UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

DELL INC., EMC CORPORATION, HEWLETT-PACKARD ENTERPRISE CO., AND HP ENTERPRISE SERVICES, LLC VERITAS TECHNOLOGIES LLC

Petitioner,

v.

REALTIME DATA LLC d/b/a IXO Patent Owner.

Case: IPR2017-00176UNASSIGNED

PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,161,506

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313–1450
Submitted Electronically via the Patent Review Processing System E2E



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.		INTRODUCTION1
II.		MANDATORY NOTICES – 37 C.F.R. § 42.8
	A.	Real Party-In-Interest Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)34
	B.	Related Matters Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)
	C.	Lead and Back-UpBack-up Counsel Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)and Service Information
	Đ.	Service Information Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4)
III.		The '506 Patent5
IV.		Identification of the challenge and summary of the prior art rendering the claims unpatentable Challenge and Summary of the
		Prior Art Rendering the Claims Unpatentable
	A.	Identification of the Challenge
	B.	Franaszek Teaches Nearly All Aspects of the Challenged Claims78
	C.	Hsu Teaches A Data Compression System that Examines Data Within the Block Itself To Select An Encoder89
	D.	Sebastian Teaches a Data Compression System with a Single Data Compression Encoder
V.		petitioner Petitioner has standing Standing to bring Bring this proceeding 1011
VI.		Claim Construction Under 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.100(b), 42.104(b)(3)11
VII.		DETAILED EXPLANATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)1112
	A.	The Grounds for Trial Are Based on Prior Art Patents and Printed Publications
		1. The Effective Filing Date of the Claimed Subject Matter Is No Earlier Than October 29, 2001
		2. Franaszek is a Prior Art Patent
		3. Hsu is a Prior Art Printed Publication
		4. Sebastian is a Prior Art Patent
	B.	Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art14



103(and 1: Claims 104 and 105 Would Have Been Obvious Under § a) Over Franaszek in View of Hsu, or in the Alternative, aszek in View of Hsu and Sebastian
1.	Claim 104 Would Have Been Obvious Over Franaszek in View of Hsu or, in the Alternative, Franaszek in View of Hsu and Sebastian
	m 104, Preamble: "A computer implemented method for ing data"
to identify	m 104: "analyzing data within a data block of an input data stream one or more data types of the data block, the input data stream g a plurality of disparate data types"
content de	m 104: "performing content dependent data compression with a ependent data compression encoder if a data type of the data block ed"
i.	Content Dependent Data Compression Encoder2021
	Performing Content Dependent Data Compression with a t Dependent Data Compression Encoder if a Data Type of the lock is Identified
	m 104: "performing data compression with a single data on encoder, if a data type of the data block is not identified". 2425
identify of descriptor	m 104: "wherein the analyzing of the data within the data block to ne or more data types excludes analyzing based only on a that is indicative of the data type of the data within the data 3132
i.	
<mark>i<u>ii</u>.</mark> Somet	Reasons a POSITA Would Have Found it Obvious to Analyze thing Other Than "Solely" a Descriptor3334
2.	Claim 105 Would Have Been Obvious Over Franaszek in View of Hsu or, in the Alternative, Franaszek in View of Hsu and Sebastian
a. Clair	m 105, Preamble: "A computer implemented method"36 <u>37</u>
	m 105: "receiving a data block in an uncompressed form, said being included in a data stream"
c. Clair	m 105: "analyzing data within the data block to determine a type



	d. Claim 105: "compressing said data block to provide a compressed data block"
	e. Claim 105: "wherein if one or more encoders are associated to said type, compressing said data block with at least one of said one or more encoders, otherwise compressing said data block with a default data compression encoder, and"
	f. Claim 105: "wherein the analyzing of the data within the data block to identify one or more data types excludes analyzing based only on a descriptor that is indicative of the data type of the data within the data block."
VIII.	PAYMENT OF FEES – 37 C.F.R. § 42.103
IX.	CONCLUSION4445



LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

'506 Patent U.S. Patent No. 7,161,506

Abst. Abstract

OA Office Action

NIRC Notice of Intent to Issue Reexamination

Certificate

Cert. Reexamination Certificate



DOCKET

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.

