

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC.,
Petitioner

v.

CHRIMAR SYSTEMS, INC.
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2016-01397
U.S. Patent No. 9,019,838

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(A)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Authorities	iv
Patent Owner’s Exhibit List.	vi
Introduction and Summary of Arguments.	1
Background	3
A. Status of Related Litigation	3
B. Chrimar	4
C. The ’838 Patent.	6
D. Person of Ordinary Skill	10
Arguments and Authorities	11
A. Legal Standard	11
B. Claim Construction	12
1. Prior Claim Constructions from the District Court Litigation.	12
2. Prior Claim Constructions from the Board	14
C. <u>Ground 1</u> : Petitioner has not made a <i>prima facie</i> case that the ’838 Patent’s claims are obvious in view of the combination of Hunter and Bulan.	15
1. Hunter	15
2. Bulan	16
3. The Hunter and Bulan references teach away from combining the two references to create the system proposed by Petitioner.	18
4. The combination of Hunter and Bulan does not disclose or teach every limitation of dependent claims 26 and 29.	21
5. The combination of Hunter and Bulan does not disclose or teach every limitation of dependent claim 47.	24

D. Ground 2: Petitioner has not made a *prima facie* case that the '838 Patent is obvious in view of Bloch, Huizinga, and the IEEE Ethernet standards. 25

1. There was no motivation to combine Bloch and Huizinga.. . . . 26

2. There was no motivation to combine Bloch and Huizinga with the IEEE Ethernet standards. 27

Conclusion 32

Certificate of Compliance with Word Count 33

Certificate of Service 34

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Federal Cases

<i>AMX, LLC v. Chrimar Sys., Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00569, Paper No. 19	14, 15
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.</i> , 800 F. 3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	11
<i>Gordon</i>	21
<i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	20
<i>In re Spinnoble</i> , 405 F.2d 578 (C.C.P.A. 1969)	19
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	18
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	26
<i>Leo Pharm. Prods., Ltd. v. Rea</i> , 726 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	19
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	12
<i>Tec Air, Inc. v. Denso Mfg. Mich. Inc.</i> , 192 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	19
<i>Tietex Int’l, Ltd. v. Precision Fabrics Group, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-01248, Paper No. 39 (2016)	11

State Cases

35 U.S.C. § 313..... 2
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)..... 1, 11
37 C.F.R. § 42.107..... 2

Federal Statutes

37 C.F.R. 42.8 11
37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c) 1, 11
37 C.F.R. § 42.22 11
37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)(2)..... 11
37 C.F.R. § 42.23 11
37 C.F.R. § 42.6 11
37 C.F.R. §42.100(b)..... 12
37 C.F.R. §42.104 11

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.