

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

INTEL CORPORATION,

Petitioner,

v.

ALACRITECH INC.,

Patent Owner

Case IPR2017-01392

U.S. Patent 7,337,241

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 313 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. OVERVIEW OF THE ‘241 PATENT	5
A. The ‘241 Patent Specification	5
B. The ‘241 Patent Claims	10
III. PROSECUTION HISTORY OF THE ‘241 PATENT	15
IV. OVERVIEW OF THE ASSERTED PRIOR ART.....	17
A. U.S. Patent No. 5,768,618 (“Erickson”)	18
B. Tanenbaum, Computer Networks, 3rd ed. (1996) (“Tanenbaum”).....	20
C. “Gigabit Ethernet Technical Brief: Achieving End-to- End Performance” (“Alteon”).....	21
D. Dr. Min Testified He Had “No Opinion” on the Prior Art	22
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	23
A. Intel’s Petition Should Be Denied Because It Alleges Challenged Claims 1-8 and 17-24 Are Indefinite	23
B. “[first/second] mechanism” (claims 1-5, 7, 8, 17, 20, 23).....	25
C. “without an interrupt dividing” (claims 1, 18, 22).....	27
VI. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY THE PETITION BECAUSE IT FAILS TO DISCLOSE ALL REAL PARTIES IN INTEREST	28
A. Intel Effectively Controls Dell	30
B. The Relationship Between Intel and Dell is Sufficiently Close.....	32
C. Dell Desires Review of the ‘241 Patent	34
D. Intel Dell Have Coordinated Interest and Action in Challenging the ‘241 Patent.....	34
E. Intel Has Effective Choice as to the Legal Theories and Proofs of Dell and Cavium.....	36
F. Finding Dell and Cavium Are Real Parties in Interest Is Consistent with Legislative Intent.....	37

VII. THE BOARD SHOULD DECLINE INSTITUTION UNDER
35 U.S.C. § 325(D) BECAUSE ALL THE PRIOR ART HAS
ALREADY BEEN CONSIDERED BY THE OFFICE..... 38

VIII. THERE IS NO REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT INTEL
WILL PREVAIL UNDER GROUND 1 (OBVIOUSNESS IN
VIEW OF ERICKSON, TANENBAUM, AND ALTEON)..... 39

A. Petitioner Has Not Shown Alteon is Prior Art..... 40

B. None of the References Show Validation of Layer
Headers “Without An Interrupt Dividing the Processing”
of the Layer Headers 43

IX. THERE IS NO REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT INTEL
WILL PREVAIL UNDER GROUND 2 (OBVIOUSNESS IN
VIEW OF ERICKSON AND TANENBAUM)..... 45

X. THERE IS NO REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT INTEL
WILL PREVAIL UNDER GROUND 3 (OBVIOUSNESS IN
VIEW OF ERICKSON, TANENBAUM, AND ALTEON)..... 49

XI. ALACRITECH RESERVES ITS RIGHTS UNDER THE
PENDING *OIL STATES* CASE AT THE UNITED STATES
SUPREME COURT 50

XII. CONCLUSION 50

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page</u>
Cases	
<i>Alacritech, Inc. v. CenturyLink, Inc.</i> , 2:16-cv-00693-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex.)	1, 31
<i>Alacritech, Inc. v. Dell Inc.</i> , 2:16-cv-00695-RWS-RSP (E.D. Tex.).....	1, 31
<i>Alacritech, Inc. v. Wistron Corp.</i> , 2:16-cv-00692-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex.)	1, 31
<i>ams AG v. 511 Innovations, Inc.</i> , Case IPR2016-01788 (PTAB Mar. 15, 2017)	26
<i>Benson & Ford, Inc. v. Wanda Petroleum Co.</i> , 833 F.2d 1172 (5th Cir. 1987).....	36
<i>Bruckelmyer v. Ground Heaters, Inc.</i> , 445 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	46
<i>Cox Commc 'ns, Inc. v. Sprint Commc 'n Co. LP</i> , 838 F.3d 1224 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	27, 28
<i>In re Cronyn</i> , 890 F.2d 1158 (Fed. Cir. 1989).....	47
<i>In re Hall</i> , 781 F.2d 897 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	45
<i>In re Steele</i> , 305 F.2d 859 (CCPA 1962).....	26
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2120 (2014)	30
<i>Oil States Energy Servs. LLC v. Greene 's Energy Group, LLC</i> , Case No. 16-712 (U.S. Jun. 12, 2017).....	55
<i>Williamson v. Citrix Online, LLC</i> , 792 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	27
Statutory Authorities	
35 U.S.C. § 102(b)	45
35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	1
35 U.S.C. 112.....	25
35 U.S.C. 112(f).....	25
35 U.S.C. § 112(6)	24
35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(2).....	31
35 U.S.C. § 313.....	1

35 U.S.C. § 314..... 5
35 U.S.C. § 314(a) 44
35 U.S.C. § 316(e) 44
35 U.S.C. § 325(D) 42

Rules and Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1) 31
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) 24
37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a) 1
37 C.F.R. § 42.108..... 5
37 C.F.R. § 42.204(b) 25
37 C.F.R. § 42.204(b)(3) 25, 26
Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756 (Aug. 14,
2012)..... 32, 33, 35, 37, 43, 46

Legislative Materials

157 Cong. Rec. S1034 (Mar. 1, 2011)..... 40
H.R. Rept. No 112-98 (2011) (Judiciary Committee Report on H.R.
1249, June 1, 2011) 40

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.