

Filed: August 25, 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

---

**APPLE INC.**

Petitioner,

v.

**VOIP-PAL.COM, INC.,**

Patent Owner

---

Case No. IPR2017-01398

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.....	4
A. Introduction to Claimed Subject Matter.....	4
B. Grounds 1 and 2 Fail Because None of the References Disclose a Caller [First Participant] Dialing Profile .....	6
1. Chu '684 Does Not Disclose A Caller Dialing Profile As Recited In The Claims .....	7
a. Overview of Chu '684 .....	7
b. The “Subscriber” Dial Plans in Chu '684 Are Enterprise Dial Plans .....	9
c. Petitioner Has Admitted That Chu '684 Uses the Word “Subscriber” To Mean an Enterprise Rather Than an Individual Caller .....	11
d. Petitioner Has Admitted That Chu '684 Does Not Disclose a Caller Dialing Profile .....	14
e. Despite Previous Admissions, the Present Petition Adopts A Misinterpretation of Chu '684 .....	18
f. Enterprise Dial Plans Cannot Be Relied On To Demonstrate The Claims Are Obvious .....	22
2. Scott Does Not Disclose a Caller Profile As Recited In The Claims .....	24
a. Overview of Scott.....	24

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

	<b>Page No.</b>
b.    The Gateway Application Settings of Scott Is Not a Caller Dialing Profile.....	26
c.    The Petition Does Not Assert That the Gateway Application Settings in Scott Are Caller-Specific .....	26
3.    Hinchey Does Not Disclose a Caller Dialing Profile As Recited In the Claims .....	27
a.    Overview of Hinchey.....	27
b.    The “Dial Plan Schema” of Hinchey Is Not a Caller Profile.....	28
c.    The Petition Does Not Assert That the Dial Plan Schemas of Hinchey Are Caller-Specific.....	29
C.    Grounds 1 and 2 Fail Because Petitioner has Misconstrued Claim 1 as Not Requiring an Order of Steps [1a] and steps [1b] and [1c] .....	30
1.    Steps [1b] and [1c] depend upon step [1a] .....	30
2.    The Board Must Resolve a Claim Construction Dispute .....	31
3.    Petitioner Cites to Steps Performed in the Wrong Order .....	31
D.    Grounds 1 and 2 Fail Because Petitioner’s Proposed Combination Would be Inoperative .....	33
1.    Petitioner Has Proposed a Manner of Combining Chu ’684 With Scott That Does Not Work.....	33

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

	<b>Page No.</b>
2. Petitioner Acknowledged In the Previous IPR Proceedings That the Manner of Combination Was Defective .....	37
3. Petitioner Has Not Refuted Patent Owner’s Previous Arguments Regarding the Inoperative Nature of the Proposed Combinations .....	42
4. Reformatting Only Calls Destined for the PSTN Would be the Operative Manner of Combination .....	43
a. Chu ’684 Classifies Calls Using a Prefix Digit As Is Standard For PBX Systems .....	43
b. Petitioner’s Assertion That Chu ’684 Does Not Operate Like a Conventional PBX is Unsupported.....	44
c. Petitioner’s Declarant Admitted That Using a Prefix Digit With Chu ’684 Would Solve The Corruption Of Private Numbers .....	47
d. Petitioner’s Proposed Combination Is Based on Hindsight.....	48
E. Grounds 1 and 2 Fail Because Petitioner’s Proposed Motivation to Combine is Flawed.....	50
1. Petitioner Cites a Non-Existent Deficiency in Chu ’684 as a Reason to Combine References.....	50
2. Petitioner’s Arguments That Users of Chu ’684 Cannot Dial As If On the PSTN Are Unsupported.....	52
F. This Follow-On Petition Should be Denied Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 314(a) and/or 325(d).....	53

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

	<b>Page No.</b>
1. The Petition Is Unjustified Under the Factors For 35 U.S.C. § 314(a) .....	55
a. Same petitioner, same independent claims.....	56
b. Petitioner uses the same primary reference, and should have known of the second reference .....	57
c. The earlier proceeding was far along when second Petition was filed .....	58
d. Nearly a year had lapsed between petition filings .....	58
e. Petitioner does not explain the purpose for its belated second attack .....	59
f. Conclusion .....	60
2. Petitioner will be estopped from maintaining this proceeding .....	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.