

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

CAVIUM, INC.,

*Petitioner,*

v.

ALACRITECH INC.,

*Patent Owner*

---

Case IPR2018-00403  
U.S. Patent 8,805,948

---

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. OVERVIEW OF THE '948 PATENT .....	6
A. The '948 Patent Specification.....	6
B. The '948 Patent Claims .....	11
III. PROSECUTION HISTORY OF THE '948 PATENT .....	11
IV. OVERVIEW OF THE ALLEGED PRIOR ART .....	12
A. Thia, <i>A Reduced Operation Protocol Engine (ROPE) for a Multiple-layer Bypass Architecture</i> (1995) (" <i>Thia</i> ") .....	13
B. Tanenbaum, <i>Computer Networks</i> , 3rd ed. (1996) (" <i>Tanenbaum</i> ") .....	17
C. Stevens, <i>TCP/IP Illustrated Volume 2: The Implementation</i> (" <i>Stevens2</i> ") (Ex. 1013) .....	19
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	21
VI. THE BOARD SHOULD EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 314(A) AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.108(A) TO DENY INSTITUTION OF ANY CLAIM OF THE '948 PATENT .....	21
A. All Factors Weigh in Favor of The Board Exercising its Discretion to Deny Institution of the Second Petition under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a) .....	22
1. First Factor: Cavium Has Filed Two Petitions Directed to the Same Claims of the '948 Patent on the Same Ground .....	23
2. Second Factor: Cavium Held Back Alleged Evidence and Arguments from the First Petition that it Now Seeks to Add in the Second Petition.....	24
3. Third Factor: Cavium Had Alacritech's Preliminary Response to the First Petition and the Board's Decision Denying the First Petition at the time the Second Petition Was Filed.....	26
4. Fourth Factor: Cavium Waited Months Between First Learning of Stevens2 reference, the	

	Deficiencies in its First Petition, and the Filing of the Second Petition .....	27
5.	Fifth Factor: Cavium Offers No Explanation for the Time Elapsed Between Filing the First and Second Petitions Challenging The Same Claims Using The Same Ground.....	29
6.	Sixth Factor: Cavium's Serial, Incremental Petitions Waste Finite Resources of the Board .....	30
7.	Seventh Factor: Cavium's Serial, Incremental Petitions Risk Issuance of a Final Determination Within One Year .....	31
B.	The Board Also Should Exercise its Discretion to Deny Institution of the Second Petition Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) .....	32
VII.	EVEN IF THE BOARD DOES NOT EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION TO DENY THE THIRD PETITION, CAVIUM STILL HAS NOT MADE A SUFFICIENT THRESHOLD SHOWING THAT STEVENS2 IS AVAILABLE AS PRIOR ART .....	34
VIII.	CAVIUM HAS NOT SUFFICIENTLY SHOWN A MOTIVATION TO COMBINE THIA WITH TANENBAUM OR STEVENS2 .....	39
IX.	CAVIUM HAS NOT SHOWN A DISCLOSURE OF <i>PACKET</i> PROCESSING FOR THE "CHECKING" LIMITATIONS OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS .....	41
X.	ALACRITECH RESERVES ITS RIGHTS UNDER THE PENDING <i>OIL STATES</i> CASE AT THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT .....	48
XI.	CONCLUSION .....	48

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Cases**

*Alacritech, Inc. v. CenturyLink, Inc.*,  
2:16-cv-00693-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex.) ..... 6

*Alacritech, Inc. v. Wistron Corp.*,  
2:16-cv-00692-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex.) ..... 6

*Alacritech, Inc. v. Dell Inc.*,  
2:16-cv-00695-RWS-RSP (E.D. Tex.)..... 6

*Apple Inc., v. DSS Technology Management, Inc.*,  
Case IPR2015-00369 (PTAB Aug. 12, 2015)..... 4, 28

*Beckman Instruments v.LKB Produkter AB*,  
892 F.2d 1547, 13 USPQ2d 1301 (Fed. Cir. 1989)..... 13

*Butamax Advanced Biofuels LLC, v. Gevo, Inc.*,  
Case IPR2014-00581 (PTAB Oct. 14, 2014)..... 29

*Cisco Systems, Inc. v. C-Cation Techs., LLC*,  
IPR2014-00454 (PTAB Aug. 29, 2014) ..... 36

*Coalition for Affordable Drugs IV LLC v. Pharmacyclics, Inc.*,  
IPR2015-01076 (PTAB Oct.19, 2015)..... 36

*Duk San Neolux Co., Ltd. v. Idemitsu Kosan Co., Ltd.*,  
Case IPR2017-00197 (PTAB March 31, 2017) ..... 26

*Dynamic Drinkware LLC v. Nat'l Graphics, Inc.*,  
800 F.3d 1375, 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2015) ..... 33

*General Plastic Industrial Co., LTD. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha*,  
Case IPR2016-01357 (PTAB September 6, 2017) ..... 3, 20, 22, 29

*Harmonic, Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.*,  
815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016)..... 20

*LG Electronics, Inc. v. Core Wireless Licensing S.A.R.L.*,  
IPR2016-00986 (PTAB August 22, 2016)..... 3

*Nvidia Corp. v. Samsung Electronics Co., LTD.*,  
Case IPR2016-00134 (PTAB May 4, 2016) ..... 3, 20, 22, 29

<i>Oil States Energy Servs. LLC v. Greene's Energy Group, LLC</i> , Case No. 16-712, <i>certiorari granted</i> (U.S. Jun. 12, 2017) .....	47
<i>Samsung Elec. Co. v. Rembrandt Wireless Techs., LP</i> , Case IPR2015-00114 (PTAB Jan. 28, 2015) .....	29
<i>Sketchers USA, Inc., v. Adidas, AG.</i> , IPR2017-00322 (PTAB May 30, 2017) .....	20, 29
<i>Symbol Techs. Inc. v. Opticon Inc.</i> , 935 F.2d 1569, 19 USPQ2d 1241 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....	13
<i>Xactware Sols., Inc. v. Eagle View Techs., Inc.</i> , Case IPR2017-00034 (PTAB April 13, 2017) .....	29
<b>Statutory Authorities</b>	
35 U.S.C. § 102.....	2, 22
35 U.S.C. § 103.....	13
35 U.S.C. § 311(b).....	2, 22
35 U.S.C. § 314.....	3
35 U.S.C. § 314(a) .....	3, 20, 47
35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11).....	21, 30
35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....	3, 20, 21, 31, 32, 33
<b>Rules and Regulations</b>	
37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b) .....	30
37 C.F.R. § 42.108.....	3
37 C.F.R. § 42.108(a) .....	3, 20
37 C.F.R. § 42.123(a) .....	4, 28
<b>Additional Authorities</b>	
Thia, <i>A Reduced Operation Protocol Engine (ROPE) for a Multiple- layer Bypass Architecture</i> (1995).....	12
U.S. Patent No. 8,805,948 .....	1

# 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.