

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

VIPTELA, INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

FATPIPE NETWORKS PRIVATE LIMITED,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-00680

U.S. Patent No. 7,406,048

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	1
II.	The Board should exercise its discretion under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) to deny the Petition.	1
A.	The Petition presents the same prior art and substantially the same arguments as those presented to the Board in IPR2016-00977.	2
B.	The Declarations of Dr. Leonard J. Forys and Dr. Kevin Negus are substantially the same.	7
III.	If instituted, this proceeding should be merged with IPR2016-00977.	10
IV.	Conclusion.....	11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Statutes

35 U.S.C. 102.....2
35 U.S.C. 103.....2, 3
35 U.S.C. 325(d)..... 1, 10, 11

Rules

37 C.F.R. § 42.107..... 1
37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b).....10

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit	Description
2001	PTAB Decision Instituting <i>Inter Partes</i> Review in IPR 2016-00977
2002	Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review in IPR 2016-00977
2003	Declaration of Dr. Kevin Negus filed in IPR 2016-00977

I. Introduction

Viptela, Inc. (“Petitioner”) filed a Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,406,048 (“the ’048 Patent”) on January 13, 2017 (Paper 1, “the Petition”). The Board mailed a Notice of Filing Date Accorded to Petition on February 2, 2017 (Paper 3). Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.107, Patent Owner FatPipe Networks Private Limited and exclusive licensee FatPipe, Inc. (for the purposes of consistency with Board convention, referred to as “Patent Owner”) timely submits this Preliminary Response.

Patent Owner respectfully requests that the Board exercise its discretion under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) to deny the Petition because the Petition presents the same prior art and substantially the same arguments as those already being considered by the Board in IPR 2016-00977.

II. The Board should exercise its discretion under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) to deny the Petition.

Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) the Board has discretion to deny a petition if it merely presents prior art and arguments already presented to the Office. Specifically, 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) sets forth that “In determining whether to institute or order a proceeding under this

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.