

DOCKET NO.: 2212123-00120 US2

Filed on behalf of Springpath, Inc.

By: Jason Kipnis, Reg. No. 40,680

Theodoros Konstantakopoulos, Reg. No. 74,155

Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP

950 Page Mill Road

Palo Alto, CA 94304

Tel: (650) 600-5036

Email: Jason.Kipnis@wilmerhale.com

Theodoros.Konstantakopoulos@wilmerhale.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Springpath, Inc.
Petitioner

v.

SimpliVity Corporation,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2016-01780

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 8,478,799
CHALLENGING CLAIMS 1–2, 7–13, 17–20, 27, and 33–35
UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 312 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.104**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Mandatory Notices	2
A.	Real Party-in-Interest	2
B.	Related Matters	3
C.	Counsel	3
D.	Service Information	3
III.	Certification of Grounds for Standing	3
IV.	Overview of Challenge and Relief Requested	4
A.	Prior Art Patents and Publications	4
B.	Grounds for Challenge	4
V.	Brief Description of Technology	5
A.	Overview of Computer File Systems	5
1.	Basic Components of File Systems	5
2.	Files	5
3.	Directories	6
4.	Inodes	6
5.	Content-Addressable File System	7
B.	Overview of the '799 Patent	7
1.	Alleged Problem	8
2.	Summary of Alleged Invention of the '799 Patent	8
3.	The Challenged Claims	14
4.	Prosecution History	15
VI.	Overview of the Primary Prior Art References	18
A.	Overview of Atkin	19
B.	Overview of Li	21
VII.	Claim Construction	23
A.	“fingerprint”	25

B.	“namespace file system”	25
VIII.	Level of Ordinary Skill In The Art	26
IX.	Specific Grounds for Petition	26
A.	Ground I: Claims 1-2, 7-9, 12, 17-19, 27, and 35 are anticipated by Atkin 27	
1.	Independent Claim 1	27
2.	Claim 2: “The file system of claim 1, wherein: object references are mapped by the object fingerprints.”	40
3.	Claim 7: “The file system of claim 1, wherein: the file object mapping comprises a linear list, a tree structure or an indirection table.”	40
4.	Claim 8: “The file system of claim 1, wherein: the file objects include a root object having its own object fingerprint derived from all of the objects in the file system such that every object in the file system is accessible through the root object.”	41
5.	Claim 9: “The file system of claim 8, wherein a change of content of any file system object changes the root object and tracking changes in the root object provides a history of file system activity.”	43
6.	Claim 12: “The file system of claim 1, wherein: the object size is variable.....	43
7.	Claim 17: The file system of claim 1, including: a stack wherein the object store comprises a lower portion of the stack and the file system comprises an upper portion of the stack.	44
8.	Claim 18: The file system of claim 1, wherein: the namespace file system and the object store are implemented in one or more of digital electronic circuitry, computer hardware, firmware, a computer program in a non- transitory machine readable storage device, or combinations thereof.....	44
9.	Independent Claim 19	45
10.	Claim 27: A computer program embodied in a non-transitory machine readable storage device comprising program code means which, when executed by a process, performs the steps of method claim 19.....	47
11.	Claim 35: The method of claim 19, including: adding, modifying or deleting an object of the file and generating a new file object fingerprint.	47
B.	Ground II: Claims 11, 20, and 33-34 are obvious over Atkin in view of Li 48	

1.	Claim 11: The file system of claim 1, wherein: the fingerprint is an cryptographic hash digest of the object content.	49
2.	Claim 20: The method of claim 19, comprising: maintaining a location index for mapping object fingerprints and physical locations of the objects.	49
3.	Claim 33: The method of claim 19, including: maintaining in the object store a location index of object names and physical object locations.	50
4.	Claim 34: The method of claim 19, wherein: the file object mapping is indexed by an offset into the content of the file, and comprises a linear list, a tree structure, or an indirection table.	51
5.	Motivation to Combine	51
C.	Ground III: Claim 10 is obvious over Atkin in view of Sandberg	53
1.	Claim 10: The file system of claim 1, wherein: the namespace file system is provided as a layer in a storage stack between a virtual file system layer and a block storage abstraction layer.	53
2.	Motivation to Combine	54
D.	Ground IV: Claim 13 is obvious over Atkin	57
1.	Claim 13: The system of claim 1, wherein: the file system is a POSIX standard compliant file system.	57
X.	Conclusion	57

Springpath, Inc. (“Springpath”) respectfully requests *Inter Partes* Review of claims 1–2, 7–13, 17–20, 27, and 33–35 of U.S. Patent No. 8,478,799 (the “’799 patent”) (Ex. 1101) pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-19 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.1 *et seq.*

I. INTRODUCTION

The ’799 patent claims a purportedly novel computer file system for naming and storing of files on computer storage devices. But in fact, the claimed file system merely combines well known techniques disclosed by Jinyuan Li and others nearly four years before the alleged invention. Decl. ¶ 24 (Ex. 1102).

The ’799 patent is directed to a stacked file system, comprising two distinct storage systems: a namespace file system and an underlying object store (also referred to in the ’799 patent as an “object file system”). The object store is used to host the data in the form of objects. The name of the object is derived from the object’s content using, for example, a strong cryptographic hash, and represents a “fingerprint” of the content. These fingerprints of the objects are globally unique because: (i) no two objects can have the same content (because in that case, they would by definition have the same fingerprint and therefore be the same object); and (ii) two objects with different content will always have different fingerprints. Object stores have an “index” that tracks all of the objects and associates each object’s name with its location. Decl. ¶ 25 (Ex. 1102).

The ’799 patent describes a “namespace file system” at the top of the storage

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.