UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

WESTERN DIGITAL CORPORATION
Petitioner

v.

SPEX TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
Patent Owner

Patent No. 6,088,802
Filing Date: June 4, 1997
Issue Date: July 11, 2000
Title: PERIPHERAL DEVICE WITH INTEGRATED SECURITY FUNCTIONALITY

SPEX TECHNOLOGIES, INC.'S PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

Case No. IPR2018-00082

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page(s)

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. THE BOARD SHOULD EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION TO DENY THE PETITION DUE TO PETITIONER'S STRATEGIC DELAY IN FILING THE PETITION 6

III. THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO PROVIDE A SUFFICIENT STATEMENT OF HOW THE CLAIMS SHOULD BE CONSTRUED 13

IV. PETITIONER HAS NOT DEMONSTRATED A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS FOR THE GROUNDS ADVANCED IN THE PETITION, AND THE PETITION SHOULD BE DENIED 16

A. Requirements for Showing Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. § 103. 16

B. Ground 1: Claims 1-2, 6-7, 11-12, 23-25, and 38-39 Are Not Obvious Over Harari in View of PCMCIA System Architecture 19

1. Petitioner Failed to Show that the Claimed "Security Means" Is Disclosed in Harari 20

2. Petitioner Failed to Show that the Claimed "Means for Operably Connecting" Is Disclosed in Harari or PCMCIA System Architecture 24

3. Petitioner Failed to Show that Harari or PCMCIA System Architecture Discloses the "Means for Providing" as Recited in Claims 6, 23, and 24, and "Receiving a Request from a Host Computing Device" and Providing Information in Response to the Request as Recited in Claims 38 26

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

4. Petitioner Failed to Show that the Claimed "Means for Mediating Communications . . . so that the Communicated Data Must First Pass Through the Security Means" Is Disclosed in Harari.....29

C. Ground 2: Claims 1-2, 11-12, 23 and 39 Are Not Obvious Over Harari in View of PCMCIA System Architecture and Wang.....33

D. Grounds 3 and 4: Claims 1-2, 11-12, 23 and 39 Are Not Obvious for the Same Reasons as Grounds 1-2 when Considered Further in View of Dumas 36

V. CONCLUSION.....37

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

Apple, Inc. v. Contentguard Holdings, Inc.,
IPR2015-00355 (P.T.A.B. June 26, 2015) 17

Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp.,
732 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir 2013) 18

Carefusion Corp. v. Baxter Int'l, Inc.,
Case IPR2016-01456 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 6, 2017).....14

Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee,
136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).....6

Fresenius USA, Inc. v. Baxter Int'l, Inc.,
582 F.3d 1288 (Fed. Cir. 2009) 19, 22

General Plastic Indus. Co., Ltd. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha,
Case IPR2016-01357 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 6, 2017).....*passim*

Graham v. John Deere Co.,
383 U.S. 1 (1966).....17

Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbott Labs.,
512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008) 18

Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.,
821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016) 18

Intelligent Bio-Syst., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.,
Case IPR2013-00324 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 21, 2013).....6

Kingston Tech. Co. v. SPEX Techs., Inc.,
Case IPR2017-00824 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 17, 2017).....3, 9, 10, 21

KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,
550 U.S. 398 (2007).....17, 35

Los Angeles Biomedical Research Inst. at Harbor-UCLA Med. Ctr. v. Eli Lilly & Co., 849 F.3d 1049 (Fed. Cir. 2017) 18

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

NetApp Inc. v. Realtime Data LLC,
Case IPR2017-01354 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 14, 2017) 8, 9

Pers. Web Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc.,
848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017) 17

SPEX Tech., Inc. v. Kingston Tech. Corp.,
No. 8:16-cv-01790 (C.D. Cal.) 2

SPEX Techs., Inc. v. Western Dig. Corp.,
No. 8:16-cv-01799 (C.D. Cal.) 1

Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.,
713 F.2d 1530 (Fed. Cir. 1983) 17

Toyota Motor Corp. v. Blitzsafe Texas LLC,
Case IPR2016-00422 (P.T.A.B. July 6, 2016) 13

Unified Patents, v. SPEX Techs., Inc.,
Case IPR2017-00430 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 14, 2016).....9, 10

In re Van Os,
844 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2017) 18

Williamson v. Citrix Online, LLC,
792 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2015) 22

Statutes

35 U.S.C. 112(f).....13

35 U.S.C. § 103.....16

35 U.S.C. § 314(a) 6, 7, 13

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3).....3, 13, 16

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4).....*passim*

37 C.F.R. § 42.108(a).....6, 7, 13

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.