



US006779118C2

(12) **INTER PARTES REEXAMINATION CERTIFICATE** (1128th)

United States Patent

Ikudome et al.

(10) **Number:** **US 6,779,118 C2**

(45) **Certificate Issued:** **Jun. 8, 2015**

(54) **USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM**

(75) Inventors: **Koichiro Ikudome**, Arcadia, CA (US);
Moon Tai Yeung, Alhambra, CA (US)

(73) Assignee: **LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC**, Pasadena, CA (US)

Reexamination Request:

No. 95/002,035, Sep. 12, 2012

No. 90/012,342, Jun. 8, 2012

Reexamination Certificate for:

Patent No.: **6,779,118**

Issued: **Aug. 17, 2004**

Appl. No.: **09/295,966**

Filed: **Apr. 21, 1999**

Reexamination Certificate C1 6,779,118 issued Mar. 27, 2012

Related U.S. Application Data

(60) Provisional application No. 60/084,014, filed on May 4, 1998.

(51) **Int. Cl.**
H04L 29/06 (2006.01)

(52) **U.S. Cl.**
CPC **H04L 29/06** (2013.01)

(58) **Field of Classification Search**

None

See application file for complete search history.

(56) **References Cited**

To view the complete listing of prior art documents cited during the proceedings for Reexamination Control Numbers 95/002,035 and 90/012,342, please refer to the USPTO's public Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system under the Display References tab.

Primary Examiner — Jalatee Worjloh

(57) **ABSTRACT**

A data redirection system for redirecting user's data based on a stored rule set. The redirection of data is performed by a redirection server, which receives the redirection rule sets for each user from an authentication and accounting server, and a database. Prior to using the system, users authenticate with the authentication and accounting server, and receive a network address. The authentication and accounting server retrieves the proper rule set for the user, and communicates the rule set and the user's address to the redirection server. The redirection server then implements the redirection rule set for the user's address. Rule sets are removed from the redirection server either when the user disconnects, or based on some predetermined event. New rule sets are added to the redirection server either when a user connects, or based on some predetermined event.

**INTER PARTES
REEXAMINATION CERTIFICATE
ISSUED UNDER 35 U.S.C. 316**

5

THE PATENT IS HEREBY AMENDED AS
INDICATED BELOW.

AS A RESULT OF REEXAMINATION, IT HAS BEEN
DETERMINED THAT:

10

Claims **1, 8, 15** and **25** were previously cancelled.
Claims **2-7, 9-14, 16-24** and **26-90** are cancelled.

* * * * *



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
95/002,035 <i>901012342</i>	09/12/2012	6779118	RI1341006F	1745
40401	7590	05/19/2015	EXAMINER WORJLOH, JALATEE	
Herskovitz and Associates, PLLC 2845 Duke Street Alexandria, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3992	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/19/2015	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Transmittal of Communication to Third Party Requester <i>Inter Partes</i> Reexamination	Control No.	Patent Under Reexamination	
	95/002,035 + 90/012,342	6779118	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jalatee Worjloh	3992	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address. --

(THIRD PARTY REQUESTER'S CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS)

Haynes & Boone, LLP
2323 Victory Avenue, Suite 700
Dallas, Texas 75219

Enclosed is a copy of the latest communication from the United States Patent and Trademark Office in the above-identified reexamination proceeding. 37 CFR 1.903.

Prior to the filing of a Notice of Appeal, each time the patent owner responds to this communication, the third party requester of the *inter partes* reexamination may once file written comments within a period of 30 days from the date of service of the patent owner's response. This 30-day time period is statutory (35 U.S.C. 314(b)(2)), and, as such, it cannot be extended. See also 37 CFR 1.947.

If an *ex parte* reexamination has been merged with the *inter partes* reexamination, no responsive submission by any *ex parte* third party requester is permitted.

All correspondence relating to this *inter partes* reexamination proceeding should be directed to the **Central Reexamination Unit** at the mail, FAX, or hand-carry addresses given at the end of the communication enclosed with this transmittal.

Transmittal of Communication to Third Party Requester <i>Inter Partes</i> Reexamination	Control No.	Patent Under Reexamination	
	90/012,342 and 95/002,035	6779118	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jalatee Worjloh	3992	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address. --

(THIRD PARTY REQUESTER'S CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS)

James J. Wong
2108 Gossamer Avenue
Redwood City, CA 94065

Enclosed is a copy of the latest communication from the United States Patent and Trademark Office in the above-identified reexamination proceeding. 37 CFR 1.903.

Prior to the filing of a Notice of Appeal, each time the patent owner responds to this communication, the third party requester of the *inter partes* reexamination may once file written comments within a period of 30 days from the date of service of the patent owner's response. This 30-day time period is statutory (35 U.S.C. 314(b)(2)), and, as such, it cannot be extended. See also 37 CFR 1.947.

If an *ex parte* reexamination has been merged with the *inter partes* reexamination, no responsive submission by any *ex parte* third party requester is permitted.

All correspondence relating to this *inter partes* reexamination proceeding should be directed to the **Central Reexamination Unit** at the mail, FAX, or hand-carry addresses given at the end of the communication enclosed with this transmittal.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ISSUE INTER PARTES REEXAMINATION CERTIFICATE	Control No. 95/002,035 and 90/012,342	Patent Under Reexamination 6779118
	Examiner Jalatee Worjloh	Art Unit 3992

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address. --

1. Prosecution on the merits is (or remains) closed in this *inter partes* reexamination proceeding. This proceeding is subject to reopening at the initiative of the Office or upon petition. Cf. 37 CFR 1.313(a). A Certificate will be issued in view of:
 - a. The communication filed on _____ by _____
 - b. Patent owner's failure to file an appropriate timely response to the Office action dated _____
 - c. The failure to timely file an Appeal with fee by all parties to the reexamination proceeding entitled to do so. 37 CFR 1.959 and 41.61.
 - d. The failure to timely file an Appellant's Brief with fee by all parties to the reexamination proceeding entitled to do so. 37 CFR 41.66(a).
 - e. The decision on appeal by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences Court dated 2/20/2015
 - f. Other: _____

2. The Reexamination Certificate will indicate the following:
 - a. Change in the Specification: Yes No
 - b. Change in the Drawings: Yes No
 - c. Status of the Claims:
 - (1) Patent claim(s) confirmed:
 - (2) Patent claim(s) amended (including dependent on amended claim(s)):
 - (3) Patent claim(s) cancelled: 2-7, 9-14, 16-24 and 26-90.
 - (4) Newly presented claim(s) patentable:
 - (5) Newly presented cancelled claims:
 - (6) Patent claim(s) previously currently disclaimed:
 - (7) Patent claim(s) not subject to reexamination:

3. Note the attached statement of reasons for patentability and/or confirmation. Any comments considered necessary by patent owner regarding reasons for patentability and/or confirmation must be submitted promptly to avoid processing delays. Such submission(s) should be labeled: "Comments On Statement of Reasons for Patentability and/or Confirmation."

4. Note attached NOTICE OF REFERENCE CITED, (PTO-892).

5. Note attached LIST OF REFERENCES CITED (PTO/SB/08 or PTO/SB/08 substitute).

6. The drawings filed on _____ is: approved disapproved.

7. Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a) - (d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some*
 - c) None
 of the certified copies have
 - been received.
 - not been received.
 - been filed in Application No. _____
 - been filed in reexamination Control No. _____
 - been received by the International Bureau in PCT Application No. _____

- * Certified copies not received:

8. Note Examiner's Amendment.

9. Other: _____

All correspondence relating to this *inter partes* reexamination proceeding should be directed to the **Central Reexamination Unit** at the mail, FAX, or hand-carry addresses given at the end of this Office action.

/Jalatee Worjloh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3992

Art Unit: 3992

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ISSUE REEXAMINATION CERTIFICATE

Summary

This Office action terminates the prosecution of *inter partes* reexamination of U.S. Patent No. 6,779,118 to Ikudome, et al.

Claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-24 and 26-90 were subject to reexamination. The rejection of claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-43, 68 and 90 were appealed. In light of the Board decision dated February 20, 2015, the appealed claims are canceled by examiner's amendment. Also, non-appealed, but rejected claims 2-7, 9-14, 28-35, 44-67, 69-89 are canceled by examiner's amendment.

Examiner's Amendment

An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. The changes made by this examiner's amendment will be reflected on the reexamination certificate to issue in due course.

All correspondence relating to this *inter partes* reexamination proceeding should be directed as follows:

By U.S. Postal Service Mail to:

Mail Stop Inter Partes Reexam
ATTN: Central Reexamination Unit Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By FAX to:
(571) 273-9900
Central Reexamination Unit

By Hand:
Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Art Unit: 3992

By EFS-Web:

Registered users of EFS-Web may alternatively submit such correspondence via the electronic filing system EFS-Web, at

<https://efs.uspto.gov/efile/myportal/efs-registered>

EFS-Web offers the benefit of quick submission to the particular area of the Office that needs to act on the correspondence. Also, EFS-Web submissions are "soft scanned" (i.e., electronically uploaded) directly into the official file for the reexamination proceeding, which offers parties the opportunity to review the content of their submissions after the "soft scanning" process is complete.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to the Central Reexamination Unit at telephone number (571)272-7705.

/Jalatee Worjloh/


Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3992

Conferees:



WOO H. CHOI
Supervisory Patent Reexamination Specialist
CRU - Art Unit 3992



Search Notes 	Application/Control No. 95002035 and 90/012,342	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination 6779118
	Examiner JALATEE WORJLOH	Art Unit 3992

CPC- SEARCHED		
Symbol	Date	Examiner

CPC COMBINATION SETS - SEARCHED		
Symbol	Date	Examiner

US CLASSIFICATION SEARCHED			
Class	Subclass	Date	Examiner

SEARCH NOTES		
Search Notes	Date	Examiner
review of patented file's prosecution history	10/3/2012	J.W.

INTERFERENCE SEARCH			
US Class/ CPC Symbol	US Subclass / CPC Group	Date	Examiner

--	--



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

BIB DATA SHEET

CONFIRMATION NO. 1745

SERIAL NUMBER 95/002,035	FILING or 371(c) DATE 09/12/2012 RULE	CLASS 726	GROUP ART UNIT 3992	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. RI1341006F
------------------------------------	---	---------------------	-------------------------------	--

APPLICANTS

INVENTORS

6779118, Residence Not Provided;
 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC(OWNER), Pasadena, CA;
~~David L. McCombs(SRD PTY REQ), Dallas, TX;~~
 CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.(REAL PTY IN INTEREST), San Jose, CA;
~~HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP IP SECTION, DALLAS, TX~~

**** CONTINUING DATA *******

This application is a REX of 09/295,966 04/21/1999 PAT 6779118
 which claims benefit of 60/084,014 05/04/1998

**** FOREIGN APPLICATIONS *******

**** IF REQUIRED, FOREIGN FILING LICENSE GRANTED ****

Foreign Priority claimed <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Met after Allowance Initials _____	STATE OR COUNTRY	SHEETS DRAWINGS	TOTAL CLAIMS	INDEPENDENT CLAIMS
35 USC 119(a-d) conditions met <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No					
Verified and Acknowledged /JALATEE WORJLOH/ Examiner's Signature _____					


ADDRESS

Hershkovitz and Associates, PLLC
 2845 Duke Street
 Alexandria, VA 22314
 UNITED STATES

TITLE

USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM

FILING FEE RECEIVED	FEES: Authority has been given in Paper No. _____ to charge/credit DEPOSIT ACCOUNT No. _____ for following:	<input type="checkbox"/> All Fees
		<input type="checkbox"/> 1.16 Fees (Filing)
		<input type="checkbox"/> 1.17 Fees (Processing Ext. of time)
		<input type="checkbox"/> 1.18 Fees (Issue)
		<input type="checkbox"/> Other _____
		<input type="checkbox"/> Credit

Reexamination 	Application/Control No. 95/002,035 and 90/012,342	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination 6779118
	Certificate Date	Certificate Number C2

Requester Correspondence Address:	<input type="checkbox"/> Patent Owner	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Third Party
<p>David L. McCombs (For the Inter Partes Requester) Haynes & Boone, LLP, IP Section 2323 Victory Ave., Suite 700 Dallas, TX 75219</p> <p>James J. Wong (For the Ex Parte Requester) 2108 Gossamer Avenue Redwood City, CA 94065</p>		

LITIGATION REVIEW <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	/J.W./ (examiner initials)	04/05/2013 (date)
Case Name	Director Initials	
(OPEN) 8:12cv522		
(CLOSED) 2:10cv277		
(CLOSED) 2:09cv26		
(CLOSED) 2:09cv26		
(CLOSED) 2:08cv385		
(CLOSED) 2:08cv304		
(CLOSED) 2:08cv264		

COPENDING OFFICE PROCEEDINGS	
TYPE OF PROCEEDING	NUMBER
1. none	

--	--



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Table with 5 columns: APPLICATION NO., FILING DATE, FIRST NAMED INVENTOR, ATTORNEY DOCKET NO., CONFIRMATION NO.
95/002.035 09/12/2012 6779118 RI1341006F 1745

40401 7590 02/20/2015
Hershkovitz and Associates, PLLC
2845 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER

WORJLOH, JALATEE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3992

MAIL DATE DELIVERY MODE

02/20/2015

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.
Requester

v.

LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC
Patent Owner

Appeal 2014-007780
Reexamination Control Nos. 95/002,035 and 90/012,342 (merged)
Patent 6,779,118 B1
Technology Center 3900

Before JAMES T. MOORE, MARC S. HOFF, and
DAVID M. KOHUT, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

KOHUT, *Administrative Patent Judge*

DECISION ON APPEAL

Appeal 2014-007780
Reexamination Control Nos. 95/002,035
and 90/012,342 (merged)
Patent 6,779,118 B1

Patent Owner, Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC, appeals under U.S.C. §§ 134 and 315 (2002) the Examiner's decision to adopt Requester's rejection of claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-43, and 68-90¹ under certain grounds, as discussed below. An oral hearing was conducted with the Patent Owner on January 28, 2015. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. §§ 134 and 315 (2002).

We AFFIRM.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This proceeding arose from a request by a Third Party Requester for an *ex parte* reexamination (90/009,301) and from a request by Cisco Systems, Inc. for an *inter parte* reexamination (95/002,035) of U.S. Patent 6,779,118 B1, entitled "User Specific Automatic Data Redirection System," and issued to Ikudome et al. on August 17, 2004 (the "'118 patent"). A decision *sua sponte* merged both proceedings into this single *inter parte* reexamination proceeding. *See Decision Sua Sponte Merging Reexamination Proceedings*, mailed March 20, 2013.

The '118 patent describes a system that contains a redirection server that uses a rule set to control data passing between a user and a public network.

Claim 16, on appeal, was not amended during reexamination and reads as follows:

¹ While claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-24, and 26-90 are subject to reexamination in the merged proceedings, only the claims listed are subject to the present appeal. App. Br. 3.

Appeal 2014-007780
Reexamination Control Nos. 95/002,035
and 90/012,342 (merged)
Patent 6,779,118 B1

16. A system comprising:
a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;
wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;
wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;
wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and
wherein the redirection server is configured to allow modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of time.

STATEMENT OF THE REJECTIONS

Requester proposes rejections of the claims over the following prior art references:

Fortinsky	US 5,815,574	Sept. 29, 1998
Wong	US 5,835,727	Nov. 10, 1998
Radia	US 5,848,233	Dec. 8, 1998
Willens	US 5,889,958	March 30, 1999
Stockwell	US 5,950,195	Sept. 7, 1999
He	US 6,088,451	July 11, 2000
Coss	US 6,170,012 B1	Jan. 2, 2001
Zenchelsky	US 6,233,686 B1	May 15, 2001
Ikudome	US 6,779,118 B1	Aug. 17, 2004

C. Rigney, et al., "Remote Authentication Dial In User Service (RADIUS)," <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc2138> (last accessed January 20, 2012). (Hereinafter "RFC2138").

Appeal 2014-007780
Reexamination Control Nos. 95/002,035
and 90/012,342 (merged)
Patent 6,779,118 B1

Patent Owner appeals the Examiner's adoption of the following rejections:

Claims 16-18, 23, 24, 26, 36-43, 68-71, 76-84, and 86-90 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over the combination of Willens, RFC2138, and Stockwell.

Claims 16-18, 23, 24, 26, 36-43, 68-71, 76-84, and 86-90 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over the combination of Willens, RFC2138, and Ikudome (hereinafter referred to as APA).

Claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-43, and 68-90 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over the combination of Radia, Wong, and Stockwell.

Claims 16-24 and 68-90 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over the combination of Radia, Wong, and Stockwell.

Claims 40-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over the combination of He, Zenchelsky, and APA.

Claims 40-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over the combination of He, Zenchelsky, Fortinsky, and APA.

Claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-43, and 68-90 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over the combination of Coss and APA.

ISSUES

Did the Examiner err in finding that the combination of Radia, Wong, and Stockwell teaches or suggests "the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification," as recited in independent claims 16-23, 36-39, and 68?

Appeal 2014-007780
Reexamination Control Nos. 95/002,035
and 90/012,342 (merged)
Patent 6,779,118 B1

Did the Examiner err in finding that the combination of Radia, Wong, and Stockwell teaches or suggests “instructions to the redirection sever to modify the rule set are received by . . . the redirection server,” as recited in dependent claim 24, or “receiving instructions by the redirection server to modify at least a portion of the user’s rule set,” as recited in independent claim 83?

Did the Examiner err in combining Radia, Wong, and Stockwell?

ANALYSIS

Claims 16-23, 36-39, and 68-82

Patent Owner argues that the rejection of claims 16-23, 36-39, and 68-82 is in error because the Examiner has interpreted the limitation “configured to allow modification,” as not requiring the redirection server to be used to perform the modification. App. Br. 13-14; Reb. Br. 10-12. Patent Owner contends that the correct interpretation, according to the Specification and the claims, requires the modification to be performed by the redirection server. App. Br. 14; Reb. Br. 10. Therefore, based on the Examiner’s interpretation, Patent Owner contends that the combination of Radia, Wong, and Stockwell does not teach the disputed limitation. App. Br. 14; Reb. Br. 10. We disagree.

