

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

VIPTELA, INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

FATPIPE NETWORKS PRIVATE LIMITED,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-00684

U.S. Patent No. 6,775,235

RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	1
II.	The '235 patent	1
III.	Person of ordinary skill in the art	6
IV.	Claim construction	7
V.	Overview of Karol.....	8
VI.	Claims 6 and 22-24 are not anticipated by Karol.....	15
	A. The item to be modified is the final destination IP address in the incoming packet.	15
	B. Protocol and header conversions do not require modifications to the destination IP address	17
	C. The actual destination IP address in the incoming packet in is not modified in the protocol conversion process of Karol.	23
	D. Petitioner and Petitioner's Expert improperly construe claim 6 by failing to understand the '235 patent specification.....	34
VII.	Claims 6 and 22-24 are not obvious over Karol.	38
VIII.	Claim 6 is patentable over Karol in view of Stallings.	41
IX.	Claims 5-6 and 22-24 are not anticipated by Karol or obvious over Karol alone or in view of Stallings.	44
	A. Claims 5 and 22 are patentable over Karol alone or in view of Stallings.	44
	1. Karol does not anticipate claim 5 or 22.....	45
	2. Karol does not render obvious claim 5.....	48
	3. Karol in view of Stallings does not render obvious claims 5 and 22.....	51
X.	Conclusion.....	55

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102.....	2
35 U.S.C. § 103.....	2, 3
35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....	1, 2, 9, 10

Rules

37 C.F.R. § 42.107.....	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b).....	9

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.120 Exclusive Licensee, FatPipe, Inc. ("FatPipe" or "Patent Owner"), submits this Response to Petition for *Inter Partes* Review ("Response") to the Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of United States Patent No. 6,775,235 filed by Petitioner, Viptela, Inc. ("Viptela" or "Petitioner").

I. Introduction

The technologies described by the prior art relied upon by the Petitioner and the subject matter described by claims 6 and 22-24 of the '235 patent differ fundamentally both in their purpose and their result. The differences are clear based on the plain meaning of these claims when viewed in light of the specification such that there is a stark deficiency in Petitioner's analysis. This Response demonstrates that Karol and the additional prior art do *not* render the challenged claims unpatentable.

II. The '235 patent

The '235 patent describes a system that dynamically load-balances over WAN paths on disparate networks. Specifically, the '235 patent is directed to a controller that interfaces with a site and "two or more disparate networks in parallel" to "provide load balancing across

network connections, greater reliability, and/or increased security.” (Ex. 1001, Abstract). The '235 patent's claimed invention represented a major advancement in the field of computer networking. (See, e.g., Ex. 2011, p. 2). Sanchaita Datta, the first-named inventor on the '235 patent, was honored as a “Women Innovator” by the Women Tech Council for her major impact on technology for, among other things, the innovations claimed in the '235 patent. (Ex. 2007).

Prior art approaches did not combine two or more disparate networks in parallel to provide benefits such as dynamic per-packet load-balancing. (Ex. 1001, col. 4:40–45). Prior art Fig. 2 (below), for example, used a primary network (the frame relay network 106) and only used the secondary network (the ISDN network 204) when the primary network failed. (Ex. 1001, col. 3:18–28). The primary network path is used for most or all of traffic while the other path is used only when the primary path fails. (Ex. 1001, col. 9:55–65). The prior art configuration of Fig. 2 does not consider load balancing on a packet-by-packet basis, or provide security by splitting and distributing pieces of messages between disparate networks. (Ex. 1001, col. 9:65–10:3).

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.