

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

JUNIPER NETWORKS INC.,  
RUCKUS WIRELESS, INC.,  
BROCADE COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS, INC.,  
and NETGEAR, INC.,  
Petitioners,

v.

CHRIMAR SYSTEMS, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2016-01397<sup>1</sup>  
U.S. Patent No. 9,019,838 B2

---

**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO PETITIONS  
FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.220**

---

<sup>1</sup> Ruckus Wireless, Inc., Brocade Communication Systems, Inc. and Netgear, Inc. (“Ruckus et al.”) filed a petition in (now terminated) IPR2017-00720, and Ruckus et al. has been joined to the instant proceeding.

## **Table of Contents**

Table of Authorities .....	iii
List of Exhibits.....	iv
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Summary of Patent Owner Response .....	1
III. Background.....	4
A. Background of the technology relevant to the patent .....	4
1. Telephone technology .....	4
2. Ethernet technology differs substantially from telephony.....	6
B. The invention of the ‘838 Patent claims .....	8
C. The challenged claims of the ‘838 Patent .....	8
D. Level of ordinary skill .....	10
E. The prior art on which Petitioners rely .....	10
IV. Standard for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review .....	11
V. Claim Construction.....	12
A. "BaseT" (Claim 1).....	12
B. “protocol” (Claim 2).....	12
VI. No Reason To Combine - An Ordinary Artisan Would Not Have Made Petitioners’ Proposed Combinations .....	13
A. <u>For both combinations</u> : at the time of the invention, an ordinary artisan would not have had a reason to apply telephone-based phantom operating power to Ethernet terminal equipment.....	13
1. Applying operating power to pre-existing Ethernet terminal equipment would have destroyed Bob Smith terminations, saturated the common mode chokes, and thus degraded the propagation of Ethernet data .....	13
2. When an unused pair of contacts is available – as in Ethernet – an ordinary artisan would have supplied power over the unused pairs, not the data pairs as Petitioners assert .....	16
B. <u>Additionally for Bloch-Huizinga-IEEE</u> : An ordinary artisan would not have applied Bloch’s telephone-based phantom power to Ethernet terminal equipment for the additional reason	

that Bloch would have disrupted and degraded the Ethernet data signal.....	26
C. <u>Additionally for Hunter-Bulan</u> : An ordinary artisan would not have replaced Hunter’s “preferable” protective device with the unnecessarily complicated currently limiting circuit of Bulan. ....	28
VII. The Proposed Hunter-Bulan Combination Does Not Disclose the Limitations of the Claims .....	32
A. All challenged claims: The Hunter-Bulan combination does not teach the claimed “Ethernet connection . . . contacts” that both (1) are “used to carry BaseT Ethernet communication signals,” and (2) via which “different magnitudes of DC current flow” .....	32
1. Petitioners have failed to show that Hunter’s discussion of “Ethernet®” discloses the claimed “contacts used to carry BaseT Ethernet communication signals” .....	34
2. Petitioners have not proven their assertion that Hunter teaches hub 170 providing phantom power to Ethernet terminal devices; on the contrary, Hunter’s phantom-power circuit connects a hub to other hubs – not to Ethernet terminal devices.....	35
3. Hunter’s specification confirms that Figure 2 does not apply to Ethernet communication signals .....	40
B. Claim 2: The Hunter-Bulan combination does not teach a “detection protocol” .....	43
C. Claims 26 and 29: The Hunter-Bulan combination does not teach a central piece of Ethernet network equipment configured to “distinguish” one “end device”/“network object” from another “end device”/“network object” .....	44
VIII. Conclusion .....	45
Certificate of Service .....	47
Certificate of Compliance Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.24 .....	49

**Table of Authorities**

**Cases**

*Endo Pharms. Inc. v. Depomed, Inc.*,  
IPR2014-00656, Paper 66 (September 21, 2015)..... 26, 31

*Gillette Co. v. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc.*,  
919 F.2d 720 (Fed. Cir. 1990) .....21

*Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.*,  
688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....11

*KSR Int’l. Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*,  
550 U.S. 398 (2007).....11

*MasterImage 3D, Inc. v. RealD Inc.*,  
IPR2015-00877, Paper 8 (September 9, 2015)..... 25, 31

*Monarch Knitting Mach. v. Sulzer Morat GmbH*,  
139 F.3d 877 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....21

*Stryker Corp. v. Karl Storz Endoscopy Am., Inc.*,  
IPR2015-00764, Paper 13 (September 2, 2015).....29

*WBIP, LLC v. Kohler Co.*,  
829 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....21

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 103 .....11

35 U.S.C. § 316(e) .....11

37 C.F.R. § 42.220 .....1

**List of Exhibits**

<b>Exhibit No.</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Identifier</b>
2017	Memorandum Opinion and Order, Dkt. No. 96, filed in Chrimar Systems, Inc., et al. v. AMX, LLC, Civil Action No. 6:13-cv-881-JDL, Eastern District of Texas	10/22/2014	
2018	Memorandum Opinion and Order, Dkt. No. 105, filed in Chrimar Systems, Inc., et al. v. AMX, LLC, Civil Action No. 6:13-cv-881-JDL, Eastern District of Texas	1/8/2015	
2019	Memorandum Opinion and Order, Dkt. No. 108, filed in Chrimar Systems, Inc., et al. v. AMX, LLC, Civil Action No. 6:13-cv-881-JDL, Eastern District of Texas	1/16/2015	
2020	Memorandum Opinion and Order, Dkt. No. 122, filed in Chrimar Systems, Inc., et al. v. Alcatel-Lucent, et al., Civil Action No. 6:15-cv-163-JDL, Eastern District of Texas	3/28/2016	
2021	Memorandum Opinion and Order, Dkt. No. 123, filed in Chrimar Systems, Inc., et al. v. Alcatel-Lucent, et al., Civil Action No. 6:15-cv-163-JDL, Eastern District of Texas	3/28/2016	
2035	Memorandum Opinion and Order, Dkt. No. 318, filed in Chrimar Systems, Inc., et al. v. AMX, LLC, Civil Action No. 6:13-cv-881-JDL, Eastern District of Texas	9/27/2016	
2036	Response to Office Action (Reexam Control No. 90/009,513) (June 15, 2010)	6/15/2010	

# 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.