Each of independent claims 16-23, 36-39, and 68 recite the following full limitation “the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set.” The Examiner finds (Ans. 10-11) and Requester agrees (3PR Resp. Br. 6) that this limitation

Appeal 2014-007780
Reexamination Control Nos. 95/002,035
and 90/012,342 (merged)
Patent 6,779,118 B1

should not be so narrowly interpreted as requiring the redirection server to perform the actual modification. The Examiner (Ans. 11) and Requester (3PR Resp. Br. 6) both cite to a portion of Patent Owner's Specification that supports a finding that Patent Owner contemplated something other than the redirection server performing the modification. Specifically, the Examiner (Ans. 11) and Requester (3PR Resp. Br. 6) cited the following from Patent Owner's Specification:

In yet another embodiment, signals from the Internet 110 side of redirection server 208 can be used to modify rule sets being used by the redirection server . . . Of course, the type of modification an outside server can make to a rule set on the redirection server is not limited to deleting a redirection rule, but can include any other type of modification to the rule set that is supported by the redirection server as discussed above.

'118 Patent, col. 7, l. 58 – col. 8, l. 11.

Patent Owner argues that the Examiner and Requester take this citation out of context. App. Br. 15; Reb. Br. 11. Specifically, Patent Owner contends that the following citation proves that it is the redirection server that causes the modification, not the outside server (App. Br. 15):

“. . . the web site then sends an authorization to the redirection that deletes the redirection to the questionnaire web site from the rule set for the user who successfully completed the questionnaire.”

'118 Patent, col. 8, l. 3-6.

We disagree with Patent Owner. While we agree that the portion cited by Patent Owner contemplates the redirection server deleting a portion of the rule set, this citation does not refute the Examiner's citation that an outside server can also modify the rule set.

Appeal 2014-007780
Reexamination Control Nos. 95/002,035
and 90/012,342 (merged)
Patent 6,779,118 B1

Patent Owner also argues that it would be impossible for the rule set to change without the redirection server being involved in the process. App. Br. 15; Reb. Br. 11. While we agree that the redirection server is present during the process, there is nothing in the Specification, or the claims, that require the redirection server to be actively involved in the process.

Therefore, under the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with Patent Owner's Specification, we find no error in the Examiner's interpretation. There is nothing in Patent Owner's Specification or the claims, themselves, that persuasively indicate that the redirection server must be the component that performs the modification. Instead, as indicated by the Examiner (Ans. 11), the claim only requires that the redirection server "allow" the modification. Thus, we see no error in the Examiner's interpretation that something other than the redirection server can perform the modification to the rule set.

Additionally, Patent Owner argues that Radia fails to teach modification and instead teaches removing and replacing a rule set. App. Br. 13; Reb. Br. 11. For instance, Patent Owner contends that when a filter has outlived its usefulness a new filter is created and the new filter is configured in the router. App. Br. 16. Again, we disagree with Patent Owner's position.

The Examiner finds, and Requester agrees, that Radia teaches a system wherein a router receives instructions to modify filtering rules by reconfiguring the router. Ans. 11 (citing Radia, col. 6, l. 66-col. 7, l. 8). Thus, we agree that the router is not just configured, but reconfigured. Therefore, we do not find Patent Owner's arguments to be persuasive.

Claims 24, 26, 40-43, and 83-90

Patent Owner argues that even if the Examiner's interpretation of the limitation listed above was correct, that interpretation would only apply to those claims. App. Br. 14. Patent Owner contends that claims 24, 26, 40-43, and 83-90 recite a different limitation that would, in fact, require the redirection server to perform the modification step and the combination of references fails to teach that limitation. *Id.* We disagree.

Claim 24 recites "instructions to the redirection server to modify the rule set are received by . . . the redirection server," and claim 83 recites "receiving instructions by the redirection server to modify at least a portion of the user's rule set." Claims 26 and 40-43 are dependent upon cancelled independent claim 25 which, before cancelled, recited similar language to claim 83.² The Examiner interprets (Ans. 10-11), and the Requester agrees (3PR Resp. Br. 6-7), that these claims only require the redirection server receive the instructions to modify the rule set and do not necessarily require the redirection server to perform the modification. We are not persuasively pointed to error with the Examiner's position, as there is nothing in the claim that indicates the redirection server must perform the actual modification to the rule set.

Additionally, the Examiner finds that, even if the claims are interpreted as Patent Owner contends they should be, the references read on the claims. Ans. 11. Specifically, the Examiner finds that Radia teaches a

² In the event of further prosecution, we recommend the Examiner and Patent Owner address the cancellation of independent claim 25 and its non-cancelled dependent claims.

Appeal 2014-007780
Reexamination Control Nos. 95/002,035
and 90/012,342 (merged)
Patent 6,779,118 B1

system wherein an ANCS sends instructions to a router to modify its filtering rules. *Id.* The Examiner finds that when the router and ANCS are combined to form the redirection server, the combination meets Patent Owner's interpretation of the disputed claim limitations. *Id.*

Patent Owner argues that it would not make sense to combine the router and the ANCS of Radia into one because each of these components has its own separate and distinct functionality. App. Br. 15-16; Reb. Br. 13. However, we agree with Requester that Radia teaches combining the ANCS with SMS 114 and, thereby, contemplates the combination of multiple components regardless of their functionality. 3PR Resp. Br. 9. As such, we also agree with Requester that it would have been obvious to combine other components within Radia's system, as the combination is nothing more than a design choice.³

Additionally, Patent Owner argues that while Radia teaches that the router can be a combination of components, Radia teaches that each of the combined components must forward packets. Reb. Br. 12. Thus, Patent Owner is arguing essentially that Radia teaches away from the combination of components proposed by Requester. However, we are not pointed to, and do not find in our review, sufficient evidence in the reference that only allows the combination of components to be combined if they are able to forward packets. Teaching an alternative or equivalent method does not

³ Making elements of a device integral or separable is considered to be an obvious design choice and does not render an invention patentable. *See In re Larson*, 340 F.2d 965, 968 (CCPA 1965); *In re Dulberg*, 289 F.2d 522, 523 (CCPA 1961).

Appeal 2014-007780
Reexamination Control Nos. 95/002,035
and 90/012,342 (merged)
Patent 6,779,118 B1

teach away from the use of a claimed method. *See In re Dunn*, 349 F.2d 433, 438 (CCPA 1965).

Combination of Radia and Stockwell

Lastly, Patent Owner contends that the combination of Stockwell and Radia does not teach the disputed limitations addressed above. App. Br. 16-18; Reb. Br. 13. However, as indicated above, we find that the combination of Radia, Wong, and Stockwell does, in fact, teach the disputed limitations. Additionally, we find that the Examiner has adopted Requester's rejections identifying the relevant portions of each of the references relied on throughout the rejection. *See generally* Ans. 21 which incorporates the rejections from Exhibit BB, pp. 2-47. To the extent that the Examiner and Requester relied on the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of the references, this practice is consistent with current case law. For example, the Supreme Court explains

Often, it will be necessary for a court to look to interrelated teachings of multiple patents; the effects of demands known to the design community or present in the marketplace; and the background knowledge possessed by a person having ordinary skill in the art, all in order to determine whether there was an apparent reason to combine the known elements in the fashion claimed by the patent at issue. To facilitate review, this analysis should be made explicit. *See In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (C.A.Fed.2006) (“[R]ejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness”). As our precedents make clear, however, the analysis need not seek out precise teachings directed to the specific subject matter of the challenged claim, for a court can

Appeal 2014-007780
Reexamination Control Nos. 95/002,035
and 90/012,342 (merged)
Patent 6,779,118 B1

take account of the inferences and creative steps that a person of ordinary skill in the art would employ.

KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. 398, 418 (2007).

In this case, the conclusions of obviousness are clearly articulated and based on detailed factual findings that are supported by the references of record. *See* Ans. 21 which incorporates the rejections from Exhibit BB, pp. 2-47. Additionally, the reason a skilled artisan would combine the references is provided by the Examiner. Ans. 12. For example, the Examiner explains that it would have been obvious to combine Stockwell and Radia in order to improve filtering capabilities of routers. Ans. 12. We find no error in the Examiner's reasoning, and Appellants have failed to specifically address the Examiner's findings.

Thus, for all of the reasons stated *supra*, we sustain the Examiner's adoption of Requester's rejection of claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-43, and 68-90 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Radia, Wong, and Stockwell.

Claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-43, and 68-90 - Other proposed rejections

Our conclusions above address the patentability of all of the claims on appeal and, thus, render it unnecessary to reach the propriety of the Examiner's decision to adopt the proposed rejections of the same claims on a different basis. *Cf. In re Gleave*, 560 F.3d 1331, 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2009). As such, we need not reach the other proposed and adopted rejections listed above.

CONCLUSION

Appeal 2014-007780
Reexamination Control Nos. 95/002,035
and 90/012,342 (merged)
Patent 6,779,118 B1

The Examiner did not err in finding that the combination of Radia, Wong, and Stockwell teaches or suggests “the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification,” as recited in independent claims 16-23, 36-39, and 68.

The Examiner did not err in finding that the combination of Radia, Wong, and Stockwell teaches or suggests “instructions to the redirection sever to modify the rule set are received by . . . the redirection server,” as recited in dependent claim 24, or “receiving instructions by the redirection server to modify at least a portion of the user’s rule set,” as recited in independent claim 83.

The Examiner did not err in combining Radia, Wong, and Stockwell.

DECISION

We affirm the Examiner’s decision to adopt the rejection of claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-43, and 68-90 (all of the claims subject to this appeal) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over the combination of Radia, Wong, and Stockwell.

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

Requests for extensions of time in this *inter partes* reexamination proceeding are governed by 37 C.F.R. § 1.956. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 41.79.

AFFIRMED

Appeal 2014-007780
Reexamination Control Nos. 95/002,035
and 90/012,342 (merged)
Patent 6,779,118 B1

HersHKovitz & Associates, PLLC
2845 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Third Party Requester:

Haynes and Boone, LLP
2323 Victory Avenue, Suite 700
Dallas, TX 75219

James J. Wong
2108 Gossamer Avenue
Redwood City, CA 94065



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Table with 5 columns: APPLICATION NO., FILING DATE, FIRST NAMED INVENTOR, ATTORNEY DOCKET NO., CONFIRMATION NO.
95/002.035 09/12/2012 6779118 RI1341006F 1745

40401 7590 02/12/2015
HersHKovitz and Associates, PLLC
2845 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER

WORJLOH, JALATEE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3992

MAIL DATE DELIVERY MODE

02/12/2015

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

RECORD OF ORAL HEARING

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC,
Patent Owner,

v.

CISCO SYSTEMS, JAMES J. WONG
Third Party Requester.

Appeal No. 2014-007780
Application Nos. 90/012,342 and 95/002,035 (merged)
Patent No. 6,779,118 B1

Oral Hearing Held: January 28, 2015

Before JAMES T. MOORE, MARC S. HOFF, and DAVID M. KOHUT,
Administrative Patent Judges.

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Wednesday, January 28, 2015, commencing at 10:00 a.m., at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia.

Appeal No. 2014-007780
Reexamination Control No.,. 90/012,342
and 95/002,035 (merged)

APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF PATENT OWNER:

GREGORY B. WOOD, ESQ.
Wood IPResolution
19222 Mayall Street
Northridge, California 91324

and

ABE HERSHKOVITZ, ESQ.
Jacobson Holman Hershkovitz, PLLC
400 Seventh Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20004

ON BEHALF OF PATENT OWNER:

THEODORE M. FOSTER, ESQ.
DAVID L. McCOMBS, ESQ.
Haynes and Boone, LLP
2323 Victory Avenue, Suite 700
Dallas, Texas 75219

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

P R O C E E D I N G S

- - - - -

USHER: Good morning. Calendar Number 39, Appeal Number
2014-007780, Mr. Wood and Mr. Foster.

JUDGE MOORE: Welcome, please be seated. We are here for
Appeal Number 2014-007780, and just a few preliminary matters before we
get started. First off, if you have any electronic devices, it's always

1 embarrassing when they go off in the middle of the hearing, so make sure
2 they're muted or off. Second, you can assume that we are intimately familiar
3 with the record in this case, so you need not give us an extensive
4 background, unless you feel it's necessary, to your presentation.

5 And thirdly, in terms of how we proceed here, the Patent Owner
6 has the appeal here, so we're presuming you'll go first, naturally, and you'll
7 have a chance to answer what they raise and you'll get, if you choose to
8 reserve some time for rebuttal, some time for rebuttal.

9 How much time do we have reserved in this room right now?
10 About an hour? So, within that constraint, let's try and keep it within the
11 hour, if we can.

12 And with all that said, Patent Owner may proceed to the podium.

13 MR. WOOD: Thank you very much. Just a matter of a couple of
14 preliminary remarks, we're going to focus on a particular aspect of this
15 invention, which is the modification of the rule set within the redirection
16 server, and what the criteria for that are, what the criteria for that are.

17 JUDGE MOORE: One moment before we continue, we are
18 having some technical issues with our remote judge in Florida. I don't know
19 if he's still there, and I want to make sure that he is still there. So, what I am
20 going to do is do a back-up audio link right now, so just hold tight for a
21 second.

22 MR. WOOD: Sure.

23 **(Brief pause in the proceedings.)**

24 JUDGE MOORE: Apologies for the interruption.

1 MR. WOOD: Not a problem.

2 I would like to reserve a little bit of time at the end as rebuttal time.

3 We have elected in this appeal to focus primarily on, as I said, the
4 redirection server and the modification of the redirection server while a
5 session in process. There was other arguments that were made in the course
6 of this that we are not foregoing. We indicated that in our brief. The
7 specific one is the redirection process itself and the fact that that redirection
8 occurs at the -- at the user side rather than at the Internet. And, frankly,
9 that's the APA, which is used as prior art, related just to that redirection
10 process in the Internet, not at the user location.

11 And we're not giving up that, but that's not the focus for argument
12 today.

13 JUDGE MOORE: It's in the brief, of course?

14 MR. WOOD: Yes, yes.

15 Let me, first of all, discuss Coss. This is really a procedural issue.
16 We have filed declarations to remove Coss as a reference. The basis of that
17 removal is that two declarations were filed showing that an actual reduction
18 to practice had occurred approximately 30 days, a little bit more than 30
19 days before the filing of the Coss reference, and the examiner has continued
20 to insist upon showing diligence to reduction to practice, and, of course, our
21 position is that diligence is not required, and the reason diligence is not
22 required is because the reduction to practice, the actual reduction to practice
23 and testing of this invention was memorialized in a document 30 days before
24 the filing of Coss.

1 That document discloses the invention in its entirety, and the
2 Patent Office has so indicated in prior reexamination proceedings, because
3 that was, in fact, the document that was filed several months later as the
4 provisional patent application. And that provisional patent application was
5 found by the Patent Office to fully encompass and support the claims that
6 were originally filed. So, we think that the whole issue of diligence is a
7 non-issue, and that the examiner is wrong on the law on that issue.

8 The second thing about Coss is that the examiner used the wrong
9 standard in determining whether the submission and the declarations were
10 sufficient. The examiner, he used the standard of an interference
11 proceeding, which is wrong. This is not an interference proceeding, we're
12 trying to swear behind the Coss reference, and it's not the each element test
13 that the examiner applied, but it's the possession of the invention test that's
14 the standard for removing a reference, and we think that's shown clearly by
15 the fact that this is the very document that was subsequently filed for the
16 provisional, and, of course, the Patent Office said that it was sufficient to
17 support the claims and support disclosure of the patent itself.

18 So, as a preliminary matter, we think Coss ought to be removed as
19 a reference. Furthermore, Coss simply doesn't teach the core of where this
20 invention is and what we're arguing today, which is modification of the rule
21 set during -- the modification of the rule set, at the user side, in the
22 redirection server, while the user is, in fact, sending data to the Internet and
23 sending it back.

24 So, we think that Coss isn't a good reference in any event.

1 I would like to discuss --

2 JUDGE KOHUT: You talk about the user side, where is that in
3 your claims where it's at the actual user side? I notice in your claims it talks
4 about the redirection server is configured to allow this, are you saying that
5 the redirection server is actually a part of the user computer?

6 MR. WOOD: We're not saying that, although it could be. I
7 would -- I believe -- direct your attention to I think for this purpose, claim
8 83, where it says, "in a system comprising of redirection server connected
9 between the user computer and a public network," which says that it's not on
10 the public network, it's between that, it's before the public network.

11 So, that's what I'm referring to. And all of the method claims recite
12 that. I think from the standpoint of the apparatus claims, that can be
13 reasonably -- reasonably inferred from the limitations that are there.

14 JUDGE KOHUT: Okay.

15 MR. WOOD: By the way, claim 83 is really very similar to claim
16 25, which was cancelled at some point, but is still the claim upon which a
17 number of dependent claims depend.

18 So, let me talk about the apparatus claims, and I'm going to focus
19 on claim 16. All of the other claims include these limitations, and I think
20 there's several key limitations here. One is that the rule set must be
21 programmed into the redirection server. It is the thing -- it is the program,
22 the software that controls and, of course, that's another feature of this, in
23 paragraph 2 of claim 16, which is the rule set is used to control data passing
24 between the user and the public network. So, we not only have the rule set

1 programmed into the redirection server, we also have it controlling data
2 during the user session, passing between the user and the public network.

3 I would point out that the whole concept of the process happening
4 while the user is using the Internet is supported by this fact that it's
5 controlling the data from the user to the public network. That can only occur
6 while the user is, in fact, using the Internet. That's obvious.

7 JUDGE MOORE: Judge Kohut can still hear you.

8 MR. WOOD: Yes. The fourth thing, or the third thing that's
9 important is the correlation. This is the correlation between the temporary
10 assigned network address and the rule set. The rule set is correlated with
11 that temporarily assigned network address, which, again, indicates that there
12 is a connection that allows communication to happen during the user
13 session. That temporarily assigned network address has something that
14 needs to be there to allow the Internet to know where to send the
15 information. And, so, that again indicates that this all must happen in a user
16 or during a user session.

17 And then, the last aspect of the claims is modification of the rule
18 set, and that modification must be of the rule set actually programmed in the
19 redirection server. It's not the modification of anything else, it's the
20 modification of the rule set, and it's the modification while the rule set is in
21 use, processing data, and while the user is -- the rule set is correlated to the
22 temporarily assigned network address, which indicates the user is involved
23 in a session.

24 Let me have just a moment.

1 Claim 24, interestingly, on just a side note here, has a requirement
2 that the redirection server must do the modifying as well. And I would say
3 that that's inherent in the other limitations that are there, because the
4 redirection server actually does the modification. I'll get to that point a little
5 later.

