

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

WISTRON CORPORATION
Petitioner

v.

ALACRITECH, INC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR. No. IPR2018-00329

U.S. Patent No. 7,673,072

Title: FAST-PATH APPARATUS FOR TRANSMITTING DATA
CORRESPONDING TO A TCP CONNECTION

**Petition For *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,673,072 Under
35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 and 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.1-.80, 42.100-.123**

Mail Stop “PATENT BOARD”

Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. REQUIREMENTS FOR PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW	1
2.1. Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a))	1
2.2. Notice of Lead and Backup Counsel and Service Information.....	1
2.3. Notice of Real-Parties-in-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)).....	2
2.4. Notice of Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)).....	2
2.5. Fee for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review	5
2.6. Proof of Service.....	5
3. IDENTIFICATION OF CLAIMS BEING CHALLENGED (§42.104(B))	5
a) U.S. Pat. No. 5,768,618, to Erickson, titled “Method for Performing Sequence of Actions in Device Connected to Computer in Response to Specified Values Being Written Into Snooped Sub Portions of Address Space,” filed on Dec. 21, 1995 and issued on June 16, 1998 (Ex.1005, “Erickson”) in view of	5
b) Computer Networks, A. Tanenbaum, 3rd ed. (1996) (Ex.1006, “Tanenbaum96”).....	6
4. BACKGROUND OF THE TECHNOLOGY.....	6
4.1. TCP/IP	6
4.2. UDP/IP	10
4.3. Protocol Offload.....	10
5. OVERVIEW OF THE 072 PATENT.....	12
6. 072 PATENT PROSECUTION HISTORY	16
7. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	16
7.1. Applicable Law	16
7.2. Construction of Claim Terms.....	17
8. PERSON HAVING ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	19
9. DESCRIPTION OF THE PRIOR ART	19
9.1. Tanenbaum96: A. Tanenbaum, Computer Networks, 3rd ed. (1996)	20
9.2. U.S. Patent No. 5,768,618 (“Erickson”)	23
9.3. Motivations To Combine Erickson and Tanenbaum96	26
10. GROUND #1: CLAIMS 1–21 ARE UNPATENTABLE AS OBVIOUS OVER ERICKSON IN VIEW OF TANENBAUM96.....	30

10.1. Claim 1 is unpatentable as obvious over Erickson in view of Tanenbaum96	30
10.2. Claim 2 is unpatentable as obvious over Erickson in view of Tanenbaum96	45
10.3. Claim 3 is unpatentable as obvious over Erickson in view of Tanenbaum96	50
10.4. Claim 4 is unpatentable as obvious over Erickson in view of Tanenbaum96	53
10.5. Claim 5 is unpatentable as obvious over Erickson in view of Tanenbaum96	56
10.6. Claim 6 is unpatentable as obvious over Erickson in view of Tanenbaum96	56
10.7. Claim 7 is unpatentable as obvious over Erickson in view of Tanenbaum96	57
10.8. Claim 8 is unpatentable as obvious over Erickson in view of Tanenbaum96	59
10.9. Claim 9 is unpatentable as obvious over Erickson in view of Tanenbaum96	59
10.10. Claim 10 is unpatentable as obvious over Erickson in view of Tanenbaum96	63
10.11. Claim 11 is unpatentable as obvious over Erickson in view of Tanenbaum96	66
10.12. Claim 12 is unpatentable as obvious over Erickson in view of Tanenbaum96	66
10.13. Claim 13 is unpatentable as obvious over Erickson in view of Tanenbaum96	67
10.14. Claim 14 is unpatentable as obvious over Erickson in view of Tanenbaum96	68
10.15. Claim 15 is unpatentable as obvious over Erickson in view of Tanenbaum96	69
10.16. Claim 16 is unpatentable as obvious over Erickson in view of Tanenbaum96	72
10.17. Claim 17 is unpatentable as obvious over Erickson in view of Tanenbaum96	73
10.18. Claim 18 is unpatentable as obvious over Erickson in view of Tanenbaum96	74
10.19. Claim 19 is unpatentable as obvious over Erickson in view of Tanenbaum96	74
10.20. Claim 20 is unpatentable as obvious over Erickson in view of Tanenbaum96	75

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,673,072

10.21.Claim 21 is unpatentable as obvious over Erickson in view of
Tanenbaum96 75

11. CONCLUSION..... 76

Exhibit List

Exhibit #	Description
Ex.1001	U.S. Patent No. 7,673,072
Ex.1002	Prosecution File History of U.S. Patent No. 7,673,072
Ex.1003	Declaration of Robert Horst Declaration
Ex.1004	<i>Curriculum Vitae</i> of Robert Horst
Ex.1005	U.S. Patent No. 5,768,618 (“Erickson”)
Ex.1006	Tanenbaum, Andrew S., <i>Computer Networks</i> , Prentice-Hall, Inc., New Jersey (1996). (“Tanenbaum96”)
Ex.1007	Transmission Control Protocol, “Darpa Internet Protocol Specification”, RFC: 793, Sept. 1981. (“RFC 793”)
Ex.1008	Stevens, W. Richard, <i>TCP/IP Illustrated Volume 1: The Protocols</i> , Addison-Wesley (1994). (“Stevens1”)
Ex.1009	Lilinkamp, J., Mandell. R. and Padlipsky, M., “Proposed Host-Front End Protocol”, Network Working Group Request for Comments: 929, Dec. 1984. (“RFC 929”)
Ex.1010	Reserved
Ex.1011	Declaration of Rice Majors regarding Tanenbaum, Andrew S., Computer Network
Ex.1012	Reserved
Ex.1013	Stevens, W. Richard and Gary R. Wright, <i>TCP/IP Illustrated Volume 2: The Implementation</i> , Addison-Wesley (1995). (“Stevens2”)
Ex.1014	Touch, J., “TCP Control Block Interdependence”, Network Working Group Request for Comments: 2140, April 1997. (“RFC 2140”)
Ex.1015	Thia, Y.H., Woodside, C.M., “A Reduced Operation Protocol Engine (ROPE) for a Multiple-Layer Bypass Architecture”, <i>Protocols for High Speed Networks</i> (Dordrecht), 1995. (“Thia”)

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.