

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.
Petitioner

v.

CONSTELLATION TECHNOLOGIES LLC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2014-00914
Patent 8,464,299

**CONSTELLATION TECHNOLOGIES LLC'S
PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Claim Construction.....	2
	A. "Action To Conserve Resources Associated With Transporting The Television Content Over The Packet Network"	2
	1. The Claims	4
	2. The Specification	6
	3. The Prosecution History	10
	B. "Resource Conserving Process"	12
III.	Institution On Ground 1 Should Be Denied Because The Petition Omits Essential Arguments, Which The Petitioner Attempts To Incorporate By Reference To A Declaration To Circumvent The Page Limit.....	13
IV.	Institution On Ground 1 Should Also Be Denied Because The Petitioner Fails To Establish That Minnick Anticipates The Challenged Claims.....	15
	A. Legal Standards For Anticipation	15
	B. Minnick Does Not Disclose "An Action To Conserve Resources Associated With Transporting . . . Content Over The Packet Network" As Required By All Challenged Claims	16
	C. Petitioner Relies On Disclosure Regarding <i>Non-Television Content</i> In Arguing That The Claimed "Action To Conserve Resources Associated With Transporting <i>Television Content</i> " Required By All Claims Is Disclosed	25
	D. Petitioner Also Fails To Show That Minnick Discloses "Determining If A Resource Conserving Process Should Be Activated" As Required By All Challenged Claims	26

E.	Petitioner Additionally Fails To Establish That Minnick Discloses Limitations Recited In Dependent Claims.....	27
V.	Institution On Ground 2 Should Be Denied Because The Petition Omits Essential Arguments, Which The Petitioner Attempts To Incorporate By Reference To A Declaration To Circumvent The Page Limit.....	29
VI.	Institution On Ground 2 Should Also Be Denied Because The Petition Fails To Establish That Riley Is Prior Art	30
A.	The '299 Patent's Priority Date Is November 17, 2004 Or Earlier	30
B.	Riley Is Not Entitled To A Reference Date Before January 24, 2005	42
VII.	Institution On Ground 2 Should Also Be Denied Because The Petition Fails To Establish Riley In View Of Minnick Renders Obvious Claims 1-3, 6-11, 14, 15 And 18-22.....	48
A.	Petitioner Fails To Establish That Riley Teaches "If The Resource Conserving Process Should Be Activated: Determining Whether The Viewer Is Watching The Television Monitor" As Required By All Challenged Claims	48
B.	Petitioner Fails To Establish That Riley And Minnick Disclose Limitations Recited In Dependent Claims	50
1.	Limitations Allegedly Only Disclosed By Minnick	50
2.	Limitations Allegedly Only Disclosed By Riley	50
C.	Petitioner Fails To Show That A Person Of Ordinary Skill Would Have Had Reason To Combine Minnick With Riley.....	51
VIII.	Institution On Ground 3 Should Be Denied Because The Petition Fails To Establish That Riley, In Combination With Minnick And Harrell, Renders Obvious Claims 12 And 13	59
IX.	Conclusion	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Atofina v. Great Lakes Chem. Corp.</i> , 441 F.3d 991 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	15, 26
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	58
<i>In re Cortright</i> , 165 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	3
<i>In re Hyatta</i> , 211 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	3
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	51
<i>Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Progressive Casualty Ins. Co.</i> , CBM2013-00003, Paper No. 8 (P.T.A.B, March 15, 2013)	52
<i>Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. Am. Hoist & Derrick Co.</i> , 730 F.2d 1452 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	58
<i>Lockwood v. Am. Airlines, Inc.</i> , 107 F.3d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	47
<i>Moses Lake Industries, Inc. v. Enthone</i> , Case IPR2014-00246, Paper 6 (P.T.A.B June 18, 2014)	52
<i>Superguide Corp. v. DirecTV Enterprises, Inc.</i> , 358 F.3d 870 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	31
<i>Tech. Licensing Corp. v. Videotek, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	32, 39
<i>Therasense, Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson & Co.</i> , 593 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	15

IPR2014-00914
Patent No. 8,464,299

Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California,
814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987) 15

Whitserve, LLC v. Computer Packages, Inc.,
694 F.3d 10 (2012) 51

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 119(e) 47

37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a)..... 51

Other Authorities

MPEP § 2143, Section I..... 52, 56

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.