

Reply to Patent Owner's Preliminary Response Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c)
IPR 2016-01263
U.S. Patent No. 8,155,298

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 IPR2016-01263
U.S. Patent No. 8,155,298

**PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY
RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

I. INTRODUCTION1

**II. APPLICANT DID NOT CLEARLY AND UNMISTAKABLY
DISAVOW THE CLAIM SCOPE ASSERTED BY PATENT
OWNER.....2**

A. Patent Owner Must Show a Clear and Unmistakable Disclaimer2

B. Applicant Introduced and Broadly Defined “Switching
Facilities” During the Prosecution of the ’777 Patent.....2

C. Applicant Did Not Clearly and Unmistakably Disavow its
Broadly Defined Scope of “Switching Facility”5

**III. PATENT OWNER’S ARGUMENTS REGARDING ARCHER
AND CHANG SIMILARLY FAIL8**

A. Patent Owner’s Assertions that Archer’s Converters 126, 132
are Edge Switches or Edge Devices are Misleading and
Inaccurate8

B. Patent Owner Misstates Petitioners’ Reading of a Web-Enabled
Processing System Coupled to a Switching Facility of the
PSTN or a Tandem Switch Onto a Combination of Archer and
Chang.....10

List of Exhibits Cited in this Reply

Exhibit Number	Document
1001	U.S. Patent No. 8,155,298 (“the ’298 patent”)
1002	Expert Declaration of Dr. Thomas La Porta
1003	U.S. Patent No. 6,683,870 to Archer (“Archer”)
1004	U.S. Patent No. 5,958,016 to Chang <i>et al.</i> (“Chang”)
1008	File history of U.S. Patent No. 8,155,298
1010	File history of U.S. Patent No. 7,764,777
1053	Supplemental Expert Declaration of Dr. Thomas La Porta (“TLP”)
1054	U.S. Patent No. 6,574,328
1055	U.S. Patent No. 7,324,635

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to the Board's order of November 1, 2016, Petitioners respectfully submit this Reply to address Patent Owner's arguments concerning disclaimer of claim scope in its Preliminary Response.

Patent Owner's Preliminary Response is an improper attempt to retroactively narrow the scope of a claim term ("switching facility") that Applicant introduced three years after it filed the related '777 patent and ten years after it filed the earliest patent to which the '777 patent claims priority. However, Applicant clearly intended this term to be interpreted broadly when it introduced this new claim term in an amendment and concurrently provided a definition with enumerated examples. Now, more than six years later, Patent Owner asks the Board to ignore the previously provided definition and enumerated examples and instead rely on a specification (presented years earlier) and arguments (presented months before the claim term was introduced by amendment) to find that Applicant disclaimed the broad scope that would otherwise be given to this claim term. Even if the Board considers Applicant's "disclaimer" evidence, which it should not, it does not contain the requisite *clear and unmistakable* disavowal of claim scope asserted by Patent Owner. As a result, the Board should accept the definition of the term "switching facility" that the Applicant provided during

Reply to Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c) prosecution when it introduced this term—“any point in the switching fabric of converging networks.”

II. APPLICANT DID NOT CLEARLY AND UNMISTAKABLY DISAVOW THE CLAIM SCOPE ASSERTED BY PATENT OWNER

A. Patent Owner Must Show a Clear and Unmistakable Disclaimer

The Federal Circuit has explained that the standard for finding a disclaimer of claim scope is “exacting.” *GE Lighting Solutions, LLC v. AgiLight, Inc.*, 750 F.3d 1304, 1309 (Fed. Cir. 2014). Disavowal does not arise merely by criticizing a particular embodiment that is encompassed in the plain meaning of a claim term. *See Epistar Corp. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n*, 566 F.3d 1321, 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2009). Nor is it enough that all the embodiments of the invention disclosed in the specification contain a particular limitation. *Thorner v. Sony Computer Ent. Am. LLC*, 669 F.3d 1362, 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2012). Rather, a disclaimer of claim scope must be “*clear and unmistakable*.” *Id.* at 1366-67 (emphasis added); *see also Openwave Systems, Inc. v. Apple Inc.*, 808 F.3d 509, 513 (Fed. Cir. 2015).

B. Applicant Introduced and Broadly Defined “Switching Facilities” During the Prosecution of the ’777 Patent

The first time that “switching facilities” appears anywhere in the intrinsic record of the ’298 patent, or any of the patents in its family, is February 16, 2010, when Applicant introduced it in response to a Final Office Action during prosecution of the related ’777 patent. EX. 1010, 66, 68-80, 84-88; TLP, ¶14;

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.