

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

INTEL CORPORATION,

*Petitioner,*

v.

ALACRITECH INC.,

*Patent Owner*

---

Case IPR2017-01713

U.S. Patent 7,337,241

---

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. OVERVIEW OF THE ‘241 PATENT .....	4
A. The ‘241 Patent Specification .....	4
B. The ‘241 Patent Claims .....	9
III. PROSECUTION HISTORY OF THE ‘241 PATENT .....	14
IV. OVERVIEW OF THE ASSERTED PRIOR ART .....	16
A. U.S. Patent No. 5,937,169 (“Connery”) .....	17
B. Dr. Min Testified He Had “No Opinion” on the Prior Art .....	18
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	19
A. Intel’s Petition Should Be Denied Because It Alleges The Challenged Claims Are Indefinite .....	20
B. “[first/second] mechanism” (claim 17) .....	21
C. “without an interrupt dividing” (claim 17) .....	23
D. “prepending” (claim 17) .....	25
VI. CONNERY, WHICH IS THE SOLE GROUND FOR THE PETITION, IS NOT PRIOR ART TO THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS .....	26
A. All Claims of The ‘241 Patent Are Fully Supported By The Provisional Application, and Therefore Connery is Not Prior Art .....	26
1. Prepending headers to segments .....	28
2. Prepending at one time as a sequence of bits .....	32
3. Without an interrupt dividing the prepending .....	33
VII. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY THE PETITION BECAUSE IT FAILS TO DISCLOSE ALL REAL PARTIES IN INTEREST .....	35
A. Intel Effectively Controls Dell .....	36
B. The Relationship Between Intel and Dell is Sufficiently Close .....	38
C. Dell Desires Review of the ‘241 Patent .....	40

D.	Intel and Dell Have Coordinated Interest and Action in Challenging the '241 Patent.....	41
E.	Intel Has Effective Choice as to the Legal Theories and Proofs of Dell and Cavium.....	42
F.	Finding Dell and Cavium Are Real Parties in Interest Is Consistent with Legislative Intent.....	43
VIII.	THE BOARD SHOULD DECLINE INSTITUTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(D) BECAUSE ALL THE PRIOR ART HAS ALREADY BEEN CONSIDERED BY THE OFFICE.....	44
IX.	CONCLUSION .....	46

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Cases**

*Apple Inc. v. Immersion Corp.*,  
Case IPR2016-01372, Paper 7 (Jan. 11, 2017) ..... 3, 20

*Ariad Pharm., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.*,  
598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010)..... 27

*Benson & Ford, Inc. v. Wanda Petroleum Co.*,  
833 F.2d 1172 (5th Cir. 1987)..... 39

*Cox Commc 'ns, Inc. v. Sprint Commc 'n Co. LP*,  
838 F.3d 1224 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 22

*In re Herschler*,  
591 F.2d 693 (CCPA 1979)..... 28

*In re Kaslow*,  
707 F.2d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 1983)..... 28

*LizardTech, Inc. v. Earth Res. Mapping, Inc.*,  
424 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 27

*Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.*,  
134 S. Ct. 2120 (2014) ..... 25

*Oil States Energy Servs. LLC v. Greene's Energy Group, LLC*,  
Case No. 16-712, certiorari granted (U.S. Jun. 12, 2017)..... 4, 45, 46

*Space Exploration Technologies Corp. v. Blue Origin LLC*,  
Case IPR2014-01378, Paper 6 (Mar. 3, 2015)..... 3, 20

*Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*,  
935 F.2d 1555 (Fed. Cir. 1991)..... 27

*Williamson v. Citrix Online, LLC*,  
792 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... 21, 22

**Statutory Authorities**

35 U.S.C. § 102 ..... 3, 20

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) ..... 1

35 U.S.C. § 112 ..... 3, 21

35 U.S.C. § 112(6) ..... 20

35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(2)..... 35

35 U.S.C. § 313 ..... 1

35 U.S.C. § 314 ..... 4

35 U.S.C. § 314(a) ..... 26, 46

35 U.S.C. § 316(e) ..... 26, 27

35 U.S.C. § 325(D) ..... 44, 45

**Rules and Regulations**

37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e) ..... 49  
37 C.F.R. § 42.24 ..... 48  
37 C.F.R. § 42.24(a)(i)..... 48  
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)..... 19  
37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a) ..... 1  
37 C.F.R. § 42.108..... 4  
37 CFR § 42.8(b)(1) ..... 35  
Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48 ..... 26  
Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756, 48759-60  
(Aug. 14, 2012)..... 36, 37

**Legislative Materials**

157 Cong. Rec. S1034, S1041 (Mar. 1, 2011)..... 43, 44

**Additional Authorities**

U.S. Patent No. 5,937,169 ..... 1, 2, 17  
U.S. Patent No. 7,337,241(Ex. 1001)..... 1

# 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.