

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

WISTRON CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

v.

ALACRITECH, INC.,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2018-00329
U.S. Patent No. 7,673,072

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 313 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. OVERVIEW OF THE '072 PATENT	3
A. The '072 Patent Specification	3
B. The '072 Patent Claims	4
III. OVERVIEW OF THE ASSERTED PRIOR ART	7
A. U.S. Patent No. 5,768,618 to Erickson et al. ("Erickson")	7
B. Andrew S. Tanenbaum, Computer Networks, 3rd ed. (1996) ("Tanenbaum")	9
IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	10
A. This Petition Should Be Denied Because Petitioner Alleges Certain Claim Terms Are Indefinite	10
B. Petitioner's Proposed Terms for Construction Do Not Affect Alacritech's Non-Obviousness Argument in This Preliminary Response.....	11
V. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY THE PETITION BECAUSE IT FAILS TO DISCLOSE ALL REAL PARTIES IN INTEREST	12
A. Intel Desires Review of the '072 Patent	13
B. Intel Effectively Controls Wistron	15
C. The Relationship Between Intel and Wistron is Sufficiently Close.....	16
D. Intel And Wistron Have Coordinated Interest And Action In Challenging The Patent-In-Suit	18
E. Intel Has Effective Choice as to the Legal Theories and Proofs of Wistron	19
F. Finding That Intel Is A Real Party In Interest Is Consistent With Legislative Intent.....	20
VI. THE BOARD SHOULD DECLINE INSTITUTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(D) BECAUSE ALL THE PRIOR ART HAS ALREADY BEEN CONSIDERED BY THE OFFICE.....	21

VII. THERE IS NO REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT THE PETITIONER WILL PREVAIL UNDER GROUND 1 (THE ONLY GROUND).....22

A. There Is No Motivation to Combine Erickson and Tanenbaum23

B. Tanenbaum Fails to Disclose and Teaches Away [1.4] [9.4] or [15.4] “Dividing, by the Interface Device, the Data into Segments”24

C. Erickson Fails to Disclose [1.4] [9.4] or [15.4] “dividing, by the interface device, the data into segments”26

1. Erickson does not disclose any interface device that is capable of dividing the data into segments26

2. Petitioner’s reliance on its expert’s hindsight modifications of Erickson is baseless27

VIII. ALACRITECH RESERVES ITS RIGHTS UNDER THE PENDING *OIL STATES* CASE AT THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT31

IX. CONCLUSION31

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page</u>
Cases	
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc’ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	30
<i>Alacritech, Inc. v. CenturyLink, Inc.</i> , 2:16-cv-00693-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex.).....	1, 12
<i>Alacritech, Inc. v. Dell Inc.</i> , 2:16-cv-00695-RWS-RSP (E.D. Tex.)	1, 12
<i>Alacritech, Inc. v. Wistron Corp.</i> , 2:16-cv-00692-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex.).....	1, 12
<i>ams AG v. 511 Innovations, Inc.</i> , Case IPR2016-01788 (PTAB Mar. 15, 2017)	11
<i>Benson & Ford, Inc. v. Wanda Petroleum Co.</i> , 833 F.2d 1172 (5th Cir. 1987)	16
<i>Fidelity Nat’l Info. Servs., Inc. v. DataTreasury Corp.</i> , IPR2014-00489	28
<i>Oil States Energy Servs. LLC v. Greene’s Energy Group, LLC</i> , Case No. 16-712, certiorari granted (U.S. Jun. 12, 2017)	31
<i>In re Steele</i> , 305 F.2d 859 (CCPA 1962)	11
Statutory Authorities	
35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	1
35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(2).....	2, 12
35 U.S.C. § 313	1
35 U.S.C. § 314.....	3
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	7
35 U.S.C. § 315	14
35 U.S.C. § 315(b)	14
35 U.S.C. § 325(d)	22
Rules and Regulations	
37 C.F.R. § 41.65(a)	30
37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(3)	28
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)	2, 12
37 CFR § 42.22(a)(2)	28
37 C.F.R. § 42.106(b).....	12
37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a).....	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.108	3

Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756, 48759-60
(Aug. 14, 2012)..... passim
H.R. Rept. No 112-98 (2011) (Judiciary Committee Report on H.R. 1249,
June 1, 2011)..... 20

Legislative Materials
157 Cong. Rec. S1034, S1041 (Mar. 1, 2011)..... 20

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.