

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SPRINGPATH, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

SIMPLIVITY CORPORATION
Patent Owner

Case IPR2016-01780
Patent 8,478,799

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|---|-------------|
| I. Introduction..... | 1 |
| II. Background of the '799 Patent | 3 |
| A. The '799 Patent Discloses an Improved Computer File System | 3 |
| 1. Object Store..... | 3 |
| 2. Fingerprints | 5 |
| 3. New Object Structures in the '799 Patent..... | 6 |
| B. The Challenged Claims of the '799 Patent | 7 |
| III. Overview of Atkin | 9 |
| A. Overview of Atkin..... | 9 |
| B. The File Server 102 in Atkin Assigns Content Addresses for File Data | 11 |
| C. The Commit Server 112 in Atkin Does Not Assign Content Addresses for Metadata or File System Information | 12 |
| IV. Claim Construction..... | 14 |
| A. The Governing Claim Construction Standard..... | 14 |
| B. The Term “Object” Should Be Given Its Plain and Ordinary Meaning..... | 16 |
| 1. Petitioner Acknowledges that Any Terms Not Offered for Construction by the Petition Should be Given Their Plain and Ordinary Meaning | 16 |
| 2. The Plain and Ordinary Meaning of “Object” Is Not Disclosed by “Block” | 17 |
| C. Petitioner’s Proposed Constructions of “Fingerprint” and “Namespace File System” Are Immaterial | 23 |
| 1. Construing “Fingerprint” Is Not Necessary..... | 23 |
| 2. Construing “Namespace File System” Is Not Necessary | 24 |
| V. Argument | 26 |
| A. Atkin Does Not Disclose “Objects” as Required by All Challenged Claims | 27 |

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| 1. | The Blocks in Atkin Do Not Disclose the Claimed “Objects” | 28 |
| 2. | The Cited Portion of Dubnicki Was Not Incorporated into Atkin and Dubnicki Does Not Transform Atkin into an Object Storage System | 30 |
| B. | Atkin Does Not Disclose Generating Fingerprints for “Metadata Objects,” “File Objects,” “Directory Objects,” and “Inode Map Objects” As Required By All Challenged Claims | 32 |
| 1. | Atkin Does Not Disclose that “Metadata Objects” Receive Fingerprints as Required by All Challenged Claims | 32 |
| 2. | Atkin Does Not Disclose that “File Objects” Receive Fingerprints as Required by All Challenged Claims | 35 |
| 3. | Atkin Does Not Disclose that “Inode Map Objects” Receive Fingerprints as Required by All Challenged Claims | 37 |
| 4. | Atkin Does Not Disclose that “Directory Objects” Receive Fingerprints as Required by All Challenged Claims | 39 |
| VI. | Conclusion | 39 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| | Page(s) |
|---|----------------|
| Cases | |
| <i>Apple, Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00351, Paper 9 (PTAB June 24, 2015) | 24, 26 |
| <i>Aventis Pharma S.A. v. Hospira, Inc.</i> , 675 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2012) | 16 |
| <i>Becton, Dickinson and Co. v. One StockDuq Holdings, LLC</i> , IPR2013-00235, Paper 30 (PTAB Sept. 25, 2014)..... | 16 |
| <i>Entegris, Inc. v. Pall Corp.</i> , Civ. No. 06-10601-GAO, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 25352 (D. Mass., Mar. 31, 2008)..... | 30 |
| <i>Ericsson, Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC</i> , IPR2014-00921, Paper 8 (PTAB Dec. 16, 2014) | 16 |
| <i>Hill-Rom Services, Inc. v. Stryker Corporation</i> , 755 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2014) | 15, 16 |
| <i>In re Translogic Tech., Inc.</i> , 504 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2007) | 17 |
| <i>Intellectual Ventures Mgmt, LLC, v. Xilinx, Inc.</i> , IPR2012-00019, Paper 33 (PTAB February 10, 2014) | 15 |
| <i>Medimmune, LLC v. PDL Biopharma, Inc.</i> , Case No. 08-05590-JF, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21169 (N.D. Cal., Feb. 22, 2010) | 30 |
| <i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc) | 15 |
| <i>Universal Remote Control, Inc. v. Universal Electronics, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00127, Paper 32 (PTAB June 30, 2014) | 15 |
| <i>Vivid Techs., Inc. v. Am. Sci. & Eng’g, Inc.</i> , 200 F.3d 795 (Fed. Cir. 1999) | 16 |

Wellman, Inc. v. Eastman Chem. Co.,
642 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2011)16, 23

Wowza Media Sys., LLC v. Adobe Systems Inc.,
IPR2013-00054, No. 12 (PTAB Apr. 8, 2013).....15

Zenon Envtl., Inc. v. United States Filter Corp. (“Zenon”),
506 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2007)30, 31

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 42.107 1

37 C.F.R. § 100(b); Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg.
48,756, 48,766 (Aug. 14, 2012).....15

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.