

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

KINGSTON TECHNOLOGY COMPANY, INC.  
Petitioner

v.

SPEX TECHNOLOGIES, INC.  
Patent Owner

Patent No. 6,088,802  
Filing Date: June 4, 1997  
Issue Date: July 11, 2000  
Title: PERIPHERAL DEVICE WITH INTEGRATED SECURITY  
FUNCTIONALITY

---

**SPEX TECHNOLOGIES, INC.'S  
PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

Case No. IPR2017-00824

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page(s)</u></b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. PETITIONER IDENTIFIED THREE KINGSTON PARTIES AS REAL PARTIES-IN-INTEREST .....	4
III. THE PETITION SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED BECAUSE PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO CONSTRUE THE MEANS-PLUS-FUNCTION CLAIM TERMS AND HAS TAKEN INCONSISTENT CLAIM CONSTRUCTION POSITIONS .....	5
IV. PETITIONER'S LITIGATION POSITION THAT MANY TERMS OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE INDEFINITE MANDATES DENIAL OF THE PETITION. ....	7
V. PETITIONER HAS NOT DEMONSTRATED A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS FOR THE GROUNDS ADVANCED IN THE PETITION, AND THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED. ....	10
A. Requirements for Showing Anticipation Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. § 103.....	10
B. Ground I: Claims 1-3, 6-8, 11-15, 23-28, and 36-39 Are Not Obvious Over Jones.....	13
1. Petitioner Failed to Show that the Claimed “Security Means” Is Disclosed in Jones .....	14
2. Petitioner Failed to Show that the Claimed “Means for Operably Connecting” Is Disclosed in Jones.....	16
3. Petitioner Failed to Show that the Claimed “Means for Mediating Communications . . . so that the Communicated Data Must First Pass through the Security Means” Is Disclosed in Jones .....	17
4. Petitioner Failed to Show that Jones Discloses “Receiving a Request from a Host Computing Device	

for Information Regarding the Type of the Peripheral  
Device” as Recited in Claims 38 .....24

C. Ground II: Claims 1, 11, 23, 36, and 39 Are Not Obvious over  
Jones in View of Schwartz and/or Kimura .....25

D. Ground III: Claims 3, 8, 15, and 28 Are Not Obvious Over  
Jones in View of Common Interface Specification .....28

E. Ground IV: Claims 14 and 17 Are Not Obvious Over Jones in  
View of Clay .....28

VI. CONCLUSION.....29

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Contentguard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00355 (PTAB June 26, 2015) .....	11
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Contentguard Holdings, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00456 (PTAB June 15, 2015) .....	7
<i>Apple Inc. v. Immersion Corp.</i> , IPR2016-01372 (Jan. 11, 2017).....	9
<i>Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.</i> , 732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir 2013) .....	12
<i>Fresenius USA, Inc. v. Baxter Int’l, Inc.</i> , 582 F.3d 1288, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	10, 15, 23, 26
<i>Golight, Inc. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</i> , 355 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	14
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	11
<i>Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	12
<i>Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	12, 29
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	11, 27, 28
<i>Los Angeles Biomedical Research Inst. at Harbor-UCLA Med. Ctr. v. Eli Lilly &amp; Co.</i> , 849 F.3d 1049 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	12
<i>Net MoneyIN, Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	10
<i>Pers. Web Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	11

*Space Exploration Techs. Corp. v. Blue Origin LLC*,  
IPR2014-01378 (Mar. 3, 2015) .....8

*Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.*,  
713 F.2d 1530 (Fed. Cir. 1983) .....11

*Transclean Corp. v. Bridgewood Servs., Inc.*,  
290 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2002) .....10

*In re Van Os*,  
844 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....12

*Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co. of Cal.*,  
814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987) .....10

*Williamson v. Citrix Online, LLC*,  
792 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....6

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 102 .....10

35 U.S.C. § 103 .....10

35 U.S.C. § 112 .....8, 9

35 U.S.C. § 314(a) .....4

**Other Authorities**

37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1).....4

37 C.F.R. §42.104(b) .....5, 13, 15, 19

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3).....7, 14

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4).....1

# 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.