

Supplemental Brief in Response to Patent Owner's Motion to Amend  
IPR 2016-01262  
U.S. Patent No. 7,764,777

IN THE 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. IPR2016-01262  
U.S. Patent No. 7,764,777

---

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY, JONI Y. CHANG, and BARBARA A. PARVIS,  
ADMINISTRATIVE PATENT JUDGES.

**PETITIONERS' SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF IN RESPONSE TO PATENT  
OWNER'S CONTINGENT MOTION TO AMEND**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
A. Preliminary Matters .....	1
B. Petitioner’s Supplemental Briefing .....	2
II. THE ’777 PATENT’S DESCRIPTION OF THE STATE OF THE ART AND THE ALLEGED INVENTION .....	3
III. CHALLENGES AND STATUTORY GROUNDS FOR CHALLENGES.....	7
A. Motivation to Combine Lewis or LaPier and AAPA.....	7
B. Challenge 1: Lewis in View of AAPA.....	8
1. Claim 49: “ <i>incoming call processing</i> ” .....	8
2. Claim 49: “ <i>PSTN telecommunications network and switches</i> ” .....	9
3. Claim 49: “ <i>web-enabled</i> ” .....	10
4. Claim 49: “ <i>conditional call blocking</i> ” .....	11
A. Challenge 2: LaPier in View of the AAPA .....	12
1. Claim 49: “ <i>incoming call processing</i> ” .....	12
2. Claim 49: “ <i>PSTN telecommunications network and switches</i> ” .....	13
3. Claim 49: “ <i>web-enabled</i> ” .....	13
4. Claim 49: “ <i>conditional call blocking</i> ” .....	15

## PETITIONERS' SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF EXHIBIT LIST

<b>Exhibit Number</b>	<b>Document</b>
<b>1001</b>	U.S. Patent No. 7,764,777 (“the ’777 Patent”)
<b>1002</b>	Expert Declaration of Dr. Thomas F. La Porta
<b>1003</b>	U.S. Patent No. 6,683,870 to Archer (“Archer”)
<b>1057</b>	U.S. Patent No. 6,442,169 to Lewis (“Lewis”)
<b>1058</b>	U.S. Patent No. 6,333,931 to LaPier (“LaPier”)
<b>1059</b>	May 8, 2017 Transcript of Deposition of Regis “Bud” Bates
<b>1060</b>	May 9, 2017 Transcript of Deposition of Regis “Bud” Bates
<b>1065</b>	Expert Declaration of Dr. Thomas F. La Porta in Support of Reply to Patent Owner’s Response
<b>1066</b>	Expert Declaration of Dr. Thomas F. La Porta in Support of Opposition to Motion to Amend
<b>2019</b>	Deposition Transcript of Dr. La Porta, Feb. 24, 2017, for IPR 2016-01259, -01261, -01262, and -01263.
<b>2020</b>	Deposition Transcript of Dr. La Porta, Feb. 23, 2017, for IPR 2016-01259, -01261, -01262, and -01263.
<b>2040</b>	Expert Declaration of Regis “Bud” Bates in Support of Patent Owner’s Motion to Amend
<b>2041</b>	Section 112 Written Description Support for the Proposed Substitute Claim
<b>2062</b>	Clean and Redlined Versions of the Proposed Substitute Claim

## I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioners submit this supplemental brief pursuant to the Board’s October 19, 2017 order to address “the issue regarding the unpatentability of the proposed substitute [Claim 49 of U.S. Pat. No. 7,764,777 (“the ’777 Patent”)]” and specifically to “address[] original claim limitations not previously addressed by Petitioners based on the prior art in the record.” Paper 65 (“*Aqua Order*”), 6.

### A. Preliminary Matters

Petitioners contend that the Board’s March 21, 2017 order (Paper 29, 4-6) was correct that the burden of persuasion on the Motion to Amend (Paper 31) is properly *on the Patent Owner to show patentability* of Claim 49. In *Aqua Prods., Inc. v. Matal*, No. 2015-1177, 2017 WL 4399000 (Fed. Cir. Oct. 4, 2017), the Federal Circuit shifted this burden onto Petitioners to show *unpatentability*. Petitioners object to and reserve their rights to challenge the *Aqua* decision, and any reliance on that decision by the Board.

In order to preserve this right, Petitioners object to the *Aqua Order* (Paper 65, pp. 6-7) on the ground that: (1) in view of the absence of rules issued by the PTO addressing this burden, it is improper for the Board in the first instance to engage in rulemaking in the Order, and (2) it violates Petitioners’ due process rights. The *Aqua Order* does not account for the difference between the burden of showing *patentability* and *unpatentability*. In order to meet its burden of patentability,

Patent Owner needed only to identify a *single limitation* that is missing from the prior art. Under 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.20, 42.24 and 42.121, Patent Owner had 25 pages to argue the either of the *two* alleged limitations in Claim 49 were *missing* from the prior art, and the Board authorized Patent Owner to submit its §112 support in a separate chart. Paper 29, 2-7; Paper 31, 12-13, 22. On the other hand, for a petitioner to meet its burden of unpatentability, it needs to show where *every limitation* of a claim is found in the prior art. In light of these different burdens, it is improper and unduly prejudicial for the Board to issue a rule limiting Petitioners to only 15 pages for this Supplemental Briefing, especially while prohibiting them from: (1) using expert testimony, including in support of any *Graham* analysis, and (2) incorporating by reference arguments from prior briefing. *Aqua* Order, 5-7.

### **B. Petitioner’s Supplemental Briefing**

In their Opposition (Paper 35), Petitioners addressed the two features that Patent Owner asserted were not found in the prior art. Per the Board’s *Aqua* Order, this Supplemental Briefing is directed to the remaining four limitations:

Proposed Substitute Claim 49 Limitation	Abbreviation
“A method for processing an incoming call from a particular PSTN tandem switch on a PSTN communication network using a tandem access controller”	“ <i>incoming call processing</i> ”
“wherein the PSTN communication network comprises edge switches connected to telephones on one side and PSTN tandem switches on the other side, wherein the PSTN tandem switches include the particular PSTN tandem switch, wherein the edge switches route calls within a local geographic area, wherein the PSTN tandem	“ <i>PSTN telecommunications network and switches</i> ”

# 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.