| JNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE |
|-------------------------------------------|
| BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD |
| Cisco Systems, Inc., Petitioner |
| Case IPR2017-01933 |

PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW

OF

U.S. PATENT NO. 8,478,799



TABLE OF CONTENTS

| PET | TTIO | NER' | 'S EXHIBIT LIST | 5 | |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----|--|
| I. | Mar | Mandatory Notices | | | |
| | A. | Real | Party-in-Interest | 13 | |
| | B. | Rela | ted Matters | 13 | |
| | C. | Lead | d and Back-up Counsel and Service Information | 13 | |
| II. | Gro | unds 1 | for Standing | 14 | |
| III. | Intro | oducti | ion | 14 | |
| IV. | Reli | ef Re | quested and Overview of Reasons Therefor | 15 | |
| V. | Des | criptio | on of the Technology | 15 | |
| | A. | Evol | lution of Computer Storage Systems | 15 | |
| | B. | Cryp | otographic Hash | 16 | |
| | C. | The | '799 Patent | 17 | |
| | | 1. | Summary of the '799 Patent | 17 | |
| | | 2. | Prosecution History | 20 | |
| | | 3. | Previous IPR Proceedings | 20 | |
| | D. | Page | e Citations and Quotations | 21 | |
| VI. | Identification of Challenges and Claim Construction | | | | |
| | A. | Challenged Claims21 | | | |
| | B. | Claim Construction | | | |
| | C. | Statutory Grounds for Challenges24 | | | |



| D. | | | r's Challenges Are Not Cumulative or Duplicative of Prior ffice Proceedings | 25 | |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|--|
| E. | Identification of How the Construed Claims Are Unpatentable2 | | | | |
| | 1. | Challenge #1: Claims 1-4, 7-9, 11-14, 17-22, 27, 28, and 31-35 are obvious over Muthitacharoen and Dabek | | | |
| | | a. | Summary of Muthitacharoen | 26 | |
| | | b. | Summary of Dabek. | 28 | |
| | | c. | Reasons to Combine Muthitacharoen and Dabek | 29 | |
| | | d. | Detailed Claim Analysis | 31 | |
| | | | Claim 1 | 31 | |
| | 2. | Challenge #2: Claims 5, 6 are unpatentable as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Muthitacharoen, Dabek, and Agrawal | | | |
| | | a. | Brief summary of Agrawal | 71 | |
| | | b. | Reasons to Combine Muthitacharoen/Dabek with Agrawal | 72 | |
| | | c. | Detailed Claim Analysis | 72 | |
| | 3. | obvi | llenge #3: Claims 10, 15, and 26 are unpatentable as being ious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Muthitacharoen, Dabek, McKusick | 74 | |
| | | a. | Brief summary of McKusick | 74 | |
| | | b. | Reasons to Combine Muthitacharoen/Dabek with McKusick | 75 | |
| | | c. | Detailed Claim Analysis | 76 | |
| | 4. | | llenge #4: Claims 29 and 30 are obvious over hitacharoen, Dabek, and Bunte | 81 | |



| | | a. | Brief summary of Bunte | 81 |
|------|-------------|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| | | b. | Reasons to Combine Muthitacharoen/Dabek with Bunte | 81 |
| | | c. | Detailed Claim Analysis | 83 |
| | 5. | obv | illenge #5: Claims 16 and 36 are unpatentable as being ious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Muthitacharoen, Dabek, Bondurant | 85 |
| | | a. | Brief summary of Bondurant | 85 |
| | | b. | Reasons to Combine Muthitacharoen/Dabek with Bondurant | 86 |
| | | c. | Detailed Claim Analysis | 87 |
| VII. | Conclusion | on | | 90 |
| VIII | .Certificat | te of | Word Count | 91 |
| IX. | Certificat | te of | Service | 92 |



PETITIONER'S EXHIBIT LIST

August 11, 2017

| 1001 | U.S. Patent No. 8,478,799 ("the '799 patent") |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1002 | Prosecution History of the '799 patent |
| 1003 | U.S. Prov. App. No. 61/269,633 ("the '633 provisional") |
| 1004 | Declaration of Dr. Prashant Shenoy Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.68 |
| 1005 | Curriculum Vitae of Dr. Prashant Shenoy |
| 1006 | Intentionally omitted |
| 1007 | Athicha Muthitacharoen, et al., "Ivy: A Read/Write Peer-to-Peer |
| | File System," Proceedings of the 5th Symposium on Operating |
| | Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI '02), OPERATING |
| | SYSTEMS REVIEW, Vol. 36, Issue SI (Winter 2002). |
| 1008 | Frank Dabek, et al., "Wide-area cooperative storage with CFS," |
| | Proceedings of the 18th ACM Symposium on Operating Systems |
| | Principles (SOSP'01), OPERATING SYSTEMS REVIEW, Vol. 35, No. 5 |
| | (Dec. 2001). |
| 1009 | Nitin Agrawal, et al., "Design Tradeoffs for SSD Performance," |
| | USENIX'08: 2008 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (Jun. 25, |
| | 2008). |



DOCKET A L A R M

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.

