

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

INTEL CORP. and CAVIUM, INC.,

Petitioners,

v.

ALACRITECH, INC.,

Patent Owner

Case IPR2017-01406¹
U.S. Patent No. 7,673,072

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

¹ Cavium, Inc., which filed a Petition in Case IPR2017-01707, has been joined as a petitioner in this proceeding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND OF THE TECHNOLOGY	2
III. OVERVIEW OF THE '072 PATENT	8
A. The '072 Patent Specification	8
B. The '072 Patent Claims	14
IV. PROSECUTION HISTORY OF THE '072 PATENT	15
V. OVERVIEW OF THE ASSERTED PRIOR ART.....	16
A. U.S. Patent No. 5,768,618 to Erickson et al. (“Erickson”).....	16
B. Andrew S. Tanenbaum, Computer Networks, 3rd ed. (1996) (“Tanenbaum96”).....	18
VI. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	19
A. “context”	20
B. “prepending” and “status information”	22
VII. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	23
VIII. THE CITED REFERENCES DO NOT RENDER THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OBVIOUS	23
A. The Combination Does Not Show or Suggest “Dividing, <i>By The Interface Device, The Data Into Segments</i> ” (All Challenged Claims).....	24
B. The Combination Does Not Show or Suggest “transferring status information for the context to the interface device <i>during the same operation as</i> transferring protocol header information to the interface device” (Claim 2)	33
C. The Combination Does Not Show or Suggest “ <i>receiving,</i> <i>by the interface device, receive packets that correspond to</i> the [context / protocol information], and updating the [context / status information] <i>by the interface device to</i> account for the receive packets” (Claims 7, 14, and 21)	34

D.	There Is No Motivation to Combine <i>Erickson</i> and <i>Tanenbaum</i>	35
1.	Tanenbaum Expressly Teaches Away From a Combination Using <i>Erickson</i>	35
2.	A POSITA Would Not Have Combined <i>Tanenbaum</i> With <i>Erickson</i> Because the Two References are Incompatible.....	39
3.	<i>Tanenbaum</i> Does Not Include an Express Motivation to Combine.....	42
4.	A POSITA Would Not Have Had an Expectation of Success in Combining <i>Tanenbaum</i> with <i>Erickson</i>	43
5.	Petitioners Mischaracterize <i>Erickson</i> as Being Similar to <i>Tanenbaum</i>	45
6.	The Complexity of the Subject Matter of <i>Erickson</i> and <i>Tanenbaum</i> Weighs Against Combining Them	46
7.	Petitioner’s Expert Agreed That Marketplace Demands Discouraged Offload.....	49
8.	Contrary to Petitioner’s Assertions, Combining <i>Erickson</i> with <i>Tanenbaum</i> Would Have Increased Complexity, Rather Than Reduced It	51
(a)	Complexity added by the window size, acknowledgement, and re-transmission inherent in TCP.....	52
(b)	Combining <i>Erickson</i> with <i>Tanenbaum</i> Would Result in Increased I/O Bus Access, Which is Contrary to the Goals of <i>Erickson</i> , and the Need For Additional Logic.....	54
IX.	THE STRONG EVIDENCE OF SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS WEIGHS AGAINST OBVIOUSNESS	56
1.	The Claimed Invention Addresses a Long-felt, Yet Unresolved Need in the Art for Accelerated Network Communications	56

2.	The Claimed Inventions Were Commercially Successful	58
3.	The Claimed Invention Received Praise in the Industry	59
4.	Many Others Tried and Failed to Develop the Claimed Technology	60
5.	Experts Were Skeptical of the Claimed Invention and Taught Away From It.....	61
X.	THE PETITION FAILS TO DISCLOSE ALL REAL PARTIES IN INTEREST	63
XI.	THE PETITION PRESENTS SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME PRIOR ART AND ARGUMENTS PREVIOUSLY BEFORE THE OFFICE.....	65
XII.	ALACRITECH RESERVES ITS RIGHTS UNDER THE PENDING <i>OIL STATES</i> CASE AT THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT	65
XIII.	CONCLUSION	66

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page</u>
Cases	
<i>Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC</i> , 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	38
<i>CCS Fitness, Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.</i> 288, F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	19
<i>CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Int’l Corp.</i> , 349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	28, 35
<i>Fortinet, Inc. v. Sophos, Inc.</i> , IPR 2015-00617 (Aug. 13, 2015)	20
<i>Garmin Int’l, Inc. v. Patent of Cuozzo Speed Techs. LLC</i> , IPR2012-00001 (PTAB Jan. 9, 2013)	28
<i>Genetics Institute, LLC v. Novartis Vaccines and Diagnostics, Inc.</i> , 655 F.3d 1291 (2011).....	49
<i>In re Ethicon, Inc.</i> , 844 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	30
<i>In re Gulack</i> , 703 F.2d 1381 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	28
<i>In re Rijckaert</i> , 9 F.3d 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993)	28
<i>In re Royka</i> , 490 F.2d 981 (C.C.P.A. 1974).....	28
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	44
<i>Link Corp. v. Securus Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00785 (PTAB Oct 7, 2015)	28
<i>Medshape, Inc. v. Cayenne Medical, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00848 (Sept. 14, 2015).....	20
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2120 (2014).....	22
<i>Personal Web Technologies, LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	38
<i>United States v. Adams</i> , 383 U.S. 39 (1966).....	44
<i>W.L. Gore & Assocs., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.</i> , 721 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	30

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.