

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 IPR2016-01399¹
U.S. Patent No. 8,902,760 B2

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

¹ Ruckus Wireless, Inc., Brocade Communication Systems, Inc. and Netgear, Inc. filed a petition in (now terminated) IPR2017-00719, who have been joined to the instant proceeding.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	i
Table of Authorities	iv
List of Exhibits	v
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 ‘760 Patent claims	8
C. The challenged claims of the ‘760 patent	10
D. Level of ordinary skill	14
E. The prior art on which Petitioners rely	15
IV. Standard for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review.....	15
V. Claim Construction.....	16
A. “powered off”; “powered-off Ethernet terminal equipment”; “powered-off end device” (Claims 103, 104, 111, 123, and 125)	16
B. “protocol” (Claim 72).....	18
C. “BaseT” (claim 5).....	18
VI. No Reason to Combine - An Ordinary Artisan Would Not Have Made Petitioners’ Proposed Combinations	19
A. <u>For both combinations</u> : at the time of the invention, an ordinary artisan would have had a reason to apply telephone-based phantom operating power to Ethernet terminal equipment.....	19
1. Applying operating power to pre-existing Ethernet terminal devices would not have destroyed Bob Smith terminations, saturated the common mode chokes, and thus degraded the propagation of Ethernet data	19
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	22

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.....	32
C.	Petitioners mistakenly assert that Hunter teaches phantom powering of Ethernet terminal equipment.....	34
1.	Petitioners have failed to show that Hunter’s discussion of “Ethernet®” is relevant to the claimed invention.....	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 communications	40
D.	<u>Additionally for Hunter-Bulan</u> : An ordinary artisan would not have replaced Hunter’s “preferable” protective device with the unnecessarily complicated current limiting circuit of Bulan	42
VII.	The Proposed Hunter-Bulan Combination Does Not Disclose Limitations of the Claims	45
A.	All challenged claims: The Hunter-Bulan combination does not teach “a BaseT Ethernet system”	45
B.	All challenged claims: Hunter-Bulan does not have a “path” for DC current flow “between a piece of BaseT Ethernet terminal equipment and a piece of central network equipment”	47
C.	Claims 37 and 112: The Hunter-Bulan combination does not teach that “magnitudes of the current flow through the loop represent information about the piece of BaseT Ethernet terminal equipment”	50
D.	Claims 59 and 134: The Hunter-Bulan combination does not have a “detection protocol”	52
E.	Claims 69 and 142: The Hunter-Bulan combination does not teach the “to distinguish” limitations	53
F.	Claims 72 and 145: The Hunter-Bulan combination does not teach the “powered-off” limitations	54
VIII.	Claims 72 and 145: The Proposed Bloch-Huizinga-IEEE Combination Does Not Teach the “Powered-Off” Limitations	58

IX. Conclusion61
Certificate of Service62
Certificate of Compliance Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.2464

Table of Authorities

Cases

<i>Endo Pharms. Inc. v. Depomed, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00656, Paper 66 at 27 (September 21, 2015).....	32, 45
<i>Gillette Co. v. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc.</i> , 919 F.2d 720 (Fed. Cir. 1990)	27
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	16
<i>KSR Int’l. Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	16
<i>MasterImage 3D, Inc. v. RealD Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00877, Paper 8 at 22 (September 9, 2015).....	31, 45
<i>Monarch Knitting Mach. v. Sulzer Morat GmbH</i> , 139 F.3d 877 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	27
<i>Stryker Corp. v. Karl Storz Endoscopy Am., Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00764, Paper 13 at 13 (September 2, 2015).....	43
<i>WBIP, LLC v. Kohler Co.</i> , 829 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	27

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 316(e)	15
35 U.S.C. §103	16
37 C.F.R. § 42.220	1

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.