

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

INTEL CORP. and CAVIUM, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

ALACRITECH, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-01406¹
U.S. Patent No. 7,673,072
Title: FAST-PATH APPARATUS FOR TRANSMITTING DATA
CORRESPONDING A TCP CONNECTION

**PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO
PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,673,072**

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

¹ Cavium, Inc., which filed a Petition in Case IPR2017-01707, has been joined as a petitioner in this proceeding. Wistron Corporation, which filed a Petition in Case IPR2018-00329, has been joined as a petitioner in this proceeding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. PATENT OWNER HAS FAILED TO REBUT PETITIONER’S SHOWING THAT A POSA WOULD HAVE BEEN MOTIVATED TO COMBINE ERICKSON WITH TANENBAUM96	2
A. A POSA Would Have Naturally Looked to Tanenbaum96 When Implementing Erickson’s TCP Functionality	2
B. Tanenbaum96 Does Not Teach Away from the Invention	5
C. A POSA Would Have a Reasonable Expectation of Success Using Tanenbaum96 to Implement Erickson’s TCP Functionality.....	8
D. At the Time of the 072 Invention, the Industry Was Actively Working On Offload	13
III. THE PRIOR ART DISCLOSES EACH LIMITATION OF THE CLAIMS	14
A. Patent Owner Has Failed To Rebut Petitioner’s Showing that The Prior Art Discloses “Dividing, By The Interface Device, The Data Into Segments”	14
B. Patent Owner Has Failed To Rebut Petitioner’s Showing that The Prior Art Discloses “Transferring Status Information For The Context To the Interface Device During the Same Operation as Transferring Protocol Header Information to the Interface Device”	18
C. Patent Owner Has Failed To Rebut Petitioner’s Showing that The Prior Art Discloses “Receiving, By The Interface Device, Receive Packets That Correspond To The [Context/Protocol Information], And Updating The [Context/Status Information] By The Interface Device To Account For The Receive Packets”	19

IV.	THE EVIDENCE OF OBVIOUSNESS FAR OUTWEIGHS PATENT OWNER’S ALLEGED “OBJECTIVE EVIDENCE”	19
A.	Patent Owner Has Not Shown Nexus Between The Challenged Claims Of The 072 Patent and The “Objective Evidence”	19
B.	There Is No Evidence of Long-Felt Need	21
C.	There Is No Evidence of Commercial Success	21
D.	There Is No Evidence of Praise.....	23
E.	There Is No Evidence of Trying and Failing	24
F.	There Is No Evidence of Skepticism.....	24
V.	THE REAL PARTY OF INTEREST IS CORRECTLY NAMED.....	24
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

Anascape, Ltd. v. Nintendo of Am. Inc.,
601 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....4

Bosch Auto. Serv. Sols., LLC v. Matal,
878 F.3d 1027 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....23

Compass Bank v. Intellectual Ventures II,
IPR2014-00786, Paper 46 (Sept. 23, 2015)4

Daiichi Sankyo Co., Ltd. v. Apotex, Inc.,
501 F.3d 1254 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....10

Genzyme Therapeutic Prods. LP v. Biomarin Pharm. Inc.,
825 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....18

In re Arora,
369 F. App'x 120 (Fed. Cir. 2010)12

In re Cree, Inc.,
818 F.3d 694 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....22

In re Ethicon, Inc.,
844 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....7

In re Magna Elecs., Inc.,
611 F. App'x 969 (Fed. Cir. 2015)25

In re Merck & Co.,
800 F.2d 1091 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....15

In re Mouttet,
686 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 3, 14

Krippelz v. Ford Motor Co.,
667 F.3d 1261 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....4

<i>Lowe’s Co. v. Nichia Corp.</i> , IRP2018-00066, Paper 7 a(Apr. 25, 2018)	15
<i>MCM Portfolio LLC v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , 812 F.3d 1284 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	16
<i>Meiresonne v. Google, Inc.</i> , 849 F.3d 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	7, 8
<i>Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp. v. Hospira, Inc.</i> , 874 F.3d 724 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	9
<i>MRC Innovations, Inc. v. Hunter Mfg., LLP</i> , 747 F.3d 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	20
<i>Optivus Tech., Inc. v. Ion Beam Applications S.A.</i> , 469 F.3d 978 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	5
<i>PAR Pharm., Inc. v. TWI Pharm., Inc.</i> , 773 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	9
<i>Randall Mfg. v. Rea</i> , 733 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	9
<i>Soft Gel Techs., Inc. v. Jarrow Formulas, Inc.</i> , 864 F.3d 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	7, 9
<i>Wyers v. Master Lock Co.</i> 616 F.3d 1231 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	20
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 103	1
Eastern District of Texas Patent L.R. 3-1(f)	21

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.