

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FACEBOOK, INC., WHATSAPP INC.,
Petitioners

v.

UNILOC LUXEMBOURG S.A.,
Patent Owner

IPR2017-01668
PATENT 8,724,622

**PATENT OWNER RESPONSE TO PETITION
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.120**

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Related Matters of the '622 Patent	1
III.	The '622 Patent	1
	A. Effective Filing Date of the '622 Patent	1
	B. Overview of the '622 Patent	2
IV.	PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	4
IV.	PETITIONERS RELY ON INCORRECT CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS	5
	A. “communication platform system”	6
V.	PETITIONERS DO NOT MEET THEIR BURDEN TO PROVE OBVIOUSNESS	7
	A. No <i>prima facie</i> obviousness for dependent Claims 4, 5 and 12	8
	1. <i>Zydney</i> does not render obvious “wherein the instant voice message includes an object field including a digitized audio file”	9
	2. <i>Zydney</i> teaches away from “wherein the instant voice message includes an action field identifying one of a predetermined set of permitted actions requested by the user” (claims 4 and 5)	18
	B. <i>Zydney</i> does not render obvious “wherein the messaging system receives connection object messages from the plurality of instant voice message client systems, wherein each of the connection object messages includes data representing a state of a logical connection with a given one of the plurality of instant voice message client systems” (claims 24-26)	20

1.	<i>Zydney</i> expressly teaches away from use of “connection objects” as defined in the ’622 patent	20
2.	No motivation to combine <i>Zydney</i> with <i>Hethmon</i> because <i>Zydney</i> ’s transport mechanism would not have worked with HTTP at that time	21
VI.	CONCLUSION	23

Patent Owner’s List of Exhibits

Exhibit No.	Description
2001	Declaration of William “Chuck” Easttom II
2002	Microsoft TechNet article showing Microsoft IIS 6.0 enabled compression over HTTP
2003	Deposition Transcript of Dr. Tal Lavin.

I. Introduction

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.120, Uniloc Luxembourg S.A. (“Uniloc” or “Patent Owner”) submits this Response to the Petition for *Inter Partes* Review (“the Petition”) of U.S. Patent No. 8,724,622 (“the ’622 patent”) filed by Facebook, Inc. and WhatsApp, Inc. (“Petitioners”).

II. Related Matters of the ’622 Patent

The ’622 patent was the subject of two requests for *inter partes* review (IPR2017-00223 and IPR2017-00224) filed by Apple Inc. on November 14, 2016, which were both denied by the Board on May 25, 2017. The ’622 patent was also the subject of an *inter partes* review (IPR2017-2080, based primarily on the same *Zydney* reference asserted here), which the Board denied on March 19, 2018.

Concurrent with the filing of this Petition, the Petitioner filed a second petition for *inter partes* review to address different claims of the ’622 patent. More specifically, the present Petition addresses claims 4, 5, 12, and 24-26, whereas the other petition (IPR2017-01667) addresses claims 3, 6-8, 10, 11, 13, 14-23, 27-35, 38, and 39.

The Petition provides what appears to be an accurate summary of pending litigation related to the ’622 patent. Pet. 1-3.

III. The ’622 Patent

A. Effective Filing Date of the ’622 Patent

The ’622 patent is titled “SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR INSTANT VOIP MESSAGING.” EX1001. The ’622 patent issued from U.S. Patent Application No. 13/546,673, which is a continuation of U.S. Patent No. 8,243,723, which is a

continuation of U.S. Patent No. 7,535,890, filed on Dec. 18, 2003. The '622 patent issued on May 13, 2014. Petitioner does not contest that the '622 patent is at least entitled to an effective filing date of Dec. 18, 2003.

B. Overview of the '622 Patent

The '622 patent recognized that conventional circuit-switched communications enabled traditional telephony yet had a variety of technical disadvantages that limited developing other forms of communication over such networks. According to the '622 patent, “[c]ircuit switching provides a communication path (i.e., dedicated circuit) for a telephone call from the telephone terminal to another device 20 over the [public switched telephone network or] PSTN, including another telephone terminal. During the telephone call, voice communication takes place over that communication path.” EX1001, 1:29-34. EX2001 ¶18.

The '622 patent expressly distinguishes circuit-switched networks from packet-switched networks (*e.g.*, the Internet) at least in that the latter routes packetized digital information, such as “Voice over Internet Protocol (i.e., “VoIP”), also known as IP telephony or Internet telephony.”¹ EX1001, 1:35-36. EX2001 ¶19.

¹ Consistent with the '622 patent specification, the USPTO has also recognized there are significant differences between circuit-switched and packet-switched networks during the relevant timeframe. *See, e.g.*, U.S. Application No. 90/012,728 and 90/012,789 (*Notice of Intent to Issue Ex Parte Reexamination Certificate*, dated April 10, 2014) at page 9, where the USPTO confirmed the following:

Ethernet packet switching protocol, including TCP/IP, are very specific connectionless/packet switched protocols. In contrast to connection-

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.