

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Reexam of U.S. Patent No. 7,161,506

FALLON, James J.

Control No.: 95/000,479

Filed: May 28, 2009

For: **SYSTEM AND METHODS FOR  
DATA COMPRESSION SUCH AS  
CONTENT DEPENDENT DATA  
COMPRESSION**

Confirmation No.: 2572

Art Unit: 3992

Examiner: LEUNG, Christina Y.

Atty. Docket: 2855.002REX3

**Realtime's Appeal Brief Under 37 C.F.R. § 41.67**

**Mail Stop "Inter Partes Reexam"**

Attn: Central Reexamination Unit  
Commissioner for Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Pursuant to the Right of Appeal Notice mailed on January 6, 2011, Realtime Data, LLC, (herein "Patent Owner"), in the above-captioned *inter partes* reexamination involving U.S. Patent No. 7,161,506 ("the '506 Patent"), timely filed its Notice of Appeal on February 7, 2011, from the final rejection of claims 1-5, 8, 9, 11, 17, 20-23, 27, 39, 43, 69-73, 79, 81, 82, 84-90, 96 and 98. The third-party requester, Blue Coat Systems, Inc., did not file a notice of cross-appeal, though it had the ability to do so based on its proposed rejections regarding the LBX, French, Sebastian, Franaszek, Lafe, and Reynar references that were not adopted. (RAN at 6-8.) This appeal is therefore limited to issues raised herein. Patent Owner's appeal brief is due on April 21, 2011, (*see* 37 C.F.R. § 41.66(a)).

Patent Owner hereby timely files one electronic copy of this Appeal Brief, together with the required fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 41.20(b)(2). If additional fees are necessary to prevent abandonment of this appeal, then any such fees required therefore are hereby authorized to be charged to the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 19-0036.

### Table of Contents

- I. Real Party in Interest..... 5
- II. Related Appeals and Interferences..... 5
- III. Status of Claims ..... 8
- IV. Status of Amendments ..... 9
- V. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter ..... 9
  - A. Independent Claim 1 ..... 9
  - B. Independent Claim 69 ..... 10
  - C. Independent Claim 86..... 11
- VI. Issues to Be Reviewed on Appeal..... 12
  - A. Ground 1 – Anticipation by U.S. Patent No. 6,253,264 to Sebastian (“Sebastian”) ..... 12
  - B. Ground 2 – Anticipation by U.S. Patent No. 5,870,036 to Franaszek (“Franaszek”) ..... 12
  - C. Ground 3 – Obviousness Over Sebastian in view of Franaszek or U.S. Patent No. 5,951,623 to Reynar (“Reynar”) ..... 12
  - D. Ground 4 – Obviousness Over Sebastian in view of “Data Compression Procedures for Data Circuit Terminating Equipment Using Error Correction Procedures,” CCITT Recommendation V.42 bis, 1990, (“CCITT V.42 bis”) or Reynar ..... 12
  - E. Ground 5 – Obviousness Over Sebastian in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,167,034 to MacLean (“MacLean”) ..... 12
  - F. Ground 6 – Obviousness Over Sebastian in view of International Application WO 95/29437 to Kawashima (“Kawashima”) ..... 13
- VII. Argument ..... 13
  - A. Standard of Review..... 13
  - B. Summary of the Reexamination before the Central Reexamination Unit ..... 13
    - 1. Proposed rejections based on LBX (Low Bandwidth X Extension, Protocol Version 1.0, X Consortium Standard)..... 14
    - 2. Proposed rejections based on French..... 14
    - 3. Proposed rejections based on Sebastian..... 14
    - 4. Proposed rejections based on Franaszek..... 15
    - 5. Proposed rejections based on Lefe..... 16
    - 6. Proposed rejections based on Reynar ..... 16
    - 7. Summary of Reexamination before the CRU ..... 17
  - C. The Problem to Be Solved by the Present Invention ..... 17
  - D. Use of the Term “Analyzing” in the Specification ..... 18
    - 1. Patent Owner is Allowed to be his Own Lexicographer..... 18
    - 2. Patent Owner has Provided a Definition of “Analyzing” ..... 19
    - 3. Dr. Modestino’s Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132 ..... 23
    - 4. The CRU Has Misconstrued the Meaning of “Analyze” ..... 24
    - 5. The CRU Did Not Properly Consider Modestino’s Declaration ..... 25
  - E. Grounds 1 and 2—Rejections of Claims 69, 70, 72, 73, 79, 81, 82, 84 and 85 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Franaszek and Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 11, 17, 21-23, 43, 69, 72, 73, 79 and 81 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Sebastian ..... 26

