

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

UNIFIED PATENTS, INC.  
Petitioner

v.

VILOX TECHNOLOGIES, LLC  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2018-00044  
Patent No. 7,302,423

---

**PATENT OWNER RESPONSE**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. DESCRIPTION OF THE PATENT AND APPLICABLE REFERENCES .....	2
A. The ‘423 Patent.....	2
1. Specification.....	2
2. The Challenged Claims .....	5
B. References.....	6
1. EX1006: <i>Maloney</i> .....	7
2. EX1009: <i>Excel</i> .....	11
3. EX1007: <i>Bertram</i> .....	14
4. EX1008, <i>Kanevsky</i> .....	24
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	26
A. “Determining a Database Schema for a Database” .....	27
B. “Determining a Number of Characters” .....	27
C. “Performing a Truncation” .....	28
D. “Displaying a Portion of Each Entry in the Selected Database Field, wherein a Number of Characters Displayed in Each Portion is Less than or Equal to the Specified Amount of Characters”.....	29
E. “Each Entry from the Selected Data Field is Displayed on a Terminal” .....	30
F. Independent Claims 1 and 3 Should Not be Construed to Recite “Conditional Limitations” .....	31
1. Background .....	31
2. Argument.....	33
IV. <i>EXCEL</i> DOES NOT QUALIFY AS PRIOR ART.....	35
A. The Controlling Priority Date Is At Least As Early As January 1999.....	38
B. Petitioner Cannot Establish Publication of the Excel Bible Prior to Patent Owner’s January 1999 Priority Date .....	41

1. “Copy 2” of the Excel Bible .....	42
2. “Copy 1” of Excel Bible.....	43
3. None of Petitioner’s Dates Predate Patent Owner’s Invention .....	45
V. RESPONSE TO GROUND I.....	46
A. A PHOSITA Would Not Have Had A Motivation to Combine <i>Maloney And Bertram</i> . .....	46
B. <i>Maloney</i> in view of <i>Bertram</i> Does Not Teach Or Suggest All Limitations of the Invention .....	51
1. Claim 1 .....	51
2. Claim 2 .....	55
3. Claim 3 .....	57
VI. RESPONSE TO GROUND II.....	57
A. A PHOSITA Would Not Have Had A Motivation to Combine <i>Excel And Bertram</i> . .....	57
1. <i>Excel</i> provides more than adequate mechanisms to accommodate a large quantity of data without requiring truncation or abbreviation .....	57
2. <i>Excel</i> includes significant features that would be rendered inoperative in the combination of <i>Excel</i> and <i>Bertram</i> .....	60
3. Petitioner has not identified any advantage offered by <i>Bertram</i> not already present in <i>Excel</i> .....	62
4. There would be no expectation of success in the combination of <i>Excel</i> and <i>Bertram</i> .....	63
5. Petitioner did not address portions of the Excel Bible that teach away from abbreviation and truncation as taught in <i>Bertram</i> .....	65
B. <i>Excel</i> in View of <i>Bertram</i> Does Not Teach Or Suggest All Limitations Of The Invention .....	66
1. Claim 1 .....	66
2. Claim 3 .....	67
VII. RESPONSE TO GROUND III.....	67

- A. **A PHOSITA Would Not Have Had a Motivation to Combine  
*Maloney, Bertram, and, Kanevsky.*** .....67
- VIII. **RESPONSE TO GROUND IV** .....69
  - A. ***Excel* in View of *Bertram* and *Kanevsky* Does Not Teach Or Suggest  
All Limitations Of The Invention** .....69
    - 1. **Claim 6** .....69
- IX. **CONCLUSION**.....71

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Ex parte Gopalan</i> , Appeal 2017-007009 (PTAB May 23, 2018) .....	passim
<i>Ex Parte Schulhauser</i> , Appeal 2013-007847, 2016 WL 6277792 (PTAB Apr. 28, 2016) .....	29
<i>Hyatt v. Boone</i> , 146 F.3d 1348, 1352 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....	35
<i>In re Jolley</i> , 308 F.3d 1317, 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2002) .....	34, 35
<i>In re Verhoef</i> , Ca. No. 2017-1976 at *6 (Fed. Cir., May 3, 2018) .....	35
<i>NFC Tech., LLC v. Matal</i> , 871 F.3d 1367, 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	34, 35
<i>Perfect Surgical Techniques, Inc. v. Olympus Am., Inc.</i> , 841 F.3d 1004, 1009 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	36
<i>Price v. Symsek</i> , 988 F.2d 1187, 1190 (Fed. Cir. 1993) .....	34, 35
<i>Purdue Pharma. L.P. v. Boehringer Ingelheim GmbH</i> , 237 F.3d 1359, 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....	34

### Statutes

35 U.S.C § 102 .....	34
----------------------	----

# 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.