

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

DELL INC.; EMC CORPORATION; HEWLETT-PACKARD
ENTERPRISE CO.; HP ENTERPRISE SERVICES, LLC; TERADATA
OPERATIONS, INC.; and VERITAS TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,
Petitioners,

v.

REALTIME DATA LLC d/b/a IXO,
Patent Owner.

Case: IPR2017-00176¹

* * * * *

Case: IPR2017-00806

[Consolidated]

Patent No. 7,161,506

**PETITIONERS' BRIEF PURSUANT TO
THE BOARD'S FEBRUARY 23rd ORDER**

¹ Case IPR2017-01688 has been joined with this proceeding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. *SCHULHAUSER* APPLIES TO CLAIMS 104 AND 1051

II. PETITIONERS’ REPLY ARGUMENTS WERE PROPER2

 A. The Full Factual Basis of Petitioners’ *Prima Facie* Case Was Set
 Forth in its Petition2

 B. Petitioners’ Reply Arguments Respond to the PO Response2

 C. PO Has Had Notice and a Fair Opportunity to Respond3

III. *SCHULHAUSER* IS SOUND AND BINDING AUTHORITY3

 A. The Board’s SOPs Require the Board to Apply *Schulhauser*.....3

 B. *Schulhauser* Was Correctly Decided4

IV. CONCLUSION5

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Aqua Prod., Inc. v. Matal</i> , 872 F.3d 1290 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	4
<i>Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC</i> , 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	3
<i>Cybersettle, Inc. v. Nat'l Arbitration Forum, Inc.</i> , 243 F. App'x 603, 607 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	5
<i>EmeraChem Holdings, LLC v. Volkswagen Group of Am.</i> , 859 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	3
<i>Ex parte Schulhauser</i> , 2016 WL 6277792, No. 2013-007847, 8-9 (PTAB Apr. 28, 2016)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Ex parte Urbanet</i> , Appeal 2011-002606, 2012 WL 4460637 (PTAB Sept. 19, 2012)	5
<i>Fresenius USA, Inc. v. Baxter Int'l, Inc.</i> , 582 F.3d 1288, 1298 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	5
<i>In re Johnston</i> , 435 F.3d 1381 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	5
<i>In re Kollar</i> , 286 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	4
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.</i> , 789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	4
<i>Netword, LLC v. Centraal Corp.</i> , 242 F.3d 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	3
<i>Reactive Surfaces LTD., LLP, v. Toyota Motor Corporation</i> , IPR2016-01914, Paper 60 (PTAB Jan. 12, 2018)	3
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. v. Infobridge Pte. Ltd.</i> , IPR2017-00100, 2017 WL 1534929 (Apr. 26, 2017)	5

Scripps Clinic & Research Found. v. Genentech, Inc., 927 F.2d 1565,
1583 (Fed. Cir. 1991)5

Skky, Inc. v. MindGeek, s.a.r.l., 859 F.3d 1014 (Fed. Cir. 2017)3

OTHER AUTHORITIES

37 C.F.R. §§ 42.25(b), 42.23(b).....2, 3

MPEP, § 2111.045

PTAB Standard Operating Procedure No. 2 Rev. 9 (Sept. 22, 2014)5

Petitioners submit this brief pursuant to the Board’s February 23, 2018 Order Authorizing Additional Briefing. *See* Paper 38. *Schulhauser* is applicable to claims 104 and 105, is sound under the law, and, as precedent, should be followed here. Finally, Petitioners’ reliance on *Schulhauser* in their reply was proper.

I. **SCHULHAUSER APPLIES TO CLAIMS 104 AND 105**

The Board’s Order in *Ex parte Schulhauser*, No. 2013-007847, at 8-10 (PTAB Apr. 28, 2016) (precedential) holds that when a patentee drafts method claims in a format where one step of the method is performed to the exclusion of another (e.g., “if X, then Y; if not X, then Z”), only one step needs to be disclosed or rendered obvious by the prior art. In other words, the claim covers two distinct methods: one in which the prerequisite condition is met, and another in which the prerequisite condition is unmet. *Schulhauser* at 8. A finding that ***either one of the two distinct methods*** would have been obvious is all that is required. *See id.* at 8-10.

As explained in the Reply, claims 104 and 105 are drafted in precisely the same manner as those at issue in *Schulhauser*. Reply at 20-23. Each is a method claim that requires performance of one of two compression steps—to the exclusion of the other—depending on whether a prerequisite condition is satisfied, e.g., “a data type of the data block is identified” (claim 104). Ex. 1001 at 2:41-43. Thus, under *Schulhauser*, the prior art asserted by Petitioners needs to satisfy ***only one*** of the two conditional steps to render the claim anticipated or obvious.

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.