6 JUDGE MOORE: Does it do the modification or is it configured
7 to allow automated modification?

8 MR. WOOD: Good point. The claims require that it be
9 configured to allow modification, and the reason for that is because that not
10 every data transfer causes a modification. It's only some of them. So, the
11 indication of when a modification is to be made comes from someplace else.
12 Hence the meaning of "allow." It would be anomalous to say that the
13 redirection server allows modification, and yet doesn't ever do it. What
14 would be the purpose of the redirection server if it didn't actually do the
15 modification that it allows. The rule set is actually the program of the
16 redirection server.

17 So, to say that it allows modification but then no modification ever
18 occurs, would actually read redirection server out of the claim. It would be
19 useless, which is not a reasonable interpretation.

20 JUDGE MOORE: Let me ask this, what does the Patent Owner
21 think "configured to allow automated modification" means?

22 MR. WOOD: Configured to allow automated modification,
23 configured is the same thing as programmed. So, when we talk about the
24 redirection server being programmed, we're talking about it being

1 reconfigured or being configured. So, it is the program that then allows that
2 change in the -- in the rule set to actually occur.

3 It's under the direction of, it's affected by, or caused by the
4 redirection server, but it's the configuration, the program itself, part of the
5 rule set, that actually enables the change to be made. That's what that --
6 that's what that means.

7 JUDGE MOORE: Thank you.

8 JUDGE KOHUT: Could it not also mean that we have another
9 device that wants to gain access to the redirection server and that redirection
10 server allows that device to input the new modification to the rule set?

11 MR. WOOD: I don't think so, but even taking that interpretation,
12 there's nothing in the -- there's nothing in the cited references which suggests
13 or teach that that ever happens. There is at most an authorization or an
14 instruction or a condition that's external to the rule set that triggers the action
15 of modification, but there's nothing in any of the references that says
16 anything outside of the redirection server actually causes that. Again, if
17 there was something outside that actually caused the change in the
18 redirection server or in the rule set in the redirection server, then what do
19 you need the redirection server for in terms of allowance? It would just
20 make the change. It would enforce the change, the redirection server would
21 have nothing to do with it, and in effect, you would be reading that
22 limitation out of the claim. And you can't do that in a proper and reasonable
23 interpretation of the claim. So, that would be my response to that question.

1 I'm going to focus on claim 83, the basic four elements of that
2 claim are the same thing that we talked about before in connection with
3 claim 16, the terminology is a little bit different. For example, "the
4 redirection server must contain," the word "contain" is used. That's the same
5 thing as programmed. The rule set still has to be correlated with a
6 preliminary -- temporarily assigned network address. There's a step of
7 modifying the rule set, and in that claim, it actually explicitly says that that's
8 in the rule set and while it is correlated. Those are requirements of the claim
9 as well.

10 And that is actually in paragraph 1, and I'm going to refer to claim
11 83. It's in paragraph 1 of 83. By the way, the correlation and contained
12 elements are in the preamble of that claim.

13 The step of receiving instructions by the redirection server to
14 modify means that the redirection server actually does the modification. If
15 the modification was not done by the redirection server, then who's doing
16 the modifying? What's doing the modifying? That claim clearly indicates
17 that it is the redirection server that receives that instruction and it's the
18 redirection server that actually does the modification of the rule set. And
19 then, of course, there's the controlling of data which we discussed earlier.

20 So, those are the essential aspects of the claims that are in issue
21 here.

22 JUDGE MOORE: Hang on a second, you just confused me.
23 Claim 83, in that last wherein clause, "includes the step of receiving
24 instructions by the redirection server." These are instructions issued by the

1 redirection server, or is this being received by, you know, they're received
2 by the redirection server?

3 MR. WOOD: It's instructions being received by the redirection
4 server.

5 JUDGE MOORE: Okay, all right, I thought I misheard you there,
6 thank you.

7 MR. WOOD: Yes. No, it's the instructions received by the
8 redirection server.

9 JUDGE MOORE: Not issued by that?

10 MR. WOOD: Not issued.

11 Okay, let me talk about Willens. And I want to talk about Willens
12 just briefly, because Willens in the examiner's rejections have talked about a
13 permitted site list and they've also talked about a requested site list. The
14 examiner confuses the two. There's nothing in Willens that talks about the
15 permitted site list ever being downloaded into cache or ever being
16 downloaded into the communication server. The only thing that's stored in
17 cache is the list of sites that are requested. Those are not sites that are on the
18 rule set or part of the rule set or even part of the central server 18.

19 That is the core of the examiner's position on Willens, is that site
20 list, in cache, in fact is the same as -- or is in the cache and therefore is the
21 same as the rule set, and because it's in cache, and because somehow it's
22 modified in the central server, that somehow it's updated during the process
23 of processing data.

1 It's just simply not the case. There's nothing in Willens that talks
2 about that permitted site list that's stored in the central server 18 ever being
3 downloaded to the communication server 14. In fact, Willens teaches
4 against that, because the whole point of Willens was to be able to centralize
5 this large set of permitted sites so that you wouldn't have to download those
6 and use up memory of a number of user computers in the system. That was
7 the whole point.

8 And if you read the -- if you read the reference carefully, you'll
9 find that that -- the only thing that's stored in cache is a list of sites that are
10 requested by a user. That list of sites can be sites that are allowed, or sites
11 that are not allowed. How you determine that is you go to the central server,
12 and once it's in the central server, then it will give an allow or disallow after
13 comparing that site with what's in these permitted site lists in their memory,
14 and that will go back and somehow flags the permitted -- excuse me, sites --
15 will flag the requested website, and that flag is somehow then associated
16 with that site in cache.

17 And if you then ask for that site again, it will go to cache, it will
18 say, oh, we previously allowed that site, therefore it must be on the
19 permitted list. And if it's on the permitted list, we will allow it, without
20 going and checking it. But again, there's nothing that talks about that
21 permitted site list being stored or transferred or downloaded into cache.

22 The examiner's argument, then, for modification of the rule set
23 fails, because if you don't change the site list in cache, then you can't change
24 the rule set, because the assumption is that the permitted site list stored in

1 cache, which it's not, is part of the rule set. And if it can change, then the
2 rule set can change, and that simply isn't the way that Willens works.

3 And, in fact, Willens teaches against that in several locations. In
4 fact, I would point to column 4, and lines about 40 through 45. And also
5 column 5 at approximately 38 through about 45, lines. Both of which
6 describe that the change, that the modification only happens to a site list,
7 never a rule set, only happens to the site list, and only happens when the site
8 list is stored in the central server.

9 That can never be correlated, that change can never be correlated
10 with a temporarily assigned network address, as the claims require, if it's
11 changed in the central server. So, it just doesn't meet that limitation of the
12 claim.

13 JUDGE MOORE: All right, you have about five minutes left, I
14 just wanted to give you a heads-up, if you wanted to reserve some of that
15 time.

16 MR. WOOD: Okay, let me just touch on Radia.

17 JUDGE MOORE: And I know Judge Kohut will have some
18 questions for you.

19 MR. WOOD: Okay. Radia also doesn't teach modification of the
20 rule set. The examiner's argument that the ANCS and the router can be
21 combined and the combination of the two can result in a, you know, a
22 redirection server where the rule set is changed.

23 JUDGE KOHUT: Why is that not the case? I know the Third
24 Party Requester and the examiner have both said that Radia's router, which

1 they're considering the redirection server, actually receives instructions to
2 modify the rules from the ANCS. Why is that not the same thing as you're
3 claiming?

4 MR. WOOD: Except that Radia doesn't teach that. Radia does not
5 teach that there's anything that's done by way of modifying the rule set that's
6 actually programmed in the router once it's programmed in the router. What
7 happens is, the rule set is created by the SCM, or SMS -- yeah, SMS, and the
8 ANCS, they collaborate on these four initial profile rules, and they create --
9 and the ANCS then creates a final rule set, which is downloaded to the
10 router. After that it's never changed. There's nothing in Radia that ever
11 teaches that once the ANCS downloads that rule to the router, that that
12 router ever does anything to change, and that the ANCS never does anything
13 to modify the rule set.

14 It may completely change the rule set for a different user, for
15 example, but once that user is starting to use it and there's a -- and there's an
16 interaction between the Internet and the user, that rule set stays the same.
17 Radia doesn't teach otherwise.

18 JUDGE KOHUT: Because I think the Third Party Requester
19 brought up in column 7 of the Radia reference that the router is actually
20 reconfigured. Have you addressed that in your briefs?

21 MR. WOOD: Let me look at that just a moment. This is page, or
22 column 7, and what lines?

23 JUDGE KOHUT: Roughly 5 through 9. Or 8.

1 MR. WOOD: Well, when it talks about reconfiguring, it's talking
2 about downloading a new rule set, completely new rule set for another user,
3 for example. It's not talking about reconfiguring during the process of the
4 user transmitting data back and forth to the Internet during a user session.
5 Obviously, the ANCS and the SMS can change the rule set if new users get
6 on, and I think that's all that that's referring to. It's not talking about
7 changing or reconfiguring that rule set during a single user session.

8 JUDGE KOHUT: Okay.

9 JUDGE MOORE: We will not count that time against you,
10 answering Judge Kohut's questions.

11 JUDGE KOHUT: Actually, I have one more question for you,
12 before you leave the podium.

13 MR. WOOD: Sure.

14 JUDGE KOHUT: One of the -- I'm getting some feedback, sorry.
15 One of the or a couple of the dependent claims, 26, 27 and 40 through 43 are
16 dependent upon claim 25, which is not at issue in this appeal. Claim 25 was
17 previously cancelled. What was your intent with the dependent claims
18 there?

19 MR. WOOD: Well, we think that the dependent claims include
20 this, you know, the patentable focus of what we're dealing with here, which
21 is modification of the rule set during a user session. We rewrote that claim
22 as claim 83, and so it was I think largely duplicate at that point. So, we
23 recreated claim 25 as claim 83.

1 JUDGE KOHUT: So, were those dependent claims supposed to be
2 dependent upon 83, then?

3 MR. WOOD: Yeah, there was a slight difference in claim 83, but
4 those dependent claims are largely parallel to the dependent claims that you
5 just mentioned, dependent upon claim 25.

6 JUDGE KOHUT: Okay.

7 JUDGE MOORE: Thank you. We'll hear from the Third Party
8 Requester now.

9 MR. FOSTER: Thank you, good morning, may it please the
10 Board, I'm Theo Foster, here on behalf of Cisco Systems. With me at
11 counsel table is David McCombs, who has been signing the papers in this
12 proceeding.

13 The Patent Owner brought up a number of issues, and I'll do my
14 best to take them in turn. I guess beginning with the question of Coss as a
15 reference, and the attempt to swear behind it or to show evidence with
16 respect to it as a reference, the Patent Owner brought up the question of
17 diligence, and I believe the reason the examiner has brought up diligence is
18 because the examiner does not believe that the Patent Owner has shown
19 sufficient evidence to establish an actual reduction to practice before the
20 earliest claimed priority date of Coss.

21 And you can see that, in part, even in the Patent Owner's own
22 brief, if you look at the Patent Owner's appeal brief, at 20, you'll see that
23 they note that the examiner was not persuaded by their evidence for two
24 reasons. The second of those, the examiner notes that there's been no

1 attempt to show a nexus between the claim language and the documentation
2 provided with the swear behind attempted declarations.

3 And the Patent Owner's brief then doesn't address that second issue
4 at all, acknowledges that it's there, but it doesn't address it, and for that
5 reason, I would submit that an actual reduction to practice has not been
6 shown.

7 Patent Owner brought up, as far as I know for the first time here at
8 this hearing, the question of what the proper standard for evaluating their
9 evidence is, and brought up this issue of whether it's an interference standard
10 or whether different proceedings would have different standards. I don't
11 recall seeing that in the briefing, and I'm also not sure that I understand the
12 Patent Owner's distinction between showing the claimed invention and
13 showing the invention. We're here dealing with the claims and as we've
14 pointed out in the briefing, there are limitations in the claims that are not in
15 that August 1997 document that they provided. One of those that's
16 throughout all of the claims, and certainly one that was addressed in some of
17 the briefing, this concept of a temporarily assigned network address. The
18 concept itself is not in that document at all.

19 Moving on to Coss as a substantive reference and addressing it on
20 the merits, the Patent Owner suggested that Coss does not teach
21 modification of a rule set, but I have not yet seen that the Patent Owner
22 acknowledge or respond to the teaching in Coss, in column 8, lines 34
23 through 36, which the examiner has relied on for dynamic rules, and to quote
24 the Coss reference, "dynamic rules allow a given rule set to be modified

1 based on events happening in the network without requiring that the entire
2 rule set be reloaded."

3 I'm not sure how the examiner or how the Patent Owner -- what
4 their basis is for stating that Coss does not teach modification of a rule set
5 given that disclosure.

6 I would also point out, later on in column 8, there's a description of
7 an example dynamic rule in Coss, a one-time rule used only for a single
8 session, which appears to be the exact same concept that you find in the
9 subject patent, in the '118 patent, in columns 6 and 7, where they have a rule
10 that's applied only one time, and then removed to allow unfettered access to
11 web browsing. It appears to be the exact same concept of the one-time rule
12 that's applied once, then removed to allow the user to do whatever they wish
13 on the network.

14 Also, in some of the discussion that the Patent Owner brought up
15 with respect to claim 83, mentioned that -- it sounds like they would treat 83
16 as an exemplary claim, which I don't recall seeing that suggestion in the
17 briefing. However, the suggestion that we should infer the between
18 limitation from 83 into other claims or infer limitations from the method
19 claims into the apparatus claims certainly, again, I don't recall seeing that in
20 the briefing, and I don't know that that's necessarily the appropriate approach
21 to claim interpretation here.

22 If the panel doesn't have any questions about Coss, I can move on.

23 JUDGE MOORE: Let me check with Judge Kohut. Any
24 questions, sir?

1 JUDGE KOHUT: No questions.

2 MR. FOSTER: Thank you.

3 So, then moving on to Willens, the discussion about Willens, of
4 course, centers in part on Willens' disclosure of caching, and then also what
5 Willens describes as being a filter rule for a specific user, which incorporates
6 a list of sites which may be permitted or denied. And to give a little bit of
7 context here, Willens is a disclosure that's designed for protecting or at least
8 controlling Internet access from a school setting.

9 And, so, they have as an example that there might be a list of
10 websites maintained by the school's PTA or parent teacher association that
11 students either should be allowed access to or should be denied access to.
12 The specific example in Willens is playboy.com. Obviously the suggestion
13 is that that should be blocked.

14 And if you look at Willens, at figure 3, you'll see that in the top
15 right corner, there are -- in the top right corner, there are user profiles, and
16 then a specific rule set labeled FTimmy, for filter rule set for the user
17 Timmy, that has a number of rules, and this is element 54 in the figure 3, one
18 of which is the statement "permit PTA list." And then if you look below that
19 in figure 3, you see that the PTA list element 52 has some example websites
20 which are incompletely specified, but we can clearly see that the PTA list is
21 part of the filter rule for user Timmy.

22 And, so, modifying the permitted site list, the PTA list, would
23 constitute a modification of the rule set. As the Patent Owner kind of
24 described in brief, Willens teaches that the filter rule is downloaded to the

1 communication server 14, which we identify as being the redirection server,
2 but the PTA list itself, the whole list is generally maintained in the central
3 server, as the Patent Owner identified, the central server 18, but portions of
4 it are downloaded in response to the user's actions and the websites that the
5 user visits.

6 JUDGE MOORE: When you say downloaded, you mean to the
7 local cache or to the remote user?

8 MR. FOSTER: Yes, downloaded to the cache, downloaded in
9 response to a request or a question of should this user Timmy be allowed
10 access to website XYZ. The communication server 14 would send that
11 query to the server 18, receive back a response and then store that
12 information in its cache so that it would know if it sees site XYZ again. It
13 doesn't have to send the request again, it has that in cache.

14 JUDGE MOORE: Okay, so your position also is that, say this
15 PTA list on the bottom right, this www.zzz, that's a rule, essentially?

16 MR. FOSTER: It's part of a rule, yes. As I understand it, the
17 Patent Owner has drawn a distinction between a rule and a site list, a site list
18 is just XYZ, a rule would be permit access to XYZ.

19 JUDGE MOORE: And by putting XYZ on the permit list versus
20 the do not permit list, that in its entirety is a rule?

21 MR. FOSTER: That is correct. That is my understanding.

22 JUDGE MOORE: Okay.

1 MR. FOSTER: And we see right -- 54, you see the explicit
2 disclosure there, and this is figure 3 of Willens, 54 has permit PTA list, so
3 the PTA list is then part of that permit rule.

4 So, when user Timmy goes to XYZ, the communication server
5 determines that XYZ should be permitted, and then stores that in cache. The
6 rule, as programmed in that communication server 14, is modified, and I
7 would note, right, that all of the claims don't recite that the modification has
8 to be a large substantive reprogramming, a wholesale change or anything
9 like that, the claims recite modifying at least a portion of a rule set, and in
10 the disclosure of the '118, the rule set can include data about sites that should
11 be permitted or denied.

12 So, modifying the PTA list, to take a site on or take a site off,
13 would constitute a modification of a part of the overall rule permit PTA list,
14 and so the automated modifications that occur as described in Willens are
15 clearly a modification of rules, and through the caching mechanism, that
16 information gets downloaded and those modifications become active on the
17 communication server 14, which is the redirection server.

18 Are there any further questions about Willens?

19 JUDGE KOHUT: No questions here.

20 MR. FOSTER: So, moving on, then, to Radia, I believe the Patent
21 Owner brought up two issues of, first, this distinction between the Radia's
22 router and the ANCS server. The first point I would make there, right,
23 there's this question about receiving instructions to perform the modification,
24 and if we look at Radia in column 10, around lines 7 through 11, we'll see

1 the description that the ANCS reconfigures the network components, which
2 would include the router, reconfigures the network components using a
3 protocol that is generally applicable to components of the network, such as
4 simple network management protocol, SNMP.

5 So, the ANCS is not somehow with some magic hand going in and
6 manipulating the memory structures of the router, it's sending messages over
7 the network, using an established protocol, SNMP, which are essentially
8 instructions to make a modification, to make a change to the programming,
9 to the rule sets in the router to change its functioning.

