

IPR2018-00132
Patent 6,226,686

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

RIOT GAMES, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

PALTALK HOLDINGS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-00132
Patent 6,226,686

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
TO PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,226,686**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....1

II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION2

A. “GROUP MESSAGING SERVER” (CLAIM 12)3

B. “MESSAGE GROUP” (CLAIMS 1, 3, 7, 12, AND 18)4

**C. “PORTION THAT IS USED TO IDENTIFY SAID MESSAGE GROUP” (CLAIMS 1, 3, 7 AND 18)
AND “PORTION THAT IS USED TO IDENTIFY SAID FIRST MESSAGE GROUP” (CLAIM 12)5**

D. “AGGREGATED MESSAGE” (CLAIMS 1, 3, 7, 12) AND “SERVER MESSAGE” (CLAIM 18).....5

E. “PAYLOAD PORTION” (CLAIM 1, 3, 7, 12 AND 18)9

**F. “AGGREGATED PAYLOAD” (CLAIMS 1, 7, 12); “AGGREGATING SAID PAYLOAD
PORTIONS” (CLAIM 3) AND “AGGREGATING SAID PAYLOAD PORTION WITH THE
PAYLOAD PORTION OF A SECOND HOST MESSAGE” (CLAIM 18)11**

**III. THE BOARD IS RESPECTFULLY URGED TO DENY INSTITUTION OF THE
PETITION WITH RESPECT TO AT LEAST CLAIMS 3 AND 7 PURSUANT TO
35 U.S.C. § 325(D)13**

**IV. PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO DEMONSTRATE A REASONABLE
LIKELIHOOD OF PREVAILING WITH RESPECT TO ANY OF THE ‘686
PATENT CLAIMS14**

**A. PETITIONER HAS NOT SUFFICIENTLY PROVEN THAT RFC 1692, RFC 1459, RFC 791,
AND RFC 1001 ARE PRIOR PUBLICATIONS TO THE ‘686 PATENT15**

**B. GROUND 1: PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO DEMONSTRATE THAT ALDRED IN VIEW OF
RFC 1692 RENDERS OBVIOUS CLAIMS 1, 3, 7, 12, 18, 26, 27, 45, 46, 62, AND 63 OF THE
‘686 PATENT UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103.....21**

**1. Petitioner has failed to demonstrate that Aldred in view of RFC 1692 renders
obvious Claims 1, 3, 7, 12 and 18.....21**

**a. Petitioner has failed to demonstrate that Aldred discloses, either inherently or
obviously, messages containing a portion for identifying a message group21**

| | |
|--|----|
| i. Petitioner has failed to show that Aldred discloses or suggests “messages contains . . . a portion that is used to identify said message group” (Claims 1, 3, 7 and 18); and “messages contains . . . a portion that is used to identify said first message group” (Claim 12) | 22 |
| ii. Petitioner has failed to show that Aldred discloses or suggests “maintaining a list of message groups” | 27 |
| b. Petitioner has failed to demonstrate that RFC 1692 discloses or suggests “aggregating said payload portions of said host messages . . . to create an aggregated payload” (Claim 1 and 3); “aggregating said payload portions of said messages . . . to create an aggregated payload” (Claim 7 and 12); and “aggregating said payload portion with the payload portion of a second host message” (Claim 18)..... | 29 |
| c. Petitioner has failed to demonstrate that RFC 1692 discloses or suggests “forming an aggregated message using said aggregated payload” (Claims 1, 12); “create an aggregated message” (Claim 3); “said aggregated message” (Claim 7); and “forming a server message . . .” (Claim 18)..... | 38 |
| i. Petitioner does not provide a sufficient motivation for combining Aldred and RFC 1692 | 38 |
| ii. The combination of Aldred and RFC 1692 does not disclose “forming an aggregated message using said aggregated payload” as recited in Claim 1, 12 and 18 or creating and aggregated message as referenced in Claims 3 and 7 | 41 |
| 2. Aldred in view of RFC 1692 does not render obvious Claims 26, 27, 45, 46, 62 and 63..... | 48 |
| C. <u>GROUND 2: PETITIONER HAS NOT DEMONSTRATED THAT ALDRED IN VIEW OF RFC 1692 AND ULRICH RENDERS OBVIOUS CLAIMS 22-27, 41-46, AND 58-63 OF THE ‘686 PATENT UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103</u> | 49 |
| D. <u>GROUND 3: PETITIONER HAS NOT DEMONSTRATED THAT ALDRED IN VIEW OF RFC 1692 AND DENZER RENDERS OBVIOUS CLAIMS 36 AND 55 OF THE ‘686 PATENT UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103</u> | 49 |
| V. CONCLUSION | 50 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Blue Coat Sys., Inc. v. Finjan, Inc., IPR2016-01444, Paper 9 (February 16, 2017) 16
Conopco, Inc. v. The Proctor & Gamble Co., No. IPR2014-00506, Paper No. 17..... 14
Ex parte Levy, 17 USPQ 2d 1461 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990).....23
Google Inc. v. Art+Com Innovationpool GMBH, IPR2015-00789, Paper 8 at p. 4
(September 2, 2015)..... 15
In re Rijckaert, 9 F.3d 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993)23
Int’l Bus. Mach. Corp. v. EnvisionIt, LLC, IPR2017-01246, Paper 7 (October 16,
2017) 16, 17
Los Angeles Cnty. Metro. Transp. Auth. v. Transp. Technologies, LLC, IPR2016-
01633, Paper 22 (November 17, 2017)..... 16
Phillips v. AWH Corp., 415 F.3d 1303, 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2005)2, 3

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3)..... 1
35 U.S.C. § 313..... 1
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)..... 13

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4)..... 1
37 C.F.R. § 42.107 1

Other Authorities

MPEP 211223

IPR2018-00132
Patent 6,226,686

LIST OF EXHIBITS

| | |
|----------------------|------------------------------|
| Exhibit 2001: | Declaration of Nancy Miracle |
|----------------------|------------------------------|

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.