

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 No. IPR2016-01397

U.S. Patent No. 9,019,838 B2

Petitioners' Opposition to Chrimar's Motion to Strike

---

Mail Stop Patent Board  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-145

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
A. Chrimar's Motion Does Not Comply With the Board's Order .....	2
B. Chrimar Was Not Authorized to Move to Strike the Entire Reply .....	7

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Corning Inc. v. DSM IP Assets B.V.</i> , No. IPR2013-00052, Paper No. 88 (P.T.A.B. May 1, 2014) .....	4
<i>Ford Motor Co. v. Paice LLC &amp; The Abell Foundation, Inc.</i> , No. IPR2014-00579, Paper 45 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 28, 2015).....	4
<i>Petroleum Geo-Services Inc. v. WesternGeco LLC</i> , No. IPR2014-01475, Paper 18 (PTAB Mar. 17, 2015) .....	5
<i>Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC</i> , 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	7
<b>Rules</b>	
37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b) .....	1, 2, 3, 6, 7

Chrimar's Motion to Strike should be denied because it misapplies the law and fails to comply with the Board's Order (Paper 42). The Board ordered Chrimar to "[i]dentify . . . exactly which arguments in Petitioner's Reply allegedly exceed the proper scope set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b), and explain specifically why those arguments exceed the proper scope." *Id.*, 2. But instead of explaining how Petitioners' arguments allegedly exceed the proper scope of the Reply, Chrimar argues that certain of Petitioners arguments are "new" and were not in the Petition. This, however, is not the legal standard for determining whether an argument is within the proper scope of a reply.

The purpose of a Reply is to respond to the patent owner's arguments in its response. 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b). As Petitioners have repeatedly explained in their Reply and Opposition to Chrimar's Motion to Exclude, the disputed arguments (*i.e.*, those which Chrimar moves to strike) were included in the Reply to rebut Chrimar's Response—specifically to demonstrate that Chrimar's arguments in the Response are irrelevant and, if considered, that they are incorrect and unsupported. Chrimar'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. Chrimar's Motion should therefore be denied because it fundamentally misapplies 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b).

Additionally, the Motion should be denied because it is not commensurate with what the Board allowed Chrimar to file. Chrimar was authorized "to file a motion to strike *certain portions* of Petitioner's Reply" and ordered to "identify (by page and line numbers) exactly" the arguments Chrimar seeks to strike. Order, 2-3. Instead, Chrimar's Motion identifies some arguments, but then moves to strike the *entire* Reply. In view of the Order, Chrimar should be deemed to have waived any right to relief with respect to arguments not specifically identified in its Motion "by page and line numbers." *See id.* The Motion also presents new evidence and argument regarding patentability, which the Board expressly ordered Chrimar *not* to include in the Motion. *Id.*

**A. Chrimar's Motion Does Not Comply With the Board's Order**

The Board ordered Chrimar to identify exactly which arguments in the Reply it is challenging and "explain specifically" why Chrimar believes they are not responsive to the Patent Owner's Response. Order, 1-2. Instead, Chrimar chose to argue about the sufficiency of the Petition, to attempt to rebut the arguments in the Reply, and to present new arguments and evidence that the Board denied Chrimar permission to file. For example, the Motion discusses a draft

# 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.