

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 PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
TO PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	2
III.	DISCUSSION OF THE PSTN AND OVERVIEW OF THE '113 PATENT	3
IV.	LEGAL STANDARDS.....	10
A.	Standard for Review.....	10
B.	Obviousness	11
1.	Claims Cannot be Found Obvious if an Element is Absent	11
2.	Reason to Combine or Modify Must Have Rational Underpinning	11
C.	Broadest Reasonable Interpretation	12
D.	BRI Cannot be so Broad to Include Elements That Have Been Disclaimed or Disavowed	14
V.	GENERAL DISCLAIMER OF CONTROLLERS CONNECTED TO EDGE SWITCHES.....	22
A.	Disparaging Statements in the '113 Patent	22
B.	Applicants' Statements in the Prosecution History to Distinguish over Schwab	28
1.	'777 Patent Prosecution - First Response to an Office Action	28
2.	'777 Patent Prosecution - Second Response to an Office Action ..	30

C.	Scope of General Disclaimer	34
VI.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS.....	35
A.	“Switching Facility”	35
B.	“Coupled To”	41
VII.	SUMMARY OF THE REFERENCES	43
A.	SUMMARY OF SHTIVELMAN.....	43
B.	SUMMARY OF O’NEAL.....	45
VIII.	ARGUMENTS.....	50
A.	The Challenged Claims of Ground 1 Are not Anticipated by Shtivelman.....	50
1.	The Claimed “Switching Facility” Cannot Be an Edge Switch	51
2.	The Purported “Switching Facility” in Shtivelman is an Edge Switch.....	52
3.	Petitioner’s Secondary Argument Regarding the Breadth of “Coupled To” are Equally Deficient.....	53
4.	Shtivelman only Discloses Subject Matter that has Been Disclaimed.....	54
5.	Independent Claim 1 and Its Dependent Claims are not Anticipated by Shtivelman.....	54
6.	Dependent Claim 17 Is not Anticipated by Shtivelman	55
7.	Dependent Claims 18 and 19 Are Not Anticipated by Shtivelman	55

B.	The Challenged Claims of Ground 2 are not Anticipated by O’Neal ..	56
1.	The Claimed “Switching Facility” Cannot be an Edge Switch.....	57
2.	The Purported “Switching Facility” in O’Neal is an Edge Switch, and the Purported “Call Processing System” is an Edge Device...	57
3.	Petitioner’s Secondary Argument Regarding The Breadth of “Coupled To” Are Equally Deficient.....	58
4.	O’Neal only Discloses Subject Matter that has Been Disclaimed .	58
5.	Independent Claim 1 and Its Dependent Claims are not Anticipated by O’Neal ..	59
6.	Dependent Claim 17 is not Anticipated by O’Neal.....	59
7.	Dependent Claims 18 and 19 are not Anticipated by O’Neal ..	59
C.	The Challenged Claims of Ground 3 are not Obvious in View of O’Neal ..	60
D.	The Challenged Claims of Ground 4 Are Not Obvious by Shtivelman in View of O’Neal.....	61
IX.	CONCLUSION ..	61

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases:

<i>Apple Inc. v. Virnetx Inc.</i> , Case IPR2014-00481, Paper No. 35, (PTAB August 24, 2015)	13
<i>Bicon, Inc. v. Straumann Co.</i> , 441 F.3d 945 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	36
<i>CFMT, Inc. v. YieldUp Int’l Corp.</i> , 349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	11
<i>Chi. Bd. Options Exch., Inc. v. Int’l Secs. Exch., LLC</i> , 677 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	16-18
<i>Edmund Optics, Inc. v. Semrock, Inc.</i> , Case IPR2014-00599, Paper 72 (PTAB September 16, 2015).....	15
<i>GE Lighting Solutions, LLC v. AgiLight, Inc.</i> , 750 F.3d 1304 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	16
<i>Google Inc., et al. v. Arendi S.A.R.L.</i> , Case IPR 2014-00452, Paper 31, (PTAB August 18, 2015)	15
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	11
<i>Honeywell Int’l, Inc. v. ITT Indus., Inc.</i> , 452 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	20-21
<i>Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	12
<i>In re Baker Hughes, Inc.</i> , 215 F.3d 1297 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	12

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.