

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

Bright House Networks, LLC,  
WideOpenWest Finance, LLC,  
Knology of Florida, Inc.  
Birch Communications, Inc.  
Petitioners

v.

Focal IP, LLC,  
Patent Owner

---

Case No. IPR2016-01261  
U.S. Patent No. 8,457,113

---

**PETITIONERS' OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO EXCLUDE**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I.</b>	<b>LEGAL STANDARD GOVERNING REPLIES.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>THE REPLY EXHIBITS DIRECTLY REBUT PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>7</b>

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

*Ford Motor Co. v. Paice LLC & The Abell Foundation, Inc.*, IPR2014-00579,  
Paper 45 at p. 29-30 (PTAB Sept. 28, 2015)..... 2, 4-5, 7

### Rules and Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b) .....1, 2

Patent Owner's Motion to Exclude should be denied because it fundamentally misapplies the law regarding replies. The very purpose of a petitioner's reply is to respond to the arguments in a patent owner's response. 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b). As Petitioners repeatedly explained in their Reply (Paper 34) and during the July 6, 2017 conference call with the Board, and as the Petitioners identified in their Responsive Listing of Support Showing Reply Arguments are Proper (Paper 42) ("Responsive Listing"), the disputed exhibits (i.e., those which Patent Owner moves to exclude) and related arguments were included in the Reply to rebut Patent Owner's Response. Specifically, the new exhibits demonstrate that Patent Owner's arguments in the Response regarding the state of the art in May 2000 lack factual support and are simply inaccurate.

Patent Owner's Motion now seeks to substantially modify the rule regarding the proper scope of replies to hold that anything that directly rebuts arguments in a response is nevertheless improper if it was not included in the Petition. That is simply not the law, and such an approach would effectively nullify the utility and purpose of a reply brief.

#### **I. LEGAL STANDARD GOVERNING REPLIES**

Patent Owner's challenges to Exhibits 1057, 1058, and related portions of Exhibit 1065, (the "Reply Exhibits") are based on the mere fact that they were submitted with the Reply and not the Petition. Such arguments are not a sufficient

basis for excluding these exhibits because Petitioners *are* permitted to submit additional evidence that is responsive to arguments raised in a patent owner response – “[t]he very nature of a reply is to rebut the patent owner’s response.” *Ford Motor Co. v. Paice LLC & The Abell Foundation, Inc.*, IPR2014-00579, Paper 45 at p. 29-30 (PTAB Sept. 28, 2015) (*citing* 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b)). In fact, the Board has found that “[t]he need to rely on new evidence may not arise until a particular point has been raised in the patent owner response. Much depends on the specific arguments made in the patent owner response.” *Id.* “The mere fact that a petitioner submits rebuttal testimony that relies on new evidence not previously identified in the petition does not suffice to establish its impropriety.” *Id.*

## **II. THE REPLY EXHIBITS DIRECTLY REBUT PATENT OWNER’S RESPONSE**

Patent Owner’s arguments in its Motion to Exclude fail to address that the Reply Exhibits were submitted *only* to rebut new arguments in Patent Owner’s Response and not to change or supplement the two instituted Grounds. Patent Owner’s Response, and the accompanying declaration of its expert (Mr. Bates), relied on three arguments premised on unsupported factual assertions. Reply, 1-3. The first of these arguments was that a POSA understood in May 2000 that the only way to connect to the PSTN was through a PSTN edge switch and therefore a POSA would understand that Archer fails to disclose connecting a call processing system to the PSTN through a PSTN tandem switch. Reply, 1-2; *see also*

# 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.