10 So, I'm not entirely sure exactly where the Patent Owner's position
11 or interpretation is. There does seem to be some inconsistency, at least I
12 have difficulty following. At times, the Patent Owner has argued that the
13 claims require receiving instructions, but then at times the Patent Owner has
14 made some arguments, certainly we've seen in the discussions before the
15 examiner that note it's the rule set itself has to modify itself somehow, that
16 it's not based on external instructions, that the rule set is self-modifying.

17 I would submit that certainly either way, Radia has sufficient
18 teaching of the modification, certainly with the disclosure here of using
19 SNMP to send instructions, and, you know, if we compare that SNMP
20 teaching to the Patent Owner's brief at 15, the Patent Owner stated the only
21 possible way for modification of the rule set to occur, if the instructions are
22 received by the redirection server, is for the redirection server to do the
23 modification in response to those instructions.

1 So, certainly I would state that with Radia, sending SNMP
2 instructions from the ANCS to the router, obviously the router is interpreting
3 those instructions, making those modifications, as directed by the ANCS.

4 Then Patent Owner also brought up this discussion or this concept
5 of the reconfiguring and the suggestion that the only reconfiguring that
6 Radia performs is to distinguish between different users, but then within
7 what they term a user session, there is no reconfiguring within Radia. And I
8 don't believe that that's correct.

9 If we look at Radia in column 7, around line 38, you'll see that the
10 context here of Radia is much like what the Patent Owner has described
11 generally, it's not in their claims, but as they've generally described the
12 purpose of what they want to claim, the context is in a login, in Radia. The
13 concept is that a user can connect their computer, and they initially will
14 receive what's termed in Radia a login profile, which limits their access, and
15 essentially the only things that the user can access are the servers that control
16 the login process, to authenticate and confirm who they are and what access
17 they should get.

18 Once the user does log in, that's when the reconfiguring occurs
19 that, you know, we see in column 10, I believe it is. In any event, the
20 reconfiguring of the filter rules in the router, after the user gets logged in, so
21 that they receive the filter rule set that's appropriate for that user and for that
22 level of access within the network that they should have.

23 So, the context is quite appropriate to the claims at issue here, that
24 they do deal with reconfiguring the router during a so-called user session,

1 and so the Patent Owner's attempt to distinguish there based on context is
2 simply incorrect.

3 Are there any questions from the Board?

4 JUDGE KOHUT: None for me.

5 JUDGE MOORE: All right, thank you.

6 MR. FOSTER: Very good.

7 JUDGE MOORE: We understand your arguments.

8 MR. FOSTER: Thank you.

9 JUDGE MOORE: Counsel for Patent Owner, you have five
10 minutes.

11 MR. WOOD: I'll try to be fast.

12 Regarding Radia, the last comment that was made, I think is
13 incorrect. If you look at figures 6 and 7, what that section that was referred
14 to is discussing is the process of creating the rule set, and that rule set
15 includes filter profiles, four filter profiles. Those filter profiles are not
16 downloaded to the router, and figure 6 and 7 show that, because it says
17 "generated filter profile, download filter profile to ANCS," not the router.
18 "Reconfigure network components, filter IP packets in accordance with
19 filtering profile." So, it's only after those filtering profiles are downloaded
20 to the ANCS, and the ANCS uses those to create a rule, that it's downloaded
21 to the filter.

22 The same thing with figure 7 talks about "wait for allocation of IP
23 address, generate login filter profile sequence," and then "download login
24 filtering profile to ANCS," and only then, after the ANCS works up a rule

1 set, is it downloaded to the router. Nothing in that talks about changing a
2 filter that's downloaded into a router. Those are all filter profiles, not filters.

3 With respect to the Coss, a statement was made that the standards
4 arguments that was made about whether Coss talked about or whether it was
5 an interference and so forth, there's a two-page discussion of that in the
6 rebuttal brief at page 13 and 14. So, that was included.

7 And then, finally, Willens figure 3, I think it's noteworthy that in
8 figure 3, Willens distinguishes between site list and filters. The fact that it
9 says "permit PTA site list" doesn't mean that the individual sites that are
10 there are stored there. That's simply the name of the list that is found
11 elsewhere. That's an identifier, nothing more.

12 So, when it says "PTA list" doesn't mean that all of the sites that
13 are there are downloaded. In fact, as I mentioned before, Willens teaches
14 against that. If it included all of the site list and PTA list included 10,000
15 sites that were permitted, then all of those 10,000 sites would have to be
16 downloaded to the communication server, and Willens teaches against that.
17 That's exactly the point that Willens is trying to avoid.

18 And finally, I would note that local cache 50, if, in fact, PTA list
19 was actually stored in the local cache 50, why isn't it there? What's there are
20 the requested sites that a user wants access to. So, I think that the arguments
21 by opponent are incorrect.

22 JUDGE MOORE: Thank you. We understand your argument.
23 Judge Kohut, have you any further question?

24 JUDGE KOHUT: I do not.

Appeal No. 2014-007780
Reexamination Control No., 90/012,342
and 95/002,035 (merged)

1 JUDGE MOORE: Judge Hoff?

2 JUDGE HOFF: No, I do not.

3 JUDGE MOORE: Well, thank you very much for a well argued
4 session. We appreciate your professionalism in this case, and we look
5 forward to seeing you again before the Board. We understand your
6 arguments and this case it's taken under advisement. Thank you for
7 attending, this hearing is complete.

8 **(Whereupon, at 10:53 a.m., the hearing was concluded.)**

Appeal No. 2014-007780
Reexamination Control No.,. 90/012,342
and 95/002,035 (merged)

GREGORY B. WOOD, ESQ.
Wood IPResolution
19222 Mayall Street
Northridge, California 91324

and

ABE HERSHKOVITZ, ESQ.
Jacobson Holman Hershkovitz, PLLC
400 Seventh Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20004

ON BEHALF OF PATENT OWNER:
THEODORE M. FOSTER, ESQ.
DAVID L. McCOMBS, ESQ.
Haynes and Boone, LLP
2323 Victory Avenue, Suite 700
Dallas, Texas 75219

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor: Koichiro Ikudome

Appeal No. 2014-007,780

Merged Reexam Proceeding No. 95/002,035 (Main)
and Reexam Proceeding No. 90/012,342
(Based on US 6,779,118 C1)

Conf. No. 1745
Conf. No. 5786

Filed: September 12, 2012 (Main) and June 8, 2012

Examiner Jalatee Worjloh
Art Unit 3992

For: USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM

PATENT OWNER'S CONFIRMATION OF ATTENDANCE OF ORAL HEARING

Mail Stop PTAB
Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 23313-1450

Honorable Commissioner:

In connection with the above-identified merged Reexamination Proceedings, Patent Owner confirms that a Request for Oral Hearing Under 37 CFR §41.73 and fee were timely filed with the USPTO by Patent Owner on May 6, 2014. Accordingly, Patent Owner timely files this response to the Notice of Hearing mailed by the Office on September 25, 2014 by October 16, 2014, and respectfully confirms attendance in person of the Hearing scheduled for January 28, 2015. No more than three persons total will be attending for Patent Owner.

Evidence of service of this Confirmation is attached hereto as the last page.

Please direct any questions to the below-listed telephone number or e-mail address.

Respectfully submitted,
Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC

Date: October 15, 2014

/Abe Hershkovitz/
Abraham Hershkovitz, Reg. No. 45,294

JACOBSON HOLMAN HERSHKOVITZ, PLLC
400 Seventh Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone 703-370-4800
Facsimile 703-370-4809
E-Mail patent@hershkovitz.net

RI1341006F-A13; AH/pjj

Electronic Acknowledgement Receipt

EFS ID:	20428314
Application Number:	95002035
International Application Number:	
Confirmation Number:	1745
Title of Invention:	USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM
First Named Inventor/Applicant Name:	6779118
Customer Number:	40401
Filer:	Abraham Hershkovitz
Filer Authorized By:	
Attorney Docket Number:	RI1341006F
Receipt Date:	15-OCT-2014
Filing Date:	12-SEP-2012
Time Stamp:	21:39:09
Application Type:	inter partes reexam

Payment information:

Submitted with Payment	no
------------------------	----

File Listing:

Document Number	Document Description	File Name	File Size(Bytes)/ Message Digest	Multi Part /.zip	Pages (if appl.)
1	Trans Letter filing of a response in a reexam	RI1341006F-A13_Transmittal-of-POs-Conf-of-Attnd-of-Oral-Hrg.pdf	131840 <small>1c1c90f2fa0f241bfa0171a9b8f14c5c9512e3c7</small>	no	1

Warnings:

Information:

2		R1341006F- R1341006D_Cnfrmtn-of-Attnd- of-Oral-Hrg-and-Cert-of-Srv- pdf	121103 ead6757ddc7568bbf3371a0bfa840c53a6c 45edfb	yes	2
---	--	--	---	-----	---

Multipart Description/PDF files in .zip description			
	Document Description	Start	End
	Confirmation of Hearing by Appellant	1	1
	Reexam Certificate of Service	2	2

Warnings:

Information:

Total Files Size (in bytes):	252943
-------------------------------------	--------

This Acknowledgement Receipt evidences receipt on the noted date by the USPTO of the indicated documents, characterized by the applicant, and including page counts, where applicable. It serves as evidence of receipt similar to a Post Card, as described in MPEP 503.

New Applications Under 35 U.S.C. 111

If a new application is being filed and the application includes the necessary components for a filing date (see 37 CFR 1.53(b)-(d) and MPEP 506), a Filing Receipt (37 CFR 1.54) will be issued in due course and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the filing date of the application.

National Stage of an International Application under 35 U.S.C. 371

If a timely submission to enter the national stage of an international application is compliant with the conditions of 35 U.S.C. 371 and other applicable requirements a Form PCT/DO/EO/903 indicating acceptance of the application as a national stage submission under 35 U.S.C. 371 will be issued in addition to the Filing Receipt, in due course.

New International Application Filed with the USPTO as a Receiving Office

If a new international application is being filed and the international application includes the necessary components for an international filing date (see PCT Article 11 and MPEP 1810), a Notification of the International Application Number and of the International Filing Date (Form PCT/RO/105) will be issued in due course, subject to prescriptions concerning national security, and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the international filing date of the application.

The United States Patent and Trademark Office
PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD



HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP IP SECTION
2323 VICTORY AVENUE
SUITE 700
DALLAS, TX 75219

Appeal No: 2014-007,780
Appellant: David L. McCombs(3RD PTY REQ), CISCO
Reexam Control No: SYSTEMS, et al.
Hearing Room: 95/002,035
Hearing Docket: D
Hearing Date: B
Hearing Time: Wednesday, January 28, 2015
Location: 10:00 AM
Madison Building - East Wing
600 Dulany Street, 9th Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

**NOTICE OF HEARING
RESPONSE REQUIRED WITHIN 21 DAYS**

Your attention is directed to 37 CFR § 41.73. The above identified appeal will be heard by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board on the date indicated. Hearings will commence at the time set, and as soon as the argument in one appeal is concluded, the succeeding appeal will be taken up. **The time allowed for argument is 30 minutes** for each appellant or respondent who has requested an oral hearing, unless additional time is requested and approved before the argument commences. **As the hearing relates to an appeal of a reexamination, the hearing will be open to the public.**

Pursuant to § 41.73(d), if any other party to the appeal desires to participate in the oral hearing, but did not request an oral hearing pursuant to § 41.73(d), i.e., within two months after the mailing date of the Examiner's Answer, then this other party will be permitted to participate in the hearing by filing a separate request for oral hearing and the fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 41.20(b)(3) within 21 DAYS of the mailing date of this Notice, as well as a confirmation of attendance at the oral hearing.

CONFIRMATION OF ATTENDANCE OR WAIVER OF THE HEARING IS REQUIRED WITHIN 21 DAYS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS NOTICE. Failure to respond will be treated as a waiver of your request to participate in the oral hearing. If you are no longer interested in participating in the oral hearing, you must still file a waiver of oral hearing with the Board. This allows the panel to promptly act on the appeal without waiting for the oral hearing date.

Confirmation or waiver of the hearing should be indicated by completing the form below and returning it to the Board. This form may be filed with the Board by any one of the following three alternative methods:

1. **PREFERRED:** Via the USPTO Electronic Filing System (EFS) at

<http://www.uspto.gov/patents/process/file/efs/>

2. Facsimile transmitted to: The USPTO Central fax number (official copy): **(571) 273-8300**
and the PTAB Hearing fax number (courtesy copy): **(571) 273-9797.**

3. By mail at the PTAB mailing address: Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. BOX 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

In all communications relating to this appeal, please identify the appeal by its number.

CHECK ONE:

- I previously filed my oral hearing request pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.73(b).
 I am now filing my initial request to participate in the oral hearing pursuant to 37 C.F. R. § 41.73(d). A request for oral hearing and the fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 41.20(b)(3) are either attached to this hearing communication or have already been submitted.

CHECK ONE:

- IN-PERSON HEARING - ATTENDANCE CONFIRMED (*EFS-Web selection: Confirmation of Hearing by Appellant*)
 TELEPHONIC HEARING - ATTENDANCE CONFIRMED (*EFS-Web selection: Confirmation of Hearing by Appellant*)
 VIDEO HEARING - ATTENDANCE CONFIRMED (*EFS-Web selection: Confirmation of Hearing by Appellant*)
 HEARING ATTENDANCE WAIVED (*EFS-Web selection: Waiver of Hearing by Appellant*)


To aid the oral hearings staff in scheduling hearing rooms, please indicate the total number of participating and observing attendees if more than three are expected: 2
To aid the judges in determining whether any conflicts exist that may require a recusal, please list in the 'Comments' section the names of any additional person(s) who will be participating in the oral hearing. (Upon arrival, all persons presenting arguments must sign in at the Usher's desk.)

Comments/Special Requests:

DAVID L. MCCOMBS
Typed or Printed Name of Attorney/Agent/Appellant

32,271
Registration No.

PATENT OWNER THIRD PARTY REQUESTER


Signature of Attorney/Agent/Appellant

OCT 7, 2014
Date

The 'Hearings' tab of the PTAB webpage <http://www.uspto.gov/ip/boards/bpai/index.jsp> provides additional information about oral hearings.

Please direct other inquiries to the PTAB Hearings Clerk at 571-272-9797.

cc: Patent Owner

JACOBSON HOLMAN HERSHKOVITZ PLLC
400 SEVENTH STREET N.W. SUITE 600
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

Electronic Acknowledgement Receipt

EFS ID:	20346479
Application Number:	95002035
International Application Number:	
Confirmation Number:	1745
Title of Invention:	USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM
First Named Inventor/Applicant Name:	6779118
Customer Number:	40401
Filer:	David L. McCombs/Theresa O'Connor
Filer Authorized By:	David L. McCombs
Attorney Docket Number:	RI1341006F
Receipt Date:	07-OCT-2014
Filing Date:	12-SEP-2012
Time Stamp:	12:03:00
Application Type:	inter partes reexam

Payment information:

Submitted with Payment	no
------------------------	----

File Listing:

Document Number	Document Description	File Name	File Size(Bytes)/ Message Digest	Multi Part /.zip	Pages (if appl.)
1		3PR_Confirmation_of_Attendance_of_Hearing.pdf	138702 <small>1a2030fba059e0ac4ef3e13f6a19e776f82e5c74</small>	yes	4

Multipart Description/PDF files in .zip description			
Document Description		Start	End
Confirmation of Hearing by Appellant		1	3
Reexam Certificate of Service		4	4

Warnings:

Information:

Total Files Size (in bytes):	138702
-------------------------------------	--------

This Acknowledgement Receipt evidences receipt on the noted date by the USPTO of the indicated documents, characterized by the applicant, and including page counts, where applicable. It serves as evidence of receipt similar to a Post Card, as described in MPEP 503.

New Applications Under 35 U.S.C. 111

If a new application is being filed and the application includes the necessary components for a filing date (see 37 CFR 1.53(b)-(d) and MPEP 506), a Filing Receipt (37 CFR 1.54) will be issued in due course and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the filing date of the application.

National Stage of an International Application under 35 U.S.C. 371

If a timely submission to enter the national stage of an international application is compliant with the conditions of 35 U.S.C. 371 and other applicable requirements a Form PCT/DO/EO/903 indicating acceptance of the application as a national stage submission under 35 U.S.C. 371 will be issued in addition to the Filing Receipt, in due course.

New International Application Filed with the USPTO as a Receiving Office

If a new international application is being filed and the international application includes the necessary components for an international filing date (see PCT Article 11 and MPEP 1810), a Notification of the International Application Number and of the International Filing Date (Form PCT/RO/105) will be issued in due course, subject to prescriptions concerning national security, and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the international filing date of the application.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Table with 5 columns: APPLICATION NO., FILING DATE, FIRST NAMED INVENTOR, ATTORNEY DOCKET NO., CONFIRMATION NO.
95/002,035 09/12/2012 6779118 RI1341006F 1745

40401 7590 09/25/2014
Jacobson Holman Hershkovitz PLLC
400 Seventh Street N.W. Suite 600
Washington, DC 20004

EXAMINER

WORJLOH, JALATEE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3992

MAIL DATE DELIVERY MODE

09/25/2014

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

The United States Patent and Trademark Office
PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD



HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP IP SECTION
2323 VICTORY AVENUE
SUITE 700
DALLAS, TX 75219

Appeal No: 2014-007,780
Appellant: David L. McCombs(3RD PTY REQ), CISCO
Reexam Control No: SYSTEMS, et al.
Hearing Room: 95/002,035
Hearing Docket: D
Hearing Date: B
Hearing Time: Wednesday, January 28, 2015
10:00 AM
Location: Madison Building - East Wing
600 Dulany Street, 9th Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

**NOTICE OF HEARING
RESPONSE REQUIRED WITHIN 21 DAYS**

Your attention is directed to 37 CFR § 41.73. The above identified appeal will be heard by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board on the date indicated. Hearings will commence at the time set, and as soon as the argument in one appeal is concluded, the succeeding appeal will be taken up. **The time allowed for argument is 30 minutes** for each appellant or respondent who has requested an oral hearing, unless additional time is requested and approved before the argument commences. **As the hearing relates to an appeal of a reexamination, the hearing will be open to the public.**

Pursuant to § 41.73(d), if any other party to the appeal desires to participate in the oral hearing, but did not request an oral hearing pursuant to § 41.73(d), i.e., within two months after the mailing date of the Examiner's Answer, then this other party will be permitted to participate in the hearing by filing a separate request for oral hearing and the fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 41.20(b)(3) within 21 DAYS of the mailing date of this Notice, as well as a confirmation of attendance at the oral hearing.

