

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MICROSOFT CORPORATION
Petitioner

v.

PROXYCONN, INC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2017-00261
U.S. Patent No. 6,757,717 B1
Issued: June 29, 2004
Application No. 09/398,007
Filed: September 16, 1999
Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR DATA ACCESS

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF CLAIM
NOS. 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 25, 26, AND 27 OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,757,717**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS FOR A PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW	1
A. Real Party-In-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1))	1
B. Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)).....	1
C. Lead And Back-Up Counsel And Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3) and (4)).....	3
D. Fee For <i>Inter Partes</i> Review (37 C.F.R. § 42.15(a))	3
E. Exhibit List (37 C.F.R. § 42.63(e))	3
F. Grounds For Standing (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a))	3
G. Identification Of Challenge (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)).....	5
II. PRIOR ART.....	6
A. The Five Prior Art References Disclosed Both Claimed Ideas.....	6
B. Each Reference Qualifies As Prior Art	7
C. Prior Art’s Disclosures	9
1. The Art Recognized The Redundant Data Problem And Its Causes.....	9
2. The Art Disclosed Common Mathematical Solutions To This Problem	11
3. DRP (Ex. 1005) Discloses Checking By Fingerprint To Address All Three Data-Redundancy Scenarios	13
4. Mattis (Ex. 1006) Discloses Implementation Details For Storing, Verifying And Searching For Data By Its Fingerprint	15
5. Williams (Ex. 1002) Discloses Sending Fingerprints For Desired And Overlapping Data In The Same Message	17

D.	Background Art	21
1.	Admitted Art	21
2.	Santos (Ex. 1004).....	23
3.	Perlman (Ex. 1003)	24
III.	'717 PATENT'S ALLEGED INVENTION	25
A.	The Specification.....	25
B.	Claims 15-17 And 19-21 Are Directed To Searching Or Verifying By Fingerprint To Reduce Data Redundancies.....	28
C.	Claims 25-27 Are Directed To Searching By Fingerprint To Reduce Data Redundancies.....	29
IV.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	29
V.	GROUND 1: DRP (EX. 1005) ANTICIPATES CLAIM 16	30
VI.	FOUNDATIONS 2-4 (OBVIOUSNESS OF CLAIMS 15, 17, 19-21, 25-27).....	31
A.	Admissions Regarding Level Of Skill In The Art	31
B.	Ground 2: Claim 15 Was Obvious Over DRP (Ex. 1005) In View Of Williams (Ex. 1002)	33
C.	Ground 3: Claims 17, 19 And 20 Were Obvious Over DRP (Ex. 1005) In View Of Mattis (Ex. 1006).....	36
1.	Claim 17's Preamble.....	36
2.	Claim 17's First Step ("creating and transmitting digital digests ...").....	39
3.	Claim 17's Second Step ("receiving a response signal")	41
4.	Claim 17's Conditional Third Step ("transmitting a signal constituting the difference ...")	43
5.	Claim 19 ("creates said digital digest ...")	44
6.	Claim 20 ("digital digest is obtained ...")	44

D.	Ground 4: Claims 21 And 25-27 Were Obvious Over DRP (Ex. 1005) In View Of Mattis (Ex. 1006) And Williams (Ex. 1002)	46
1.	The “Method” Of Claim 21 Was Obvious.....	46
2.	The “Methods” Of Claims 25-27 Were Obvious	48
3.	Claim 25’s Preamble.....	48
4.	Claim 25’s First Step (“receiving a message ...”).....	50
5.	Claim 25’s Second Step (“searching in predetermined locations ...”)	53
6.	Claim 25’s Third Step (“searching in predetermined locations ...”)	56
7.	Claim 25’s Conditional Fourth Step (“forming a partial indication signal ...”).....	57
8.	Claim 26 (“searching the network cache ...”).....	57
9.	Claim 27 (“searching said network cache ...”)	59
E.	These Combinations Of DRP, Mattis, And Williams Were Obvious.....	59
1.	Same Problem	60
2.	Same Solution	61
3.	Same Application.....	61
4.	Mattis (Ex. 1006) Contemplates DRP-Type Requests	62
5.	No Teaching Away	62
6.	Summary	62
F.	No Objective Indicia Of Non-Obviousness	63
VII.	THE SKELETAL ’717 SPECIFICATION	63
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	63

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

Atl. Gas Light Co. v. Bennett Regulator Guards,
IPR2015-00826, Paper 12, 2015 WL 5159438 (PTAB Sept. 1, 2015).....4

In re Epstein,
32 F.3d 1559 (Fed. Cir. 1994) 33, 63

In re Fox,
471 F.2d 1405 (CCPA 1973)..... 33, 63

In re Freeman,
30 F.3d 1459 (Fed. Cir. 1994)7, 31

In re Tiffin,
448 F.2d 791 (CCPA 1971).....63

In re Vamco Machine & Tool, Inc.,
752 F.2d 1564 (Fed. Cir. 1985)63

Macauto U.S.A. v. BOS GmbH & KG,
IPR2012-00004, Paper 18, 2013 WL 5947694 (PTAB Jan. 24, 2013).....4

Microsoft Corp. v. Parallel Networks Licensing, LLC,
IPR2015-483, Paper 10, 2015 WL 4760578 (PTAB July 15, 2015)5

Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn, Inc.,
789 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2015)30

Perfect Web Techs., Inc. v. InfoUSA, Inc.,
587 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2009)59

Stephen Slesinger, Inc. v. Disney Enterprises, Inc.,
702 F.3d 640 (Fed. Cir. 2012)8

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.