

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 7,302,423

PETITIONER'S REPLY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....5

II. Vilox’s Proposed Constructions Do Not Affect the Present Grounds of Unpatentability and Should not be Adopted5

 A. Claim 1 “determining a database schema for a database”5

 B. Other Terms from Claim 1, 3, and 67

III. Vilox Did Not Meet Its Burden to Swear Behind *Excel*.....8

 A. Vilox Fails to Prove Conception8

 1. Vilox does not allege conception of the claimed subject matter9

 2. Vilox does not provide sufficient evidence of conception9

 B. Vilox Fails to Prove Reduction to Practice10

 1. No reduction to practice of “if the number of characters included in each entry exceeds a specified amount of characters, displaying a portion of each entry in the selected database field” Claim 111

 2. No reduction to practice of “if the first quantity [indicative of a number of characters in each entry of the selected data field] exceeds a specified limit, reducing a number of characters to be displayed for each entry from the selected data field” Claim 314

 C. Vilox Fails to Show Diligence14

IV. *Bertram* Is Properly Combined with *Maloney* and *Excel*16

 A. *Bertram* does not teach altering data.....16

 B. *Bertram* does not render *Maloney* inoperable18

C. *Bertram* does not render *Excel* inoperable19

D. *Bertram* provides features different from those of *Excel* and with additional advantages21

V. *Maloney* and *Bertram* Teach All Features of the Claims22

A. *Maloney* teaches “determining a database schema for a database”22

B. *Bertram* teaches “determining a number of characters”24

C. *Bertram* teaches “if the number of characters included in each entry exceeds a specified amount of characters...”25

VI. *Excel* and *Bertram* Teach All Features of the Claims25

VII. Dependent Claim 226

VIII. Independent Claim 326

IX. Grounds Including *Kanevsky*26

A. *Kanevsky* is properly combined with *Maloney* and *Bertram*26

B. *Kanevsky* is properly combined with *Excel* and *Bertram*28

X. The Board Correctly Applied *Schulhauser* to Claims 1 and 328

A. Claim 129

B. Claim 330

XI. Conclusion30

PETITIONER'S UPDATED EXHIBIT LIST

EX1001	U.S. Patent 7,302,423 to DeBellis (“’423 Patent”)
EX1002	Prosecution File History of U.S. Patent 7,302,423 (“’423 PH”)
EX1003	Excerpts from Prosecution File History of U.S. Patent 6,760,720 (“’720 PH”)
EX1004	Prosecution File History of U.S. Provisional Appl. 60/227,305
EX1005	Declaration of Dr. Philip Greenspun Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.68 (“ <i>Greenspun</i> ”)
EX1006	US Patent 5,701,453 to Maloney et al. (“ <i>Maloney</i> ”)
EX1007	US Patent 7,168,039 to Bertram (“ <i>Bertram</i> ”)
EX1008	US Patent 6,300,947 to Kanevsky (“ <i>Kanevsky</i> ”)
EX1009	John Walkenbach, <u>Microsoft Excel 2000 Bible</u> (IDG Books Worldwide, Inc. 1999). (“ <i>Excel</i> ”)
EX1010	IBM Dictionary of Computing, Tenth Edition (1993) (“ <i>IBM</i> ”)
EX1011	Declaration of Ingrid Hsieh-Yee
EX1012	Curriculum Vitae of Dr. Philip Greenspun
EX1013	Declaration of Dr. Philip Greenspun Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.68 in Support of Petitioner’s Opposition to Patent Owner’s Motion to Amend (“ <i>Greenspun-MtA</i> ”)
EX1014	US Patent 6,452,597 to Goldberg et al. (“ <i>Goldberg</i> ”)
EX1015	Deposition Transcript of Dr. Wesley Chu (“ <i>Chu Deposition</i> ”)

I. Introduction

The Response fails in almost every instance to address the specific combinations of art articulated in the Petition, instead addressing passages that do not pertain to the grounds of unpatentability. Furthermore, Vilox does not:

- a) contest that the combination of *Excel* and *Bertram* fails to teach limitations of claims 1–3, or
- b) contest that any limitations of claim 3 are missing from either of the grounds.

For the reasons discussed in the Petition and elaborated below, the challenged claims (1–9 and 13) are unpatentable.

II. Vilox's Proposed Constructions Do Not Affect the Present Grounds of Unpatentability and Should not be Adopted

A. Claim 1 “determining a database schema for a database”

Vilox construes this claim term as, “ascertaining or identifying the logical structure of data stored in computerized files.” *Resp.*, 27. This proposed construction should be rejected, at least in part.

First, Vilox construes “determining” to mean, “ascertaining or identifying.” Unified does not oppose this construction. However, Vilox is incorrect to use this construction to attempt to preclude any knowledge by a “human person, or any inanimate object,” of a database schema. *See, e.g., Resp.*, 52. Vilox appears to be advancing a construction that is similar to “deducing” or “discovering” rather than

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.