

Filed: August 24, 2017

Filed on behalf of:

Patent Owner Voip-Pal.com Inc.

By: Kerry Taylor

John M. Carson

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

2040 Main Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

Irvine, CA 92614

Tel.: (858) 707-4000

Fax: (858) 707-4001

Email: BoxDigifonica@knobbe.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

**AT&T SERVICES, INC.**

Petitioner,

v.

**VoIP-PAL.COM, INC.,**

Patent Owner

---

Case No. IPR2017-01383

U.S. Patent 9,179,005

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO  
PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## Page No.

I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. ARGUMENT .....	5
A. Introduction to Claimed Subject Matter.....	5
B. Ground 1 fails because Fisher and Vu, alone or combined, do not disclose claim elements 74b and 74c as recited in Claim 74 .....	7
1. Overview of Fisher.....	9
2. Fisher does not disclose that the CPEDRE provides the entire routing path for the call to the gateway .....	12
a. Fisher does not disclose the structure(s) that perform the routing step referred to in ¶0047 .....	13
b. Fisher teaches that the CPEDRE routes calls only as far as the PSTN gateway or the VoIP gateway .....	15
c. Fisher teaches that routing beyond the gateways is performed by elements other than the CPEDRE, such as the PSTN gateway 126 or the VoIP gateway 132 .....	17
3. The combination of Fisher and Vu fails to disclose or suggest the subject matter of Claim 74 .....	19
C. Ground 1 Fails Because Neither Reference Discloses a First Participant Profile as Recited in the Claims.....	21
1. There is No Dispute that First Participant Profile Recited in the Claims Requires Caller-Specific Information.....	22
2. Fisher Does Not Disclose A First Participant Profile As Recited In The Claims .....	23

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
**(Cont'd)**

	<b>Page No.</b>
a.    The “Routing Rules” in Fisher Apply to All Callers Using a CPE.....	23
b.    Petitioner Has Admitted That Fisher Doesn’t Disclose A First Participant Profile.....	23
3.    Vu Does Not Disclose A First Participant Profile .....	24
a.    The “Subscriber Profiles” in Vu are Enterprise Specific .....	24
b.    The Petitioner’s Assertions That Vu Discloses Caller Specific Information Are Unsupported .....	25
D.    Ground 1 fails because the motivation to combine is flawed .....	26
1.    Calling plans for callers in Vu are not caller-specific and so modifying the routing rules of Fisher to be caller-specific would not reduce routing costs. ....	27
a.    Fisher discloses a single calling plan for a CPE.....	28
b.    Modifying the routing rules of Fisher to be caller-specific would not reduce routing costs.....	30
2.    The subscriber profiles in Vu are not caller-specific and so the combination of Fisher and Vu would not result in caller-specific routing rules .....	31
E.    Ground 1 fails with respect to Claim 84 because the combination of Fisher and Vu fails to disclose that the address in the first portion is accessible through the first participant’s Internet service provider ....	31
F.    Ground 2 fails because the Petition fails to show how the combination of Nadeau and Kelly “produc[es] a second network routing message ... identifying an address in a second portion of the packet switched network, the second portion not controlled by the entity.” .....	32

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
**(Cont'd)**

	<b>Page No.</b>
1. Overview of Nadeau .....	33
2. Overview of Kelly.....	36
3. The “routing instructions” in Nadeau do not identify the IP-PSTN Gateway.....	37
4. The Petitioner’s assertion that the “routing instructions” in Nadeau “must” include an identification of the IP-PSTN Gateway is unsupported.....	39
5. The Petitioner fails to explain how Nadeau would be modified such that a second network routing message is produced which identifies an address in a second portion of the packet switched network, the second portion not controlled by the entity as recited in the claims .....	43
a. Petitioner proposes to use the call packet produced by Kelly’s gateway selection process as routing instructions in Nadeau .....	46
b. Petitioner fails to explain how modifying Nadeau’s SLC to produce a call packet as taught by Kelly, leads to “producing a second network routing message ... identifying an address in a second portion of the packet switched network, the second portion not controlled by the entity” as claimed .....	46
i. The Petition has not indicated where the call packet would be sent .....	47
ii. The Petition fails to explain how the call packet would be modified such that the proposed combination produces a second network routing message ... identifying an address in a second	

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
**(Cont'd)**

**Page No.**

portion of the packet switched network, the second portion not controlled by the entity.....	49
G. The Petitioner’s rationale for combining Nadeau-Kelly is simplistic and incomplete, and is not fairly based upon the cited arts’ teachings .....	51
1. Petitioner overlooks that Nadeau does not need Kelly’s solution to perform least cost routing, thus there is no motivation to combine .....	53
2. Petitioner fails to explain why a POSITA would have been motivated to modify Nadeau in a manner that is unsupported by the cited art’s teachings.....	56
3. Petitioner’s analysis of the modifications required is too truncated and simplistic to establish a reasonable expectation of success.....	60
III. CONCLUSION .....	65

# 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.