CONFIRMATION OF ATTENDANCE OR WAIVER OF THE HEARING IS REQUIRED WITHIN 21 DAYS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS NOTICE. Failure to respond will be treated as a waiver of your request to participate in the oral hearing. If you are no longer interested in participating in the oral hearing, you must still file a waiver of oral hearing with the Board. This allows the panel to promptly act on the appeal without waiting for the oral hearing date.

Confirmation or waiver of the hearing should be indicated by completing the form below and returning it to the Board. This form may be filed with the Board by any one of the following three alternative methods:

1. **PREFERRED:** Via the USPTO Electronic Filing System (EFS) at

<http://www.uspto.gov/patents/process/file/efs/>

2. Facsimile transmitted to: The USPTO Central fax number (official copy): **(571) 273-8300**
and the PTAB Hearing fax number (courtesy copy): **(571) 273-9797.**

3. By mail at the PTAB mailing address: Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. BOX 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

In all communications relating to this appeal, please identify the appeal by its number.

CHECK ONE:

- I previously filed my oral hearing request pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.73(b).
- I am now filing my initial request to participate in the oral hearing pursuant to 37 C.F. R. § 41.73(d). A request for oral hearing and the fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 41.20(b)(3) are either attached to this hearing communication or have already been submitted.

CHECK ONE:

- IN-PERSON HEARING - ATTENDANCE CONFIRMED (*EFS-Web selection: Confirmation of Hearing by Appellant*)
- TELEPHONIC HEARING - ATTENDANCE CONFIRMED (*EFS-Web selection: Confirmation of Hearing by Appellant*)
- VIDEO HEARING - ATTENDANCE CONFIRMED (*EFS-Web selection: Confirmation of Hearing by Appellant*)
- HEARING ATTENDANCE WAIVED (*EFS-Web selection: Waiver of Hearing by Appellant*)

To aid the oral hearings staff in scheduling hearing rooms, please indicate the total number of participating and observing attendees if more than three are expected: _____

To aid the judges in determining whether any conflicts exist that may require a recusal, please list in the 'Comments' section the names of any additional person(s) who will be participating in the oral hearing. (Upon arrival, all persons presenting arguments must sign in at the Usher's desk.)

Comments/Special Requests:

Typed or Printed Name of Attorney/Agent/Appellant

Registration No.

PATENT OWNER THIRD PARTY REQUESTER

Signature of Attorney/Agent/Appellant

Date

The 'Hearings' tab of the PTAB webpage <http://www.uspto.gov/ip/boards/bpai/index.jsp> provides additional information about oral hearings.

Please direct other inquiries to the PTAB Hearings Clerk at 571-272-9797.

cc: Patent Owner

JACOBSON HOLMAN HERSHKOVITZ PLLC
400 SEVENTH STREET N.W. SUITE 600
WASHINGTON, DC 20004



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Table with 5 columns: APPLICATION NO., FILING DATE, FIRST NAMED INVENTOR, ATTORNEY DOCKET NO., CONFIRMATION NO.
95/002,035 09/12/2012 6779118 RI1341006F 1745

40401 7590 09/25/2014
Jacobson Holman Hershkovitz PLLC
400 Seventh Street N.W. Suite 600
Washington, DC 20004

EXAMINER

WORJLOH, JALATEE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3992

MAIL DATE DELIVERY MODE

09/25/2014

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

The United States Patent and Trademark Office
PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD



HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP IP SECTION
2323 VICTORY AVENUE
SUITE 700
DALLAS, TX 75219

Appeal No: 2014-007,780
Appellant: David L. McCombs(3RD PTY REQ), CISCO
Reexam Control No: SYSTEMS, et al.
Hearing Room: 95/002,035
Hearing Docket: D
Hearing Date: B
Hearing Time: Wednesday, January 28, 2015
10:00 AM
Location: Madison Building - East Wing
600 Dulany Street, 9th Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

**NOTICE OF HEARING
RESPONSE REQUIRED WITHIN 21 DAYS**

Your attention is directed to 37 CFR § 41.73. The above identified appeal will be heard by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board on the date indicated. Hearings will commence at the time set, and as soon as the argument in one appeal is concluded, the succeeding appeal will be taken up. **The time allowed for argument is 30 minutes** for each appellant or respondent who has requested an oral hearing, unless additional time is requested and approved before the argument commences. **As the hearing relates to an appeal of a reexamination, the hearing will be open to the public.**

Pursuant to § 41.73(d), if any other party to the appeal desires to participate in the oral hearing, but did not request an oral hearing pursuant to § 41.73(d), i.e., within two months after the mailing date of the Examiner's Answer, then this other party will be permitted to participate in the hearing by filing a separate request for oral hearing and the fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 41.20(b)(3) within 21 DAYS of the mailing date of this Notice, as well as a confirmation of attendance at the oral hearing.

CONFIRMATION OF ATTENDANCE OR WAIVER OF THE HEARING IS REQUIRED WITHIN 21 DAYS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS NOTICE. Failure to respond will be treated as a waiver of your request to participate in the oral hearing. If you are no longer interested in participating in the oral hearing, you must still file a waiver of oral hearing with the Board. This allows the panel to promptly act on the appeal without waiting for the oral hearing date.

Confirmation or waiver of the hearing should be indicated by completing the form below and returning it to the Board. This form may be filed with the Board by any one of the following three alternative methods:

1. **PREFERRED:** Via the USPTO Electronic Filing System (EFS) at

<http://www.uspto.gov/patents/process/file/efs/>

2. Facsimile transmitted to: The USPTO Central fax number (official copy): **(571) 273-8300**
and the PTAB Hearing fax number (courtesy copy): **(571) 273-9797.**

3. By mail at the PTAB mailing address: Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. BOX 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

In all communications relating to this appeal, please identify the appeal by its number.

CHECK ONE:

- I previously filed my oral hearing request pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.73(b).
- I am now filing my initial request to participate in the oral hearing pursuant to 37 C.F. R. § 41.73(d). A request for oral hearing and the fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 41.20(b)(3) are either attached to this hearing communication or have already been submitted.

CHECK ONE:

- IN-PERSON HEARING - ATTENDANCE CONFIRMED (*EFS-Web selection: Confirmation of Hearing by Appellant*)
- TELEPHONIC HEARING - ATTENDANCE CONFIRMED (*EFS-Web selection: Confirmation of Hearing by Appellant*)
- VIDEO HEARING - ATTENDANCE CONFIRMED (*EFS-Web selection: Confirmation of Hearing by Appellant*)
- HEARING ATTENDANCE WAIVED (*EFS-Web selection: Waiver of Hearing by Appellant*)

To aid the oral hearings staff in scheduling hearing rooms, please indicate the total number of participating and observing attendees if more than three are expected: _____

To aid the judges in determining whether any conflicts exist that may require a recusal, please list in the 'Comments' section the names of any additional person(s) who will be participating in the oral hearing. (Upon arrival, all persons presenting arguments must sign in at the Usher's desk.)

Comments/Special Requests:

Typed or Printed Name of Attorney/Agent/Appellant

Registration No.

PATENT OWNER THIRD PARTY REQUESTER

Signature of Attorney/Agent/Appellant

Date

The 'Hearings' tab of the PTAB webpage <http://www.uspto.gov/ip/boards/bpai/index.jsp> provides additional information about oral hearings.

Please direct other inquiries to the PTAB Hearings Clerk at 571-272-9797.

cc: Patent Owner

JACOBSON HOLMAN HERSHKOVITZ PLLC
400 SEVENTH STREET N.W. SUITE 600
WASHINGTON, DC 20004



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Table with 5 columns: APPLICATION NO., FILING DATE, FIRST NAMED INVENTOR, ATTORNEY DOCKET NO., CONFIRMATION NO.
95/002,035 09/12/2012 6779118 RI1341006F 1745

40401 7590 09/25/2014
Jacobson Holman Hershkovitz PLLC
400 Seventh Street N.W. Suite 600
Washington, DC 20004

EXAMINER

WORJLOH, JALATEE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3992

MAIL DATE DELIVERY MODE

09/25/2014

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

The United States Patent and Trademark Office
PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD



JACOBSON HOLMAN
HERSHKOVITZ PLLC
400 SEVENTH STREET N.W.
SUITE 600
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

Appeal No: 2014-007,780
Appellant: TECHNOLOGY, LLC(OWNER) , et al.
Reexam Control No: 95/002,035
Hearing Room: D
Hearing Docket: B
Hearing Date: Wednesday, January 28, 2015
Hearing Time: 10:00 AM
Location: Madison Building - East Wing
600 Dulany Street, 9th Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

**NOTICE OF HEARING
RESPONSE REQUIRED WITHIN 21 DAYS**

Your attention is directed to 37 CFR § 41.73. The above identified appeal will be heard by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board on the date indicated. Hearings will commence at the time set, and as soon as the argument in one appeal is concluded, the succeeding appeal will be taken up. **The time allowed for argument is 30 minutes** for each appellant or respondent who has requested an oral hearing, unless additional time is requested and approved before the argument commences. **As the hearing relates to an appeal of a reexamination, the hearing will be open to the public.**

Pursuant to § 41.73(d), if any other party to the appeal desires to participate in the oral hearing, but did not request an oral hearing pursuant to § 41.73(d), i.e., within two months after the mailing date of the Examiner's Answer, then this other party will be permitted to participate in the hearing by filing a separate request for oral hearing and the fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 41.20(b)(3) within 21 DAYS of the mailing date of this Notice, as well as a confirmation of attendance at the oral hearing.

CONFIRMATION OF ATTENDANCE OR WAIVER OF THE HEARING IS REQUIRED WITHIN 21 DAYS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS NOTICE. Failure to respond will be treated as a waiver of your request to participate in the oral hearing. If you are no longer interested in participating in the oral hearing, you must still file a waiver of oral hearing with the Board. This allows the panel to promptly act on the appeal without waiting for the oral hearing date.

Confirmation or waiver of the hearing should be indicated by completing the form below and returning it to the Board. This form may be filed with the Board by any one of the following three alternative methods:

1. **PREFERRED:** Via the USPTO Electronic Filing System (EFS) at

<http://www.uspto.gov/patents/process/file/efs/>

2. Facsimile transmitted to: The USPTO Central fax number (official copy): **(571) 273-8300**
and the PTAB Hearing fax number (courtesy copy): **(571) 273-9797**.

3. By mail at the PTAB mailing address: Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. BOX 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

In all communications relating to this appeal, please identify the appeal by its number.

CHECK ONE:

- I previously filed my oral hearing request pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.73(b).
- I am now filing my initial request to participate in the oral hearing pursuant to 37 C.F. R. § 41.73(d). A request for oral hearing and the fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 41.20(b)(3) are either attached to this hearing communication or have already been submitted.

CHECK ONE:

- IN-PERSON HEARING - ATTENDANCE CONFIRMED (*EFS-Web selection: Confirmation of Hearing by Appellant*)
- TELEPHONIC HEARING - ATTENDANCE CONFIRMED (*EFS-Web selection: Confirmation of Hearing by Appellant*)
- VIDEO HEARING - ATTENDANCE CONFIRMED (*EFS-Web selection: Confirmation of Hearing by Appellant*)
- HEARING ATTENDANCE WAIVED (*EFS-Web selection: Waiver of Hearing by Appellant*)

To aid the oral hearings staff in scheduling hearing rooms, please indicate the total number of participating and observing attendees if more than three are expected: _____
To aid the judges in determining whether any conflicts exist that may require a recusal, please list in the 'Comments' section the names of any additional person(s) who will be participating in the oral hearing. (Upon arrival, all persons presenting arguments must sign in at the Usher's desk.)

Comments/Special Requests:

Typed or Printed Name of Attorney/Agent/Appellant

Registration No.

() PATENT OWNER () THIRD PARTY REQUESTER

Signature of Attorney/Agent/Appellant

Date

The 'Hearings' tab of the PTAB webpage <http://www.uspto.gov/ip/boards/bpai/index.jsp> provides additional information about oral hearings.

Please direct other inquiries to the PTAB Hearings Clerk at 571-272-9797.

cc: Third Party Requester

HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP IP SECTION
2323 VICTORY AVENUE
SUITE 700
DALLAS, TX 75219



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
95/002,035	09/12/2012	6779118	RI1341006F	1745

40401 7590 07/17/2014
Hershkovitz & Associates, PLLC
2845 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER

WORJLOH, JALATEE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3992	

3992

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/17/2014	PAPER

07/17/2014

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



United States Patent and Trademark Office

Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and
Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office

P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

HERSHKOVITZ & ASSOCIATES, PLLC
2845 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

Appeal No: 2014-007780
Inter Partes Reexamination
Control No: 95/002,035 & 90/012,342
Appellant: Koichiro Ikudome et al.

Patent Trial and Appeal Board Docketing Notice

Inter Partes Reexamination Control No. 95/002,035 & 90/012,342 was received from the Technology Center at the Board on July 02, 2014 and has been assigned Appeal No: 2014-007780.

In all future communications regarding this appeal, please include both the *Inter Partes* Reexamination Control Number and the appeal number.

The mailing address for the Board is:

PATENT TRIAL and APPEAL BOARD
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313-1450

Telephone inquiries can be made by calling 571-272-9797 and referencing the appeal number listed above.

By order of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board.

CLU

cc: Third Party Requester

HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP IP SECTION
2323 VICTORY AVENUE
SUITE 700
DALLAS, TX 75219

JAMES J. WONG
2108 GOSSAMER AVENUE
REDWOOD CITY, CA 94065



HERSHKOVITZ & ASSOCIATES, PLLC

PATENT AGENCY

2845 DUKE STREET, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

TEL. 703-370-4800 ~ FACSIMILE 703-370-4809

patent@hershkovitz.net ~ www.hershkovitz.net

Inventor: Koichiro Ikudome et al.

Art Unit: 3992

Reexamination Proceeding: 95/002,035 (MAIN)
(based on U.S. Patent No. 6,779,118)

Confirmation No.: 1745

Reexamination Filed: September 12, 2012

Examiner: Jalatee Worjloh

For: USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM

Mail Stop "inter partes Reexam"
Attn.: Central Reexamination Unit
Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 23313-1450

Honorable Commissioner:

Transmitted herewith are PATENT OWNER'S REQUEST FOR ORAL HEARING UNDER 37 CFR §41.73 and CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE, in the above-captioned Proceeding.

The fee has been calculated as shown below:

Claims After Amendment	No. of Claims Previously Paid	Present Extra	Small Entity		Large Entity	
			Rate	Fee	Rate	Fee
*Total Claims:			x 30=	\$	x 60=	\$
**Indep. Claims:			x125=	\$	x250=	\$
Extension Fee for Months				\$		\$
Other: Oral Hearing				\$		\$1,300.00
Total:				\$	Total:	\$1,300.00

Fee Payment made through EFS.

Payment is made herewith by Credit Card (see attached Form PTO-2038).

The Director is hereby authorized to charge all fees, including those under 37 CFR §§1.16 and 1.17, which are required for entry of the papers submitted herewith, and any fees which may be required to maintain pendency of this Proceeding, to Deposit Account No. 50-2929.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge all fees under 37 CFR § 1.18 which may be required to complete issuance of this application to Deposit Account No. 50-2929.

Respectfully submitted,
Koichiro Ikudome et al.

Date: May 6, 2014

/Abe Hershkovitz/
Abraham Hershkovitz
Registration No. 45,294

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor: Koichiro Ikudome

Art Unit 3992

Merged Reexam Proceeding No. 95/002,035 (Main)
and Reexam Proceeding No. 90/012,342
(Based on US 6,779,118 C1)

Conf. No. 1745
Conf. No. 5786

Examiner Jalatee Worjloh

Filed: September 12, 2012 (Main) and June 8, 2012

For: USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM

PATENT OWNER'S REQUEST FOR ORAL HEARING UNDER 37 CFR §41.73

Mail Stop "*inter partes* Reexam"
Attn.: Central Reexamination Unit
Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 23313-1450

Honorable Commissioner:

Patent Owner respectfully submits that an Oral Hearing is desirable for proper presentation of the present Appeal, and in accordance with 37 CFR §41.73, requests that such Hearing be scheduled for the above-identified merged Proceedings.

The requisite Oral Hearing fee is being submitted concurrently herewith.

