

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

INTEL CORPORATION
Petitioner

v.

ALACRITECH, INC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR. No. **2017-01392**
U.S. Patent No. 7,337,241

Title: FAST-PATH APPARATUS FOR RECEIVING DATA CORRESPONDING
TO A TCP CONNECTION

**Corrected Petition For *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,337,241 Under
35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 and 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.1-.80, 42.100-.123**

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. REQUIREMENTS FOR PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW	1
2.1. Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a))	1
2.2. Notice of Lead and Backup Counsel and Service Information.....	1
2.3. Notice of Real-Parties-in-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)).....	2
2.4. Notice of Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)).....	3
2.5. Fee for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review	14
2.6. Proof of Service.....	14
3. IDENTIFICATION OF CLAIMS BEING CHALLENGED (§ 42.104(B))	14
4. BACKGROUND OF THE TECHNOLOGY	15
4.1. TCP/IP	16
4.2. UDP/IP	20
4.3. Protocol Offload.....	20
5. OVERVIEW OF THE 241 PATENT.....	21
6. 241 PATENT PROSECUTION HISTORY	24
7. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	25
7.1. Applicable Law	25
7.2. Construction of Claim Terms.....	25
7.2.1. “[first/second] mechanism”	26
7.2.2. “without an interrupt dividing”.....	34
8. PERSON HAVING ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	35
9. DESCRIPTION OF THE PRIOR ART	35
9.1. U.S. Patent No. 5,768,618 (“Erickson”)	35
9.2. Tanenbaum96: A. Tanenbaum, Computer Networks, 3rd ed. (1996)	38
9.3. “Gigabit Ethernet Technical Brief: Achieving End-to-End Performance” by Alteon Networks (Ex.1033, “Alteon”)	40

9.4.	Alacritech’s expert admits that almost all of the limitations are found in the prior art.....	42
9.5.	Motivations To Combine Erickson and Tanenbaum96	43
9.6.	Motivations To Combine Erickson, Tanenbaum96, and Alteon	47
10.	GROUND #1: CLAIMS 1-8, 18, 22, AND 23 ARE UNPATENTABLE AS OBVIOUS OVER ERICKSON IN COMBINATION WITH TANENBAUM96 AND ALTEON.....	49
10.1.	Claim 1 is unpatentable as obvious over Erickson in combination with Tanenbaum96 and Alteon	50
10.1.1.	[1.P] A method for network communication, the method comprising:	50
10.1.2.	[1.1] receiving a plurality of packets from the network, each of the packets including a media access control layer header, a network layer header and a transport layer header;	50
10.1.3.	[1.2] processing the packets by a first mechanism, so that for each packet the network layer header and the transport layer header are validated without an interrupt dividing the processing of the network layer header and the transport layer header;	53
10.1.4.	[1.3] sorting the packets, dependent upon the processing, into first and second types of packets, so that the packets of the first type each contain data;.....	55
10.1.5.	[1.4] sending, by the first mechanism, the data from each packet of the first type to a destination in memory allocated to an application without sending any of the media access control layer headers, network layer headers or transport layer headers to the destination.....	56
10.2.	Claim 2 is unpatentable as obvious over Erickson in combination with Tanenbaum96 and Alteon	58

10.2.1.	[2.1] The method of claim 1, wherein processing the packets by a first mechanism further comprises: processing the media access control layer header for each packet without an interrupt dividing the processing of the media access control layer header and the network layer header.....	58
10.3.	Claim 3 is unpatentable as obvious over Erickson in combination with Tanenbaum96 and Alteon	59
10.3.1.	[3.1] The method of claim 1, further comprising: processing an upper layer header of at least one of the packets by a second mechanism, thereby determining the destination, wherein the upper layer header corresponds to a protocol layer above the transport layer.....	59
10.4.	Claim 4 is unpatentable as obvious over Erickson in combination with Tanenbaum96 and Alteon	61
10.4.1.	[4.1] The method of claim 1, further comprising: processing an upper layer header of at least one of the packets of the second type by a second mechanism, thereby determining the destination.....	61
10.5.	Claim 5 is unpatentable as obvious over Erickson in combination with Tanenbaum96 and Alteon	61
10.5.1.	[5.1] The method of claim 1, further comprising: processing a transport layer header of another packet by a second mechanism, prior to receiving the plurality of packets from the network, thereby establishing a Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) connection for the packets of the first type.....	61
10.6.	Claim 6 is unpatentable as obvious over Erickson in combination with Tanenbaum96 and Alteon	63
10.6.1.	[6.1] The method of claim 1, wherein sorting the packets includes classifying each of the packets of the first type as having an Internet Protocol (IP) header and a Transmission Control Protocol (TCP).	63

10.7.	Claim 7 is unpatentable as obvious over Erickson in combination with Tanenbaum96 and Alteon	64
10.7.1.	[7.1.1] The method of claim 1, further comprising: transmitting a second plurality of packets to the network,	64
10.7.2.	[7.1.2] each of the second plurality of packets containing a media access control layer header, a network layer header and a transport layer header,	65
10.7.3.	[7.1.3] including processing the second plurality of packets by the first mechanism, so that for each packet the media access control layer header, the network layer header and the transport layer header are prepended at one time as a packet header.....	67
10.8.	Claim 8 is unpatentable as obvious over Erickson in combination with Tanenbaum96 and Alteon	71
10.8.1.	[8.1] The method of claim 1, wherein the first mechanism is a sequencer running microcode.	71
11.	GROUND #2: CLAIMS 9-24 ARE UNPATENTABLE AS OBVIOUS OVER ERICKSON IN COMBINATION WITH TANENBAUM96.....	71
11.1.	Claim 9 is unpatentable as obvious over Erickson in combination with Tanenbaum96.....	72
11.1.1.	[9.P] A method for communicating information over a network, the method comprising:	72
11.1.2.	[9.1] obtaining data from a source in memory allocated by a first processor;	72
11.1.3.	[9.2] dividing the data into multiple segments;	73
11.1.4.	[9.3.1] prepending a packet header to each of the segments by a second processor, thereby forming a packet corresponding to each segment,	73

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.