

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CIM MAINTENANCE INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

P&RO SOLUTIONS GROUP, INC.

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-00516

Patent 8,209,205

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO
PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
OF CLAIMS 1-20 OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,209,205
UNDER 35 USC §§ 311-319 AND 37 CFR §42.100 ET SEQ.**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. OVERVIEW OF THE '205 PATENT3

III. PROSECUTION HISTORY OF THE '205 PATENT.....6

IV. INSTITUTION SHOULD BE DENIED FOR ALL GROUNDS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(D) BECAUSE THE SAME OR SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME PRIOR ART OR ARGUMENTS WERE PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED TO THE OFFICE.....8

A. Institution Should Be Denied for Grounds 1-3 Based on the Combination of Eller and Best Practice Guideline Because the Patent Office Already Considered the Same or Substantially the Same Prior Art or Argument9

B. Institution Should Be Denied for Grounds 4-6 Based on the Combination of Eller and Palmer Because the Patent Office Already Considered the Same Prior Art.....12

V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....14

A. The Broadest Reasonable Interpretation of “Short Notice Outage Sections” Should Be “a Portion of the User Interface that Displays Planned Outages of Short Duration for the Purpose of Performing Maintenance,” Which is Consistent With the Previous BPAI Construction.....15

B. Petitioner’s First Proposed Construction of “Short Notice Outage Sections” has Already Been Rejected by the BPAI.....17

C. Petitioner’s Second Proposed Construction of “Short Notice Outage Sections” Erroneously Purports to be Consistent with the BPAI Construction18

VI. DESCRIPTION OF PRIMARY PRIOR ART REFERENCE ELLER.19

VII. THE PETITION FAILS TO ESTABLISH A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF UNPATENTABILITY OF ANY CLAIM.....20

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------|
| A. | Grounds 1-3: The Petition Fails to Establish that the Claims Are Obvious over the Combination of Eller and Best Practice Guideline | 22 |
| 1. | The PTAB Should Deny Institution on Grounds 1-3 Because the Patent Office Already Considered the Same or Substantially the Same Prior Art or Arguments | 22 |
| 2. | Petitioner Acknowledges that Neither Eller Nor Best Practice Guideline Discloses “Short Notice Outage Sections” Under the Proper Construction | 23 |
| 3. | The Petition Fails to Establish that Best Practice Guideline is a Printed Publication..... | 23 |
| 4. | Neither Eller nor Best Practice Guideline Teaches Moving Work Orders from One Week to Another Week | 31 |
| 5. | The Petition Fails to Establish that Claim 4 Is Obvious Over the Combination of Eller and Best Practice Guideline..... | 33 |
| 6. | Ground 3: The Petition Fails to Establish that Walkenbach is a Printed Publication..... | 36 |
| a. | The Dates and the Webpage Printout are Inadmissible Under the Federal Rules of Evidence..... | 37 |
| b. | Even if Admissible, Petitioner’s Evidence Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood that Walkenbach Was Publicly Accessible Prior to the Critical Date..... | 40 |
| B. | Grounds 4-6: The Petition Fails to Establish that the Claims are Obvious over the Combination of Eller and Palmer | 42 |
| 1. | The PTAB Should Deny Institution on Grounds 4-6 Because the Patent Office Already Considered the Same or Substantially the Same Prior Art..... | 42 |
| 2. | Neither Eller nor Palmer Teaches Moving Work Orders from One Week to Another Week | 43 |
| 3. | The Petition Fails to Establish that Claim 4 Is Obvious over the Combination of Eller and Palmer | 44 |
| 4. | The Petition Fails to Establish that Palmer is a Prior Art Printed Publication | 46 |

a. The Dates and the Webpage Printout are Inadmissible Under the Federal Rules of Evidence46

b. Even if Admissible, Petitioner’s Evidence Fails to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood that Palmer Was Publicly Accessible Prior to the Critical Date47

5. Grounds 5 and 6: The Petition Fails to Establish a Motivation to Combine Sinex and Walkenbach with Eller and Palmer.....49

6. Ground 6: The Petition Fails to Establish that Walkenbach is a Printed Publication.....53

VIII. CONCLUSION53

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| | Page(s) |
|--|----------------|
| CASES | |
| <i>ADVA Optical Networking, Inc. v. Rad Data Communications Ltd.</i> , IPR2016-01848, Paper 6, 2017 WL 951368 (PTAB Mar. 9, 2017)..... | 11, 14 |
| <i>Apotex Inc. v. Wyeth LLC</i> , IPR2014-00115, Paper 94 (PTAB Apr. 20, 2015) | 35, 44, 49 |
| <i>Apple Inc. v. DSS Technology Management, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00373, Paper 8 (PTAB June 25, 2015) | 37 |
| <i>Blue Calypso, LLC v. Groupon, Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2016) | 27, 28 |
| <i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. C-Cation Technologies, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00454, Paper 12, 2014 WL 4352301 (Aug. 29, 2014)..... | 51 |
| <i>Dominion Dealer Solutions, LLC v. AutoAlert, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00223, Paper 9 (PTAB Aug. 15, 2013)..... | 50, 51 |
| <i>Duk San Neolux Co., Ltd. v. Idemitsu Kosan Co., Ltd.</i> , IPR2017-00197, Paper 10, 2017 WL 1216064 (PTAB Mar. 31, 2017) | 9 |
| <i>EMC Corp. v. PersonalWeb Technologies, LLC et al.</i> , IPR2013-00084, Paper 64 (PTAB May 15, 2014) | 38 |
| <i>Ex Parte Jay S. Walker, Paul T. Breitenbach, Daniel E. Tedesco, Sih Y. Lee, Paul D. Signorelli, Geoffrey M. Gelman, & James A. Jorasch</i> , APL 2010-005478 (PTO Feb. 28, 2011) | 13 |
| <i>Ex Parte Sharad Nishith & Gulshan Garg</i> , APL 2006-2286 (PTO Nov. 27, 2006) | 13 |
| <i>Ex Parte Thomas L. Mikes & Lian Xing</i> , APL 2006-2172 (PTO Feb. 1, 2007) | 13 |

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.