- 1. Overview of Rejections..... 26
- 2. Franaszek does not Disclose “Analyzing a Data Block” to “Identify One or More Data Types of the Data Block,” or “Analyzing said Data Block to Determine a Type of said Data Block” ..... 26
- 3. Sebastian does not disclose “Analyzing a Data Block” to “Identify One or More Data Types of the Data Block,” or “Analyzing said Data Block to Determine a Type of said Data Block” ..... 30
- 4. Conclusion ..... 32
- F. Ground 3 – Rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Over Sebastian in view of Franaszek or Reynar ..... 33
  - 1. Overview of Rejection ..... 33
  - 2. Sebastian in view of Franaszek or Reynar does not disclose “Analyzing a Data Block of an Input Data Stream to Identify One or More Data Types of the Data Block” ..... 33
  - 3. Conclusion ..... 33
- G. Ground 4 – Rejection of claims 27 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Over Sebastian in view of CCITT V.42 bis or Reynar ..... 34
  - 1. Overview of Rejection ..... 34
  - 2. Sebastian in view of CCITT V.42 bis or Reynar does not disclose “Analyzing a Data Block of an Input Data Stream to Identify One or More Data Types of the Data Block” ..... 34
  - 3. Conclusion ..... 35
- H. Ground 5 – Rejection of claim 82 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Over Sebastian in view of MacLean ..... 35
  - 1. Overview of Rejection ..... 35
  - 2. Sebastian in view of MacLean does not disclose “Analyzing said Data Block to Determine a Type of said Data Block” ..... 35
  - 3. Conclusion ..... 36
- I. Ground 6 – Rejection of claims 70, 71, 84-90, 96 and 98 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Over Sebastian in view of Kawashima ..... 36
  - 1. Overview of Rejection ..... 36
  - 2. Regarding claims 70, 71, 84 and 85, Sebastian in view of Kawashima does not disclose “Analyzing said Data Block to Determine a Type of said Data Block” ..... 36
  - 3. Regarding claims 86-90, 96 and 98, Sebastian in view of Kawashima does not Disclose “Determining Whether to Output said Data Block in Received Form or in a Compressed Form” or “Determining Whether to Compress Said Data Block with Content Dependent Data Compression Based on the Type of Said Data Block” ..... 37
  - 4. A Person of Ordinary Skill Would Not Combine Sebastian and Kawashima..... 38
  - 5. Conclusion ..... 42
- J. Conclusion ..... 43
- VIII. Claims Appendix ..... 44
- IX. Evidence Appendix ..... 52
- X. Related Proceedings Appendix ..... 53

XI. Certificate of Service ..... 54

## ***I. Real Party in Interest***

The real party in interest in this principal brief on appeal is the patent owner Realtime Data LLC, (Patent Owner). The Patent Owner is the assignee of record for the patent under reexamination, U.S. Patent No. 7,161,506 (“the ‘506 patent”), attached as Exhibit A. The original assignment for the priority filing for the ‘506 patent was recorded with the United States Patent & Trademark Office on August 10, 2010 at reel 024812, frame 0268. The original assignment establishing Patent Owner’s ownership of the ‘506 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

## ***II. Related Appeals and Interferences***

All prior and pending appeals, interferences or judicial proceedings known to Patent Owner, Patent Owner’s legal representatives, or assignee that may be related to, directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board’s decision in the pending appeal are listed below. In addition, a summary of related Appeal Briefs for Reexam control numbers 95/000,464 and 95/000,478 is also presented below.

### **Reexaminations**

<b>Reexam #</b>	<b>Patent #</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Status</b>
90/009,428	6,601,104	System and Methods for Accelerated Data Storage and Retrieval	Decision affirming Examiner’s rejections mailed 3/18/11
95/000,464	6,624,761	Content Independent Data Compression Method and System	Notice of Appeal filed 2/7/2011, Appeal Brief filed 4/21/2011

# 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.