Please direct any questions to the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC

Date: May 6, 2014

/Abe Hershkovitz/
Abraham Hershkovitz
Reg. No. 45,294

HERSHKOVITZ & ASSOCIATES, PLLC
2845 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone 703-370-4800
Facsimile 703-370-4809
E-Mail patent@hershkovitz.net

RI1341006F/R1341006D ; AH/pjj

Certificate of Service

It is hereby certified that the attached PATENT OWNER'S REQUEST FOR ORAL HEARING UNDER 37 CFR §41.7 and a copy of this Certificate of Service **are being served on May 6, 2014 by first class mail** on third party requesters at third party requesters' addresses of record:

David L. McCombs
Haynes & Boone, LLP
2323 Victory Avenue, Suite 700
Dallas, TX 75219

[for *inter partes* Proceeding No. 95/002,035]

James J. Wong
2108 Gossamer Ave.
Redwood City, CA 94065

[for *ex parte* Proceeding No. 90/012,342]

 /Abe Hershkovitz/
Abraham Hershkovitz

Electronic Patent Application Fee Transmittal

Application Number:	95002035
Filing Date:	12-Sep-2012
Title of Invention:	USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM
First Named Inventor/Applicant Name:	6779118
Filer:	Abraham Hershkovitz
Attorney Docket Number:	RI1341006F

Filed as Large Entity

inter partes reexam Filing Fees

Description	Fee Code	Quantity	Amount	Sub-Total in USD(\$)
Basic Filing:				
Pages:				
Claims:				
Miscellaneous-Filing:				
Petition:				
Patent-Appeals-and-Interference:				
Request for Oral Hearing	1403	1	1300	1300

Post-Allowance-and-Post-Issuance:

Extension-of-Time:

Description	Fee Code	Quantity	Amount	Sub-Total in USD(\$)
Miscellaneous:				
Total in USD (\$)				1300

Electronic Acknowledgement Receipt

EFS ID:	18955235
Application Number:	95002035
International Application Number:	
Confirmation Number:	1745
Title of Invention:	USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM
First Named Inventor/Applicant Name:	6779118
Customer Number:	40401
Filer:	Abraham Hershkovitz
Filer Authorized By:	
Attorney Docket Number:	RI1341006F
Receipt Date:	06-MAY-2014
Filing Date:	12-SEP-2012
Time Stamp:	16:00:46
Application Type:	inter partes reexam

Payment information:

Submitted with Payment	yes
Payment Type	Credit Card
Payment was successfully received in RAM	\$1300
RAM confirmation Number	2482
Deposit Account	
Authorized User	

File Listing:

Document Number	Document Description	File Name	File Size(Bytes)/ Message Digest	Multi Part	Pages Total

1	Trans Letter filing of a response in a reexam	RI1341006F-A12_Transmittal-of-Req-Oral-Hrg.pdf	164473 84d15b83b6170efb16fa2a9325c567e830227d18	no	1
Warnings:					
Information:					
2		RI1341006F-R1341006D_Req-Oral-Hrg.pdf	125239 c294787f2bd7f66aa78966623a7bf67cd8e1ca7c	yes	2
	Multipart Description/PDF files in .zip description				
	Document Description		Start	End	
	Oral Hearing Request-Owner		1	1	
	Reexam Certificate of Service		2	2	
Warnings:					
Information:					
3	Fee Worksheet (SB06)	fee-info.pdf	30219 ea4f9e23022f549ded10fe7c4815e9dff7929e9	no	2
Warnings:					
Information:					
Total Files Size (in bytes):			319931		
<p>This Acknowledgement Receipt evidences receipt on the noted date by the USPTO of the indicated documents, characterized by the applicant, and including page counts, where applicable. It serves as evidence of receipt similar to a Post Card, as described in MPEP 503.</p> <p><u>New Applications Under 35 U.S.C. 111</u> If a new application is being filed and the application includes the necessary components for a filing date (see 37 CFR 1.53(b)-(d) and MPEP 506), a Filing Receipt (37 CFR 1.54) will be issued in due course and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the filing date of the application.</p> <p><u>National Stage of an International Application under 35 U.S.C. 371</u> If a timely submission to enter the national stage of an international application is compliant with the conditions of 35 U.S.C. 371 and other applicable requirements a Form PCT/DO/EO/903 indicating acceptance of the application as a national stage submission under 35 U.S.C. 371 will be issued in addition to the Filing Receipt, in due course.</p> <p><u>New International Application Filed with the USPTO as a Receiving Office</u> If a new international application is being filed and the international application includes the necessary components for an international filing date (see PCT Article 11 and MPEP 1810), a Notification of the International Application Number and of the International Filing Date (Form PCT/RO/105) will be issued in due course, subject to prescriptions concerning national security, and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the international filing date of the application.</p>					



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
95/002,035 90101342	09/12/2012	6779118	R11341006F	1745
40401	7590	04/28/2014	EXAMINER WORJLOH, JALATEE	
Hershkovitz & Associates, PLLC 2845 Duke Street Alexandria, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3992	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/28/2014	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Transmittal of Communication to Third Party Requester Inter Partes Reexamination	Control No.	Patent Under Reexamination	
	90/012,342 and 95/002035	6779118	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jalatee Worjloh	3992	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address. --

(THIRD PARTY REQUESTER'S CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS)

James J. Wong
2108 Gossamer Ave. Redwood City, CA 94065

Enclosed is a copy of the latest communication from the United States Patent and Trademark Office in the above-identified reexamination proceeding. 37 CFR 1.903.

Prior to the filing of a Notice of Appeal, each time the patent owner responds to this communication, the third party requester of the *inter partes* reexamination may once file written comments within a period of 30 days from the date of service of the patent owner's response. This 30-day time period is statutory (35 U.S.C. 314(b)(2)), and, as such, it cannot be extended. See also 37 CFR 1.947.

If an *ex parte* reexamination has been merged with the *inter partes* reexamination, no responsive submission by any *ex parte* third party requester is permitted.

All correspondence relating to this *inter partes* reexamination proceeding should be directed to the **Central Reexamination Unit** at the mail, FAX, or hand-carry addresses given at the end of the communication enclosed with this transmittal.

Transmittal of Communication to Third Party Requester Inter Partes Reexamination	Control No.	Patent Under Reexamination	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	95/002,035 and 90012,342	6779118	
	Jalatee Worjloh	3992	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address. --

_____ (THIRD PARTY REQUESTER'S CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS) _____

David L. McCombs
Haynes & Boone, LLP
2323 Victory Avenue, Suite 700 Dallas, Texas 75219

Enclosed is a copy of the latest communication from the United States Patent and Trademark Office in the above-identified reexamination proceeding. 37 CFR 1.903.

Prior to the filing of a Notice of Appeal, each time the patent owner responds to this communication, the third party requester of the *inter partes* reexamination may once file written comments within a period of 30 days from the date of service of the patent owner's response. This 30-day time period is statutory (35 U.S.C. 314(b)(2)), and, as such, it cannot be extended. See also 37 CFR 1.947.

If an *ex parte* reexamination has been merged with the *inter partes* reexamination, no responsive submission by any *ex parte* third party requester is permitted.

All correspondence relating to this *inter partes* reexamination proceeding should be directed to the **Central Reexamination Unit** at the mail, FAX, or hand-carry addresses given at the end of the communication enclosed with this transmittal.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
90/012,342 & 95/002,035	08 June, 2012	6779118	R1341006-D

Hershkovitz & Associates, PLLC 2845 Duke Street Alexandria, VA 22314	EXAMINER	
	Jalatee Worjloh	
	ART UNIT	PAPER
	3992	20140425

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The supplemental rebuttal brief filed April 22, 2014 by the Patent Owner has been entered.

The reexamination proceeding is being forwarded to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for decision on the appeal(s).

/Jalatee Worjloh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3992

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application of: Koichiro Ikudome, et al.	§	Docket No.	43614.61
<i>Inter Partes</i> Reexamination	§		
	§	Examiner:	WORJLOH, Jalatee
Patent No. 6,779,118	§		
	§	Art Unit:	3992
Proceeding Nos.: 95/002,035 and	§		
90/012,342 (merged)	§	Conf. No.	1745, 5786
	§		
For: User specific automatic data redirection system			

Mail Stop *Inter Partes* Reexam
Attn: Central Reexamination Unit
Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REQUEST FOR ORAL HEARING


Third Party Requester Cisco Systems, Inc. hereby requests an oral hearing of this appeal. This hearing request is being submitted pursuant to and in accordance with 37 CFR 41.73. The request is timely submitted in response to the Examiner's Answer dated March 6, 2014. A certificate of service is attached herewith. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee set forth under 37 CFR 41.20(b)(3), in the amount of \$1300.00. Further, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees that may be associated with this filing, or credit any overpayment, to the Haynes and Boone, LLP Deposit Account No. 08-1394.

Respectfully submitted,

/David L. McCombs/

David L. McCombs
Registration No. 32,271

Dated: April 23, 2014
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
2323 Victory Avenue, Suite 700
Dallas, Texas 75219
Telephone: 972/739-8636
Facsimile: 214/200-0853
Attorney Docket No.: 43614.61



CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that a copy of the REQUEST FOR ORAL HEARING was served on:

HERSHKOVITZ & ASSOCIATES, PLLC
2845 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

the attorneys of record for the assignee of USP 6,779,118 and

JAMES J. WONG
2108 GOSSAMER AVE.
REDWOOD CITY, CA 94065

the attorney of record for the requester in Control No. 90/012342, in accordance with 37 C.F.R.
1.903, on April 23, 2014.

/David L. McCombs /

David L. McCombs,
Registration No. 32,271

R_364638

Electronic Patent Application Fee Transmittal

Application Number:	95002035
Filing Date:	12-Sep-2012
Title of Invention:	USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM
First Named Inventor/Applicant Name:	6779118
Filer:	David L. McCombs/Theresa O'Connor
Attorney Docket Number:	RI1341006F

Filed as Large Entity

inter partes reexam Filing Fees

Description	Fee Code	Quantity	Amount	Sub-Total in USD(\$)
Basic Filing:				
Pages:				
Claims:				
Miscellaneous-Filing:				
Petition:				
Patent-Appeals-and-Interference:				
Request for Oral Hearing	1403	1	1300	1300

Post-Allowance-and-Post-Issuance:

Extension-of-Time:

Description	Fee Code	Quantity	Amount	Sub-Total in USD(\$)
Miscellaneous:				
Total in USD (\$)				1300

Electronic Acknowledgement Receipt

EFS ID:	18837417
Application Number:	95002035
International Application Number:	
Confirmation Number:	1745
Title of Invention:	USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM
First Named Inventor/Applicant Name:	6779118
Customer Number:	40401
Filer:	David L. McCombs/Theresa O'Connor
Filer Authorized By:	David L. McCombs
Attorney Docket Number:	RI1341006F
Receipt Date:	23-APR-2014
Filing Date:	12-SEP-2012
Time Stamp:	14:03:09
Application Type:	inter partes reexam

Payment information:

Submitted with Payment	yes
Payment Type	Credit Card
Payment was successfully received in RAM	\$1300
RAM confirmation Number	287
Deposit Account	081394
Authorized User	MCCOMBS, DAVID L

The Director of the USPTO is hereby authorized to charge indicated fees and credit any overpayment as follows:

Charge any Additional Fees required under 37 C.F.R. Section 1.16 (National application filing, search, and examination fees)

Charge any Additional Fees required under 37 C.F.R. Section 1.17 (Patent application and reexamination processing fees)

Charge any Additional Fees required under 37 C.F.R. Section 1.19 (Document supply fees)
 Charge any Additional Fees required under 37 C.F.R. Section 1.20 (Post Issuance fees)
 Charge any Additional Fees required under 37 C.F.R. Section 1.21 (Miscellaneous fees and charges)

File Listing:

Document Number	Document Description	File Name	File Size(Bytes)/ Message Digest	Multi Part /.zip	Pages (if appl.)
1		3PR_Request_for_Oral_Hearing.pdf	64496 bc3ca8fa426246bbe6eb5270221aa2015e5cf2b9	yes	3

Multipart Description/PDF files in .zip description				
	Document Description	Start	End	
	Oral Hearing Request - Third Party Requester	1	2	
	Reexam Certificate of Service	3	3	

Warnings:

Information:

2	Fee Worksheet (SB06)	fee-info.pdf	30285 a622659c9c4a22cdfb72dfcd88dcfbee61b05ec	no	2
---	----------------------	--------------	--	----	---

Warnings:

Information:

Total Files Size (in bytes):			94781		
-------------------------------------	--	--	-------	--	--

This Acknowledgement Receipt evidences receipt on the noted date by the USPTO of the indicated documents, characterized by the applicant, and including page counts, where applicable. It serves as evidence of receipt similar to a Post Card, as described in MPEP 503.

New Applications Under 35 U.S.C. 111

If a new application is being filed and the application includes the necessary components for a filing date (see 37 CFR 1.53(b)-(d) and MPEP 506), a Filing Receipt (37 CFR 1.54) will be issued in due course and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the filing date of the application.

National Stage of an International Application under 35 U.S.C. 371

If a timely submission to enter the national stage of an international application is compliant with the conditions of 35 U.S.C. 371 and other applicable requirements a Form PCT/DO/EO/903 indicating acceptance of the application as a national stage submission under 35 U.S.C. 371 will be issued in addition to the Filing Receipt, in due course.

New International Application Filed with the USPTO as a Receiving Office

If a new international application is being filed and the international application includes the necessary components for an international filing date (see PCT Article 11 and MPEP 1810), a Notification of the International Application Number and of the International Filing Date (Form PCT/RO/105) will be issued in due course, subject to prescriptions concerning national security, and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the international filing date of the application.



HERSHKOVITZ & ASSOCIATES, PLLC

PATENT AGENCY

2845 DUKE STREET, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

TEL. 703-370-4800 ~ FACSIMILE 703-370-4809

patent@hershkovitz.net ~ www.hershkovitz.net

Inventor: Koichiro Ikudome et al.

Art Unit: 3992

Reexamination Proceeding: 95/002,035 (MAIN)
(based on U.S. Patent No. 6,779,118)

Confirmation No.: 1745

Examiner: Jalatee Worjloh

Reexamination Filed: September 12, 2012

For: USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM

Mail Stop "inter partes Reexam"
Attn.: Central Reexamination Unit
Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 23313-1450

Honorable Commissioner:

Transmitted herewith are A COVER LETTER FOR SUPPLEMENTAL PATENT OWNER'S REBUTTAL BRIEF UNDER 37 CFR §41.71 AND MARKED-UP PAGES 4 AND 13, AND A SUPPLEMENTAL PATENT OWNER'S REBUTTAL BRIEF UNDER 37 CFR §41.71 AND CLAIMS APPENDIX WITH A CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE, in the above-captioned Proceeding.

The fee has been calculated as shown below:

Claims After Amendment	No. of Claims Previously Paid	Present Extra	Small Entity		Large Entity	
			Rate	Fee	Rate	Fee
*Total Claims:			x 30=	\$	x 60=	\$
**Indep. Claims:			x125=	\$	x250=	\$
Extension Fee for	Months			\$		\$
Other:				\$		\$
Total:				\$	Total:	\$

Fee Payment made through EFS.

Payment is made herewith by Credit Card (see attached Form PTO-2038).

The Director is hereby authorized to charge all fees, including those under 37 CFR §§1.16 and 1.17, which are required for entry of the papers submitted herewith, and any fees which may be required to maintain pendency of this Proceeding, to Deposit Account No. 50-2929.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge all fees under 37 CFR § 1.18 which may be required to complete issuance of this application to Deposit Account No. 50-2929.

Respectfully submitted,
Koichiro Ikudome et al.

Date: April 22, 2014

/Abe Hershkovitz/
Abraham Hershkovitz
Registration No. 45,294

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor: Koichiro Ikudome

Art Unit 3992

Merged Reexam Proceeding No. 95/002,035 (Main)
and Reexam Proceeding No. 90/012,342
(Based on US 6,779,118 C1)

Conf. No. 1745
Conf. No. 5786

Examiner Jalatee Worjloh

Filed: September 12, 2012 (Main) and June 8, 2012

For: USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM

**COVER LETTER FOR
SUPPLEMENTAL PATENT OWNER'S REBUTTAL BRIEF UNDER 37 CFR §41.71**

Mail Stop "*inter partes* Reexam"
Attn.: Central Reexamination Unit
Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 23313-1450

Honorable Commissioner:

On April 7, 2014, Patent Owner timely filed a Rebuttal Brief under 37 CFR §41.71 responsive to the March 6, 2014 Examiner's Answer and Respondent's Brief filed on January 8, 2014 by third party requester ("Requester") in the above-identified merged *inter partes/ex parte* Reexamination Proceedings ("the present Proceedings") for underlying US Patent No. 6,779,118 ("the '118 Patent"). The fee for Patent Owner's Rebuttal Brief also was submitted on April 7, 2014 with the Brief through EFS-Web, and the Office was then and now authorized to charge any fee necessary to enter the April 7, 2014 Brief or this Supplemental Brief, or to preserve the pendency of these Proceedings, to Deposit Account No. 50-2929 for Docket No. RI1341006F.

Through solely clerical error during preparation of the April 7, 2014 Rebuttal Brief, a typographical mistake was introduced which might create confusion in the mind of the reader. Accordingly, Patent Owner respectfully submits this Supplemental Rebuttal Brief to repair this unintentional clerical error, i.e., as shown here in italics, to correct the sentence in Section G.3. on page 13 at line 2, from "Stockwell likewise *does teach or disclose* modifying a rule set..." to "Stockwell likewise *does not teach or disclose* modifying a rule set...." The only other change

made from the April 7, 2014 Brief to the present Supplemental Brief is completely editorial, i.e., to add a space on page 4, line 7, to separate the words "in" and "view", and accordingly, Patent Owner respectfully submits that correction is proper for clarity in the record, and courteously requests entry and consideration of this Supplemental Patent Owner's Rebuttal Brief.

Marked-up versions of pages 4 and 13 are submitted herewith simply to highlight the only changes made in this Supplemental Rebuttal Brief. A complete and "clean" version of this Supplemental Rebuttal Brief is submitted for consideration by the Examiner and the Board.

Please direct any questions to the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC

 /Abe HersHKovitz/
Abraham HersHKovitz
Reg. No. 45,294

Stephen Marcus
Reg. No. 64,075

Attachments: Marked-Up Pages 4 and 13
Supplemental Rebuttal Brief

Date: April 22, 2014

HERSHKOVITZ & ASSOCIATES, PLLC
2845 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
TEL: (703) 370-4800
FAX: (703) 370-4809
E-MAIL: patent@hershkovitz.net

RI1341006F/R1341006D ; AH/pjj

address.” The Examiner agrees with Patent Owner that as to claims 24, 26, 40-43, and 83-90, instructions are received by the redirection server to modify the rule set. However, the Examiner now maintains the rejection on modified ground. Therefore, the rejections under this issue continue to include:

Claims 16-24, 26-27, 36-43 and 68-90 as being obvious over Radia in view of Wong '727, and further in view of Stockwell; and

Claims 16-24 and 68-90 as being obvious over Radia ~~in view~~ in view of Wong '727, and further in view of APA.

3. (Withdrawn) The Examiner has withdrawn the rejection of Claims 40-43 as being obvious over He, Zenchelsky, Fortinsky, and APA.

4. Whether Coss is prior art citable against the '118 Patent in view of the Declarations of the Inventors under 37 CFR §1.131.

5. If Coss is properly citable prior art against the '118 Patent, whether Coss in view of APA renders obvious “the redirection server...configured to allow automated modification of...the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address.” The rejections under this issue include:

Claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-43 and 68-90 as being obvious over Coss in view of APA.

(D) Defective Grounds of Rejection Due to Lack of *prima facie*

Obviousness

Initially, Patent Owner respectfully points out it has been held that, “...when the prior art teaches away from the claimed solution..., obviousness cannot be proven merely by showing that a known composition could have been modified by routine experimentation or solely on the expectation of success; **it must be shown** that those of ordinary skill in the art would have had **some apparent reason to modify** the known composition in a way that would result in the claimed composition.” *Ex parte Whallen II*, 2008 Pat. App. LEXIS 25, 21–22; 89 U.S.P.Q.2D 1078 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 2008) (emphasis added).

