For the Same Reasons as Shtivelman	62
a)	O’Neal Does Not Anticipate the Challenged Claims of Ground 1 Because It Does Not Disclose a Call Processing System Coupled to a Switching Facility.....	63
b)	Dependent Claim 17 is not Anticipated by O’Neal.....	64
3.	Dependent Claims 18 and 19 are not Anticipated by O’Neal	64
D.	The Challenged Claims of Ground 3 Are Not Obvious in View of O’Neal.....	65
E.	The Challenged Claims of Ground 4 Are Not Obvious Over Shtivelman in View of O’Neal	66
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	66

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases:

Akamai Techs., Inc. v. Limelight Networks, Inc.,
629 F.3d 1311 (Fed. Cir. 2010)..... 13-14

Akamai Techs., Inc. v. Limelight Networks, Inc.,
419 F. App'x 989 (Fed. Cir. 2011) 13

Akamai Techs., Inc. v. Limelight Networks, Inc.,
805 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... 13

Bicon, Inc. v. Straumann Co.,
441 F.3d 945 (Fed. Cir. 2006)..... 33

Biogen, Inc. v. Berlex Labs., Inc.,
318 F.3d 1132 (Fed. Cir. 2003)..... 14

Chi. Bd. Options Exch., Inc. v. Int'l Secs. Exch., LLC,
677 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 11-12, 31

Edmund Optics, Inc. v. Semrock, Inc.,
Case IPR2014-00599, Paper 72 (PTAB Sept. 16, 2015)..... 11

Epistar Corp. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n,
556 F.3d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2009)..... 13

GE Lighting Solutions, LLC v. AgiLight, Inc.,
750 F.3d 1304 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 30

Hakim v. Cannon Avent Group, PLC,
479 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2007)..... 27

Honeywell Int'l, Inc. v. ITT Indus., Inc.,
452 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2006)..... 12-14

In re Baker Hughes, Inc.,
215 F.3d 1297 (Fed. Cir. 2000)..... 31

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.