

Patent No. 7,161,506
Petition for *Inter Partes* Review

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

NetApp, Inc., Rackspace US, Inc.
Petitioner

v.

Realtime Data LLC
Patent Owner

Patent No. 7,161,506

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2017-01660

PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW

UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.100 *et seq.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iv
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. NOTICES AND STATEMENTS.....	3
III. SUMMARY OF THE '506 PATENT	5
A. Background of the '506 Patent.....	5
B. Priority Date	7
C. Prosecution History of the '506 Patent	8
1. Original Prosecution	8
2. First Reexamination	9
3. Second Reexamination.....	10
IV. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	11
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	12
A. “analyzing”/“analyze”	13
B. “default data compression encoder”	13
VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION	13
VII. DETAILED EXPLANATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(B)	15
A. Ground 1: Claim 105 is Obvious in View of Hsu and Franaszek.....	15
1. Summary of Hsu	15
2. Summary of Franaszek	21
3. Independent Claim 105 Is Obvious in View of Hsu and Franaszek	21
a. Hsu Discloses the Preamble of Claim 105	22
b. Hsu Discloses Limitation A of Claim 105	23
c. Hsu Discloses Limitation B of Claim 105.....	24
d. Hsu Discloses Limitation C of Claim 105.....	25
e. Hsu Discloses Limitation D of Claim 105	26

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
f. Implementing Limitation E of Claim 105 in View of Hsu and Franaszek Would Have Been Obvious	28
(i) A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Have Been Motivated to Implement Hsu’s System With “a Default Encoder” Such As Taught in Franaszek to Provide for Maximum Compression	29
(ii) The Combination of Hsu and Franaszek Does Nothing More Than Implementing One Known Technology with Another Known Technology to Produce Predictable Results	34
g. Hsu Discloses Limitation F of Claim 105	37
B. Ground 2: Claim 105 is Obvious in View of Hsu and Sebastian.....	38
1. Summary of Sebastian	38
2. Independent Claim 105 Is Obvious in View of Hsu and Franaszek	39
a. Hsu Discloses the Preamble and Limitations A-D, and F of Claim 105	39
b. Implementing Hsu in View of Sebastian to Include Limitation E Claim 105 Would Have Been Obvious.....	39
C. Ground 3: Claim 105 is Obvious in View of Franaszek and Hsu.....	41
1. Independent Claim 105 Is Obvious in View of Franaszek and Hsu	41
a. Franaszek Discloses the Preamble of Claim 105	41
b. Franaszek Discloses Limitation A of Claim 105.....	41
c. Franaszek Discloses Limitation B of Claim 105.....	41
d. Franaszek Discloses Limitation C of Claim 105.....	42
e. Franaszek Discloses Limitation D of Claim 105.....	43

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
f. Frasaszek Discloses Limitation E of Claim 105	43
g. Implementing Limitation F of Claim 105 in View of Franaszek and Hsu Would Have Been Obvious	44
D. Ground 4: Claim 105 is Obvious in View of Franaszek and Chu	46
1. Summary of Chu	46
2. Independent Claim 105 Is Obvious in View of Franaszek and Chu	46
a. Frasaszek Discloses the Preamble and Limitations A-E of Claim 105.....	46
b. Implementing Franaszek in View of Chu to Include Limitation F of Claim 105 Would Have Been Obvious.....	46
VIII. CONCLUSION.....	48

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Allied Erecting & Dismantling Co. v. Genesis Attachments, LLC</i> , 825 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	31
<i>In re CSB-System Int’l, Inc.</i> , 832 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2016), <i>cert. denied</i> , 137 S. Ct. 1384 (2017)	12
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....	12
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	35, 36
<i>McGinley v. Franklin Sports, Inc.</i> , 262 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	36
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (<i>en banc</i>)	12

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.