Not once has the Examiner shown where there is any motivation or any reason whatsoever given anywhere in Willens (**except by the improper hindsight knowledge of the exclusive teaching of the ‘118 Patent that is being improperly used in all rejections**) to modify Willens to achieve the novel claimed invention of the ‘118 Patent, particularly with

3. Combining Radia And Stockwell

Radia does not teach or suggest modifying the rule set (used to process data packets from the user) by the router while the rule set is configured in the router. Stockwell likewise does not teach or disclose modifying a rule set (used to process data packets from the user) by the router while the rule set is configured in the router. Combining Radia and Stockwell does not make obvious a requirement of the claims absent from both references but required by the '118 Patent claim language, such as in claim 16, that recites "*a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set ... to control data passing between the user and a public network...wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of...the rule set....*"

For each of the above reasons, the rejections based on a combination of Radia and Stockwell must be withdrawn.

H. Coss

1. The Examiner's Finding of Insufficiency of the Evidence in the Inventors' Declarations is Erroneously Based on Authority Applicable Only to Interference Proceedings

Patent Owner has submitted two Declarations, including receipts showing the purchase of supplies and a Report dated August 14, 1997, to demonstrate *actual* reduction to practice before the effective date of the Coss reference. This evidence was submitted to establish invention (reduction to practice) of the '118 Patent prior to the effective date of the Coss reference, not to support a count in interference.

The Examiner has rejected the sufficiency of this factual evidence first on the grounds that the Declarations fail to prove "diligence." However, again the Examiner errs because in this case, evidence of diligence is not required since the evidence of *actual* reduction to practice was dated August 14, 1997, *before the effective date of the reference*. Under 37 CFR §1.131(b), where the evidence of reduction to practice occurs before the critical date, evidence of "diligence" is *irrelevant*. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection based on the sufficiency of the evidence to show diligence is therefore without legal merit or foundation, and must be reversed.

The Examiner has also rejected the sufficiency of the evidence to establish a reduction to practice in the US. However, Exhibit B shows that all of the components purchased to implement the invention were purchased in the United States of America (See Exhibit A to the Inventor Declarations under 37 CFR §1.131). Furthermore, the location of employment for both Inventors was Pasadena, California (Yeung Declaration, paragraph 4; Ikudome Declaration, paragraphs 5-8; and Exhibit B). This evidence is sufficient to show both conception and reduction to practice in Pasadena, California within the United States. By contrast, the Examiner has neither cited evidence nor presented any evidence-based inference

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor: Koichiro Ikudome

Art Unit 3992

Merged Reexam Proceeding No. 95/002,035 (Main)
and Reexam Proceeding No. 90/012,342
(Based on US 6,779,118 C1)

Conf. No. 1745
Conf. No. 5786

Examiner Jalatee Worjloh

Filed: September 12, 2012 (Main) and June 8, 2012

For: USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM

SUPPLEMENTAL PATENT OWNER'S REBUTTAL BRIEF UNDER 37 CFR §41.71

Mail Stop "*inter partes* Reexam"
Attn.: Central Reexamination Unit
Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 23313-1450

Honorable Commissioner:

As Appellant, Patent Owner respectfully submits this Rebuttal Brief under 37 CFR §41.71 responsive to the Examiner's Answer mailed on March 6, 2014 in the above-identified merged *inter partes/ex parte* Reexamination Proceedings ("the present Proceedings") for underlying US Patent No. 6,779,118 ("the '118 Patent"), and to Respondent's Brief filed on January 8, 2014 by third party requester ("Requester").

The fee for Patent Owner's Rebuttal Brief is being submitted concurrently through EFS-Web. However, the Office is authorized to charge any fee in connection herewith or any fees necessary to preserve the pendency of these Proceedings, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-2929, referencing Docket No. RI1341006F.

As required by 37 C.F.R. §1.943(c), Patent Owner's Rebuttal Brief is 15 pages or fewer, excluding the Claims Appendix that is presented herewith for the convenience of the Board.

(A) Requester's Respondent Brief

Due to page limitations in this Rebuttal Brief, Patent Owner will only address the first ones of the unsupported or inaccurate remarks in the Respondent Brief filed by Requester on January 8, 2014, since the Respondent Brief is substantially reiteration of the Examiner's remarks from the Right of Appeal Notice ("RAN") and attorney comments regarding those Examiner's remarks, neither of which impact the irrefutable and factual evidence of the validity and patentability of the claims of the '118 Patent.

Specifically, on page 1 (and with reference to footnote number 1 on page 2), Requester has made the completely erroneous statement that Patent Owner "concedes the invalidity of claims 2-7, 9-14, 28-35, and 44-67, which were rejected as obvious over US 5,848,233 to Radia in view of the Admitted Prior Art and further in view of US 6,154,775 to Coss." Patent Owner categorically rebuts this statement, and any and all other such inaccurate remarks. Patent Owner has not conceded and does not concede the validity or patentability of any claim proposed, pending, issued or cancelled in either the original patent, a previous Proceeding or the present Proceedings. The reality is that what is factually taught in the prior art, and the *lack* of teaching therein, is incontrovertible proof that the claimed invention defines over all art cited and applied, alone or in any reasonable combination.

Further, Requester asserts in footnote 2 on page 5 of the Respondent Brief that:

Requester also proposed rejecting claims 26-27 and 36-43 as obvious over Radia in view of Wong'727 (*sic.*) and the Admitted Prior Art in the detailed analysis adopted by the Examiner. *See* RAN at 21; Request Ex. BB at 55-102. Their omission from the rejection appears to be a clerical oversight, not the result of a determination on the merits.

However, upon review of the listed rejections of the claims in the RAN on page 20, it is clear that only claims 7, 14, 16-24, 50-56, and 62-90 are identified as being rejected over Radia in view of Wong '727 and further in view of Admitted Prior Art ("APA"), and the same is true in the RAN on page 21, the page cited by Petitioner. Additionally, in the Examiner's Answer, a completely separate paper issued after the RAN, the same proposed rejection (obvious over Radia in view of Wong and further in view of APA) is made for only claims 7, 14, 16-24, 50-56 and 62-90. Nowhere in the RAN or the Examiner's Answer are claims 26, 27 and/or 36-43 of the '118 Patent rejected under that combination of art. Accordingly, it is presumed that such ground of rejection has been withdrawn for those claims.

Since it appears that the Respondent Brief is substantially merely the same previously-presented attorney opinions that has no weight over factual evidence, particularly with regard to the factual evidence of the reduction to practice of the invention disclosed only in the '118 Patent that was presented in the Inventors' Declarations, Patent Owner hereby rebuts all inaccurate or unsupported attorney comments in the Respondent Brief and will not deal further with the contents of the Respondent Brief.

(B) The Examiner's Answer

As the statements and position taken by the Examiner in the RAN appear to be substantially reflected in the Examiner's Answer, Patent Owner directs the specific rebuttal of the Examiner's Answer to the maintained rejections of the novel and unobvious claims in view of the lack of teaching in the prior art and hindsight use of the exclusive disclosure found only in the '118 Patent. Patent Owner also rebuts the lack of proper weight and consideration given to the substantive evidence of reduction to practice furnished by the Inventors' Declarations.

(C) Issues to be Reviewed

As the Examiner's Answer indicates on page 2, every ground of rejection made in the Office Action dated September 9, 2013, from which Appeal is being taken, is maintained. Accordingly, Patent Owner submits that the following issues are being reviewed in this Rebuttal Brief:

1. Whether Willens in combination with RFC2138, Stockwell or "Admitted Prior Art" (APA), alone or in combination, discloses or renders obvious the limitations of: "the redirection server...configured to allow automated modification of...the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address." The rejections under this issue include:

Claims 16-18, 23, 24, 26, 36-43, 68-71, 76-84 and 86-90 as being obvious over Willens in view of RFC2138 and Stockwell; and

Claims 16-18, 23, 24, 26, 36-43, 68-71, 76-84 and 86-90 as being obvious over Willens in view of RFC2138 and APA.

2. Whether Radia in view of Wong '727, Stockwell, Wong '178 or APA, alone or in any reasonable combination, discloses or renders obvious "the redirection server...configured to allow automated modification of...the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network

address.” The Examiner agrees with Patent Owner that as to claims 24, 26, 40-43, and 83-90, instructions are received by the redirection server to modify the rule set. However, the Examiner now maintains the rejection on modified ground. Therefore, the rejections under this issue continue to include:

Claims 16-24, 26-27, 36-43 and 68-90 as being obvious over Radia in view of Wong '727, and further in view of Stockwell; and

Claims 16-24 and 68-90 as being obvious over Radia in view of Wong '727, and further in view of APA.

3. (Withdrawn) The Examiner has withdrawn the rejection of Claims 40-43 as being obvious over He, Zenchelsky, Fortinsky, and APA.

4. Whether Coss is prior art citable against the '118 Patent in view of the Declarations of the Inventors under 37 CFR §1.131.

5. If Coss is properly citable prior art against the '118 Patent, whether Coss in view of APA renders obvious “the redirection server...configured to allow automated modification of...the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address.” The rejections under this issue include:

Claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-43 and 68-90 as being obvious over Coss in view of APA.

(D) Defective Grounds of Rejection Due to Lack of *prima facie* Obviousness

Initially, Patent Owner respectfully points out it has been held that, “...when the prior art teaches away from the claimed solution..., obviousness cannot be proven merely by showing that a known composition could have been modified by routine experimentation or solely on the expectation of success; **it must be shown that those of ordinary skill in the art would have had some apparent reason to modify the known composition in a way that would result in the claimed composition.**” *Ex parte Whallen II*, 2008 Pat. App. LEXIS 25, 21–22; 89 U.S.P.Q.2D 1078 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 2008) (emphasis added).

Not once has the Examiner shown where there is any motivation or any reason whatsoever given anywhere in Willens (**except by the improper hindsight knowledge of the exclusive teaching of the '118 Patent that is being improperly used in all rejections**) to modify Willens to achieve the novel claimed invention of the '118 Patent, particularly with

regard to the inventive steps of configuring the redirection server to allow automatic modification of the rule set during the user's session.

That is, no credible line of reasoning has been given as to why any person having ordinary skill in the art could find the invention claimed in the '118 Patent to be obvious in light of the teachings of the references because the factual contents of the references have not been correctly interpreted. Instead, individual components in the prior art have been alleged to read on the elements of the novel invention disclosed only in the '118 Patent. However, in doing so, it has been made even clearer that the components in the prior art are **not** the same and do **not** function the same way as in the claimed invention.

The explanation as to how the teachings, and the lack of teachings, in the prior art verifies that the rejections of the appealed claims of the '118 Patent are defective is discussed in detail hereinbelow.

(E) Willens

1. Willens Requires That the Filter (Rule Set) Be Maintained (Not Modified) After Being Downloaded To the Communications Server 14 – a Teaching That Directly Contradicts the “Modification” Requirement of the '118 Patent Claims

In the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner's argument for rejection of the claims based on Willens is essentially the same as previously given, that is: (1) the Willens' permit list (also referred to as “sitelist”) and a filter (“rule set”) are the same; and (2) Willens discloses that the permit list can be updated on a daily or hourly basis; and therefore (3) Willens teaches modification of the rule set as claimed in the '118 Patent. The disclosure and requirements of Willens do not support this argument.

The Examiner's argument is erroneous because (a) Willens teaches that the filter alone is downloaded to the communications server (14) and integrated with the client software (44); (b) Willens teaches that the only sites ever stored in cache are *user requested sites*, not sites from the permit list; (c) the Willens' sitelist (permit list), against which a user requested site is compared, is stored and maintained **exclusively in the remote network access server (18)** and **is never downloaded to the communications server (14) and is never stored in the cache (50)**; and (d) the comparison between the user requested site and the list of sites included in the sitelist is **always** done in the remote network server (18) and **never** in the communications server (14).

Accordingly, adding or removing a website from a site list (such as the “PTA List”) in the network access server (18) does not change the filter downloaded and integrated with the user software in the communications server (14). See Willens 5:34-36. Therefore, the PTA List ***cannot*** be a “filter” (rule set), because any modification of the PTA List (sitelist) in the access server (18) does not change the rule set downloaded in the communications server (14). Furthermore, even assuming (*arguendo*) the Examiner’s contention that the sitelist was a rule set, the only modification taught by Willens is done in the network access server (18). The ‘118 Patent claims ***require*** that modification be done to the rule set (whether or not including a sitelist) ***while it is resident in the redirection server*** and acting to process data packets from the user during a user session. As discussed above, the sitelist of Willens is ***never*** resident in the communications server, where the ‘118 Patent claims require that the modification be done to the rule set in the redirection server during a user session. Willens not only does not teach the rule set of the ‘118 Patent that must be downloaded into the redirection server for modification, Willens ***teaches away from*** the novel rule set claimed in the ‘118 Patent because the “rule set” (sitelist) that the Examiner contends is shown by Willens that is downloaded to the communications server is ***never modified while resident in the communications server***, as required by each of the ‘118 Patent claims on appeal.

As to the Willens “filter” in the communications server, the Examiner is still ignoring the explicit teaching of Willens that, once the filter (rule set) is downloaded and integrated with the user software, that filter “...is ***maintained*** in the server 14 for the rest of the user 22’s session.” See Willens, Abstract and 5:25-26. According to www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/, the plain meaning of “maintain” is “to cause [something] to exist or continue *without changing*.” Simply stated, once downloaded into the communications server 14, Willens’ filter (rule set) is ***not modified***. By contrast, the ‘118 Patent claims on appeal each ***require*** that the rule set resident in the redirection server be able to change, i.e., be “modified,” ***during*** a user session.¹

The only support cited by the Examiner that the PTA List (sitelist) is a rule set is Willens 5:5-27:

When user 22 logs in through the communications server 14, the RADIUS client software 45 first determines **if** user 22 is authorized by checking his password through RADIUS server 16, utilizing user profiles 46. The user

¹ A “user session” in the ‘118 Patent is the period during which the rule set resident in the redirection server is correlated with the temporarily assigned network address (TANA) to “control data passing between the user and the public network.” This corresponds to “session” as used in Willens.

profiles 46 also identify a filter "F(Timmy)" in his user profile 46. After checking user 22's authorization, the RADIUS server 16 supplies the filter identification through the RADIUS client 45 software along with the verification acknowledgment for the user 22 for use by client software 44 for controlling access by the user 22 to Internet sites. The client software 44 then checks to see if the filter "F(Timmy)" is stored locally in cache 50. If it is, the client software 44 uses it for controlling access. If not, the client software 44 sends a lookup request to the network access server 18, which stores the centralized permitted sitelist and the filters to be used as masks for checking access classifications of requested sites, to download the filter "F(Timmy)", which is maintained in the server 14 memory for the rest of the user 22's session. (emphasis added)

However, this section of Willens requires just the opposite. The Examiner's summary of this section contends that the user profile identifies a *filter* named "F(Timmy)"; the client software searches for that *filter* "F(Timmy)", first in local cache and next in the remote access server (18); and then downloads the *filter* "F(Timmy)" to the communications server (14). Patent Owner agrees with this summary as far as it goes. However, omitted from the Examiner's summary is the fact that the *filter* "F(Timmy)" is the *only* thing downloaded to the server 14. Further omitted is the unambiguous requirement of Willens that the filter be *maintained in the communications server "for the rest of the user 22's session."* Accordingly, the version of the filter "F(Timmy)" that is downloaded into the communications server 14 is not modified in the communications server 14.

If the sitelist (the "PTA list" being one example), was an actual rule set used to grant or deny access as contended by the Examiner, then the PTA list would necessarily have been downloaded to the server (14) associated with the user, since that is where the claims of the '118 Patent require that modification to the rule set be done. **Willens teaches the opposite.** Indeed, a key feature of Willens was to provide "for a central, server based permit list..." (Willens 4:40-43). In short, *Willens teaches that the sitelists are exclusively maintained at the centralized network access server (18)* so that they are available to multiple users 22, 32, 34, and 36 (Willens 5:27-31).

The Examiner seems also to infer that the sitelists are stored in cache. However, the only sites stored in cache are sites *requested by the user*. See Willens 5:27-31. This again confirms the teaching of Willens that the sitelists are *exclusively stored on the central network access server (18)* so as to be available to multiple users, and so again, **teaches away** from the rule set claimed in the '118 Patent.

The position of the Examiner is further undercut because Willens discloses that the site requested by a user and the sitelist are compared by the network access server 18, *not* the communications server where a version of the filter is downloaded.

...the server 14 sends a filter lookup request to server 18. This lookup [request] contains the list name "PTA list" and the site Timmy [the requestor] is trying to access

(www.playboy.com). *The server 18 searches list 52* ["PTA List"] and sends back the result. Based on the result, the *server 14 either permits or denies access* and updates its local cache [with the requested site]. Willens 6:1-7. (emphasis added)

Therefore, it is the server 18 that does the comparison of the *requested* site from the communications server 14 with the set of websites stored under the name "PTA List" *in the server 18*. The "result" sent to the server 14 is *not* a sitelist or website, but simply information that the requested site is either present or not present in the server 18 sitelist. That "result" is used by server 14 to either allow or disallow access (the rule's function). **Willens does not teach or disclose the communication of any website or sitelist from the server 18 to the communications server 14.**

For each of the above reasons, the Willens' sitelists and filters (rule set) are distinct elements, and the PTA List cannot be a rule set as posited by the Examiner². As such, the filter downloaded in the communications server is not modified as required by the '118 claims on appeal, and updating of the sitelist is done exclusively in the network server 18, not in the communications server 14 as required by the '118 Patent.

2. Modification of the Rule Set

The Examiner argues that Willens does teach that the redirection server is configured to allow modification of the rule set because the filters of Willens define rules and the "PTA List" is a "rule." For the reasons discussed above, the Examiner's position is completely contrary to the teaching and requirements of Willens, and the rejections on that ground should therefore be reversed.

The Examiner also conjectures regarding the disclosure of Willens 5:9 and 18-26 as follows: "In Willens, while a user is logged in, the client software can send a lookup request to the network access server to download filters." However, the actual quote in context is as follows:

When user 22 logs in ... Willens 5:9

...

The client software 44 then checks to see if the *filter "F(Timmy)"* is stored locally in cache 50. If it is, the client software 44 uses it [the filter "F(Timmy)"] for controlling access. If not, **the client software 44 sends a lookup request to the network access server 18, which stores the centralized permitted site list and the filters to be used as masks for checking access classifications of requested sites, **to download the *filter "F(Timmy)"*, which is maintained in the server 14 memory for the rest of the user 22's session.** Willens 5:18-26**

...

² The Examiner's citation of the '118 Patent specification as justification for defining the Willens sitelist as a filter is a classic example of improper hindsight reconstruction. This is particularly true *since Willens teaches just the opposite* – that the filter and sitelist are separate and distinct. Even if the '118 Patent taught that its rule set included the identity of one or more allowed or disallowed websites, that teaching cannot be used to conflate Willens filter and sitelist *where Willens explicitly teaches just the opposite.*

The server [18] software also automatically maintains the permit list by downloading updated versions of the list over the internet and compiling the list for use by the client software 42. Willens 5:40-44 (emphasis added)

First, to insure accuracy, the words used by Willens are “when a user logs in”, and not “while a user is logged in,” the former describing the initial log in and the latter describing user actions during a user session.

Secondly, the Examiner summarizes this section from Willens as support for the proposition that the communications server (14) receives “updated versions of the list” and therefore the communications server (14) allows modification of the rule set. However, as discussed in detail above, nothing in Willens discloses or suggests that a sitelist is ever communicated from the network server (18) to the communications server (14). In fact, **Willens teaches just the opposite**. Specifically, Willens teaches that it is the network server (18) that compares the user requested site against the sitelist eliminating any need to communicate a sitelist to each individual communications server (14). Indeed, the only information returned is the “result” of the comparison done by the network server (18) – that a comparison was found or not found. Willens does the comparison at a central site rather than a number of separate communications server sites to avoid having to send large lists of websites to the individual communications servers to do the comparison. See Willens 4:40-45.

For the above reasons, the Willens’ communications server (14) does not “allow modification of the rule set” in the communications server (14). The rejection of the claims based on Willens is therefore erroneous and must be withdrawn.

(F) Stockwell

Non-Obviousness Over Willens In View Of Stockwell

The Examiner continues to maintain this obviousness rejection on several grounds.

First, the Examiner still posits that Willens teaches modification of the rule set downloaded in the communications server. However, it is unmistakable that, for the reasons discussed above, the version of the rule set (filter) downloaded into the communications server 14 is maintained for the duration of the user session, and is not modified during a user session by

the communications server 14 as required by the '118 Patent claims on appeal. The Examiner's obviousness rejection is again therefore incorrect and must therefore be withdrawn.

Secondly, the Examiner interposes for the first time a new ground of rejection based on Stockwell, namely that Stockwell teaches cache entries and their expiration, "thereby ensuring that automatic updates received by the Choice Net server 18 will propagate down to the communications server 14 in a timely fashion." However, as described above, Willens teaches that all comparisons of the sitelist against a user requested site are done *by the server 18*. Only prior *user requested sites* are stored in cache. The sitelists from the server (18) are never communicated to the communications server 14, and there is no teaching, no suggestion for modification, and indeed no need in Willens to "propagate" those sitelists from the server (18) to the communications server (14). The Examiner's rejection on this ground is also erroneous and must be withdrawn.

(G) Radia.

1. The Examiner's Position That the '118 Claims Do Not Limit Modification to the Redirection Server is Erroneous

Apparatus claims 16-23, 36-39 and 68-82 each include the limitations:

"redirection server programmed with a user's rule set" and "wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automatic modification of a least a portion of the rule set as a function of [a defined parameter]."

Apparatus claim 24 includes the additional limitation:

"wherein instructions to the redirection server to modify the rule set are received by ... the redirection server."

Method claims 26, 40-43 and 83-90 include the following language:

"the redirection server containing a user's rule set" and "receiving instructions by the redirection server to modify at least a portion of the user's rule set...."

Additionally, all of the above claims require that the rule set programmed in the redirection server include functionality to *"control data passing between the user and a public network."*

Patent Owner's position is that the above claim language requires that the modification of the rule set be done in the redirection server, and that it is only the redirection server that actually makes any modification to be done to the rule set, whether in response to extrinsic instructions or not, as discussed in Patent Owner's Appellant Brief filed in this Proceeding, which is incorporated herein by reference.

The Examiner takes a contrary position that the above language "does not limit the modification to the redirection server," arguing that the embodiment in the '118 Patent at 8:3-11 "permits an outsider server to make modification to the rule set," and reciting from *Yamamoto* that, during Reexamination,

claims are given their broadest possible interpretation consistent with the specification. The Examiner then argues that the ANCS server is an outsider server that makes modification to the rule set programmed in the router.

Again, the Examiner's analysis is erroneous for several reasons.

First, as discussed more fully in Patent Owner's Appellant Brief, the Examiner's interpretation of the embodiment in the '118 Patent at 8:3-11 is erroneous. As unambiguously recited in the '118 Patent 8:3-4, a website sends an "authorization," but the *action* of "deleting" of the redirection from the rule set in response to that authorization is done *by the redirection server, not by the website sending the authorization*. Furthermore, if the authorization to delete was sufficient without involving the redirection server to actually do the deleting, then sending the authorization to the redirection server would be superfluous and unnecessary. Also, the '118 Patent claims unambiguously require that rule set be the one programmed (contained) in the redirection server. As such, changing the rule set without involving the redirection server is *impossible*. Radia does not disclose, and the Examiner does not explain, how the ANCS server or any other outside website could change the rule set programmed in the redirection server as required by the '118 Patent claims without necessarily involving the redirection server itself³. The Examiner's interpretation is therefore not supported by this or any other embodiment in the '118 Patent.

Second, the '118 Patent claims require that the rule set being modified be the rule set resident ("programmed" or "contained") in the redirection server, which is therefore an integral part of the redirection server. The ANCS of Radia creates a rule set and then downloads that rule set into a router. However, Radia does not teach or suggest any modification to a rule set already downloaded (configured) in the router while that rule set is being used to process data packets between the user and the internet.

Third, whether the "*redirection server is configured to allow automatic modification*" or "*instructions to the redirection server to modify the rule set are received by...the redirection server,*" the claims of the '118 Patent require that the redirection server control the modification process. This is consistent with the specification which states at '118 Patent 4:52-53, "the redirection server performs *all* the central tasks of the system" (emphasis added).

Finally, interpreting the claims broadly enough to enable the rule set to be modified directly by an external website, as imagined by the Examiner, would effectively read the "redirection server configured to allow" limitation out of the claims by permitting the rule set to be modified with or without control by the redirection server. While Patent Owner understands that claims should be given their broadest *reasonable* interpretation during Reexamination, an interpretation that effectively reads the "redirection

³ The sentence in the '118 Patent at 8:6-10 states that "modifications" other than redirection are possible in the prior example, but regardless of the type, this example is still based on the fact that it is the redirection server that does the "modifying."

server configured to allow,” or any other functional limitation, out of the claims is *not* reasonable. In *Randall May Int’l Inc. v Deg Music Prods., Inc.*, 378 Fed. App’x. 989, 994 (Fed. Cir. 2010), the Court held that it was legal error to interpret a claim in such a way that a limitation was read out of the claim “because all the limitations in a claim must be considered meaningful.” The Supreme Court applied this construction principle in *Warner Jenkinson Co. v. Hilton Davis Chemical*, 520 U.S. 17 (1997), stating that “[i]t is important to ensure that the application of the doctrine [of equivalents], even as to an individual element, is not allowed such broad play as to effectively eliminate that element in its entirety.” *Id* at 29.

The Examiner’s interpretation is defective, since under the Examiner’s interpretation, the limitation “the redirection server is configured to allow,” for example in Claim 16, or the limitation “receiving instructions by the redirection server to modify...the user’s rule set...,” would be rendered meaningless surplusage since the claim would cover modification whether or not the redirection server was a participant.

For each of the above reasons, in addition to those presented in Patent Owner’s Appellant Brief, the Examiner’s expansive interpretation must be reversed.

2. Radia Itself Precludes an Interpretation That the Router and ANCS Can Be Combined to Defined the Claimed Redirection Server

The Examiner also contends that, even if the claims required modification by the redirection server, Radia’s ANCS (112) and router (106) can be combined and, as combined, teach the redirection server required by the ‘118 Patent claims. The ‘118 Patent claims all require that the rule set programmed in the redirection server include functionality to “*control data passing between the user and a public network.*” The ANCS does not receive data packets, does not process data packets and therefore cannot “control data passing between the user and the public network.” In Radia, the router is disclosed and described as performing this function. Furthermore, while Radia expressly teaches that the router (redirection server) can be a combination of one or more components, each of those components ***must*** “***forward packets originating at the client system.***” Radia at 7:2-5. The ANCS does not “forward packets originating at the client system,” and indeed, does not process packets at all. The ANCS therefore does not meet the express requirement imposed by Radia itself for combining components to process data packets, as is required of the redirection server in the ‘118 Patent. For the above reasons, as well as for the reasons stated in Patent Owner’s Appellant Brief, the ANCS and router cannot therefore be combined. Indeed, ***Radia expressly teaches just the opposite.*** The Examiner’s rejection on this ground must therefore be withdrawn.

3. Combining Radia And Stockwell

Radia does not teach or suggest modifying the rule set (used to process data packets from the user) by the router while the rule set is configured in the router. Stockwell likewise does not teach or disclose modifying a rule set (used to process data packets from the user) by the router while the rule set is configured in the router. Combining Radia and Stockwell does not make obvious a requirement of the claims absent from both references but required by the '118 Patent claim language, such as in claim 16, that recites "*a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set ... to control data passing between the user and a public network...wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of...the rule set....*"

For each of the above reasons, the rejections based on a combination of Radia and Stockwell must be withdrawn.

H. Coss

1. The Examiner's Finding of Insufficiency of the Evidence in the Inventors' Declarations is Erroneously Based on Authority Applicable Only to Interference Proceedings

Patent Owner has submitted two Declarations, including receipts showing the purchase of supplies and a Report dated August 14, 1997, to demonstrate *actual* reduction to practice before the effective date of the Coss reference. This evidence was submitted to establish invention (reduction to practice) of the '118 Patent prior to the effective date of the Coss reference, not to support a count in interference.

The Examiner has rejected the sufficiency of this factual evidence first on the grounds that the Declarations fail to prove "diligence." However, again the Examiner errs because in this case, evidence of diligence is not required since the evidence of *actual* reduction to practice was dated August 14, 1997, *before the effective date of the reference*. Under 37 CFR §1.131(b), where the evidence of reduction to practice occurs before the critical date, evidence of "diligence" is *irrelevant*. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection based on the sufficiency of the evidence to show diligence is therefore without legal merit or foundation, and must be reversed.

The Examiner has also rejected the sufficiency of the evidence to establish a reduction to practice in the US. However, Exhibit B shows that all of the components purchased to implement the invention were purchased in the United States of America (See Exhibit A to the Inventor Declarations under 37 CFR §1.131). Furthermore, the location of employment for both Inventors was Pasadena, California (Yeung Declaration, paragraph 4; Ikudome Declaration, paragraphs 5-8; and Exhibit B). This evidence is sufficient to show both conception and reduction to practice in Pasadena, California within the United States. By contrast, the Examiner has neither cited evidence nor presented any evidence-based inference

that would suggest reductions to practice other than in the United States. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection based on the sufficiency of the evidence to show reduction to practice in the U.S. is without foundation and must therefore also be reversed.

Finally, the Examiner has rejected the sufficiency of the evidence to show actual reduction, stating that "to establish actual reduction to practice, a showing of the invention in a physical or tangible form that shows every element of the *count*" (emphasis added) is required, citing *Wetmore v. Quick*, 536 F.2d 937, 942 (CCPA 1976) and MPEP 2138.05. However, again, these citations apply only to determine priority of invention in *interference* proceedings and *are not applicable to swearing behind a reference to remove that reference as prior art pursuant to 37 CFR §1.131*. To swear behind a reference, a "declaration under 37 CFR 1.131 is required to show no more than what the reference shows. *In re Stryker*, 435 F.2d. 1340 (CCPA 1971)... If the [declaration] contains facts showing a completion of the invention commensurate with the extent of the invention as claimed is shown in the reference or activity, the ...declaration is sufficient, whether or not it is a showing of the identical disclosure of the reference or the identical subject matter involved in the activity." MPEP §715.02. The Declaration is sufficient if it establishes possession of the basic invention. *In re Spiller*, 500 F.2d 1170 (CCPA 1974), MPEP 715.02.

Accordingly, the Examiner, in applying the interference standard, erred. The Declarations to swear behind a reference do not need to show "a physical or tangible form that shows every element of the count." Indeed, there is no "count" against which this standard can even be measured when the purpose of the Declaration is to remove a reference as prior art rather than show priority of invention.

Under the proper standard, the Inventor Declarations submitted by Patent Owner are sufficient to show that the Inventors possessed the invention as of August 14, 1997, before the September 12, 1997 effective filing date of Coss. Exhibit B appended to the Declarations shows that the Inventors, prior to the effective date of Coss, actually demonstrated dynamic rules. See, *e.g.*, Exhibit B, page 6, Step 4, where, during a user session, the redirection rule was removed, dynamically changing the rules. This was the feature for which Coss was cited ("Coss teaches dynamic rules which are included with the access rules as a need arises⁴"). Accordingly, the Inventor Declarations as submitted are sufficient to remove Coss as a reference, and all rejections based on Coss must therefore be reversed.

⁴ By this recitation, Patent Owner does not concede that Coss is invalidating prior art under §103, but merely that the Inventor Declarations and their Exhibits show dynamic rule changing, the reason the Examiner cites Coss.

2. Coss Combined With APA Does Not Teach or Suggest the Invention

Even if Coss were arguably proper prior art (which it is not), there is nothing in Coss to suggest the modification proposed by the Examiner, alone or in combination with the APA as more fully discussed in Patent Owner's Appellant Brief.

Conclusion

For the above reasons, Appellant (Patent Owner) respectfully requests reversal of all of the Examiner's rejections of the claims on appeal.

Appellant also respectfully requests reversal of the Examiner's improper handling of the Inventor Declarations Under 37 CFR §1.131, and withdrawal of Coss as prior art.

Appellant further respectfully requests remand to the Examiner for issuance of a Notice of Intent to Issue a Reexamination Certificate of all the claims on appeal.

Evidence of service of this Rebuttal Brief on third party requesters is attached hereto.

Please direct any questions to the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC

/Abe HersHKovitz/

Abraham HersHKovitz
Reg. No. 45,294

Stephen Marcus
Reg. No. 64,075

Attachments:
Claims Appendix (For the Convenience of the Board)
Certificate of Service

Date: April 22, 2014

HERSHKOVITZ & ASSOCIATES, PLLC
2845 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
TEL: (703) 370-4800
FAX: (703) 370-4809
E-MAIL: patent@hershkovitz.net

Claims Appendix1. *(Cancelled in Reexamination Certificate) (Reproduced for the Convenience of the Board)*

A system comprising:

a database with entries correlating each of a plurality of user IDs with an individualized rule set;

a dial-up network server that receives user IDs from users' computers;

a redirection server connected to the dial-up network server and a public network, and an authentication accounting server connected to the database, the dial-up network server and the redirection server;

wherein the dial-up network server communicates a first user ID for one of the users' computers and a temporarily assigned network address for the first user ID to the authentication accounting server;

wherein the authentication accounting server accesses the database and communicates the individualized rule set that correlates with the first user ID and the temporarily assigned network address to the redirection server; and

wherein data directed toward the public network from the one of the users' computers are processed by the redirection server according to the individualized rule set.

2. The system of claim 1, wherein the redirection server further provides control over a plurality of data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

3. The system of claim 1, wherein the redirection server further blocks the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

4. The system of claim 1, wherein the redirection server further allows the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

5. The system of claim 1, wherein the redirection server further redirects the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

6. The system of claim 1, wherein the redirection server further redirects the data from the users' computers to multiple destinations as a function of the individualized rule set.
7. The system of claim 1, wherein the database entries for a plurality of the plurality of users' IDs are correlated with a common individualized rule set.
8. *(Cancelled from Reexamination Certificate)(Reproduced for the Convenience of the Board)*
In a system comprising a database with entries correlating each of a plurality of user IDs with an individualized rule set; a dial-up network server that receives user IDs from users' computers; a redirection server connected to the dial-up network server and a public network, and an authentication accounting server connected to the database, the dial-up network server and the redirection server, the method comprising the steps of:
- communicating a first user ID for one of the users' computers and a temporarily assigned network address for the first user ID from the dial-up network server to the authentication accounting server;
 - communicating the individualized rule set that correlates with the first user ID and the temporarily assigned network address to the redirection server from the authentication accounting server;
 - and processing data directed toward the public network from the one of the users' computers according to the individualized rule set.
9. The method of claim 8, further including the step of controlling a plurality of data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.
10. The method of claim 8, further including the step of blocking the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.
11. The method of claim 8, further including the step of allowing the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

12. The method of claim 8, further including the step of redirecting the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

13. The method of claim 8, further including the step of redirecting the data from the users' computers to multiple destinations a function of the individualized rule set.

14. The method of claim 8, further including the step of creating database entries for a plurality of the plurality of users' IDs, the plurality of users' ID further being correlated with a common individualized rule set.

15. *(Cancelled from Reexamination Certificate) (Reproduced for the Convenience of the Board)*

A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address; wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address; and

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses.

16. A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of time.

17. A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of the data transmitted to or from the user.

18. A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of the location or locations the user accesses.

19. A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow the removal or reinstatement of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of time.

20. A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow the removal or reinstatement of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of the data transmitted to or from the user.

21. A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow the removal or reinstatement of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of the location or locations the user accesses.

22. A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow the removal or reinstatement of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location or locations the user accesses.

23. A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the redirection server has a user side that is connected to a computer using the temporarily assigned network address and a network side connected to a computer network and wherein the computer using the temporarily assigned network address is connected to the computer network through the redirection server.

24. The system of claim 23 wherein instructions to the redirection server to modify the rule set are received by one or more of the user side of the redirection server and the network side of the redirection server.

25. *(Cancelled from Reexamination Certificate) (Reproduced for the Convenience of the Board)*

In a system comprising a redirection server containing a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address wherein the user's rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network; the method comprising the step of:

modifying at least a portion of the user's rule set while the user's rule set remains correlated to the temporarily assigned network address in the redirection server; and

wherein the redirection server has a user side that is connected to a computer using the temporarily assigned network address and a network address and a network side connected to a computer network and

wherein the computer using the temporarily assigned network address is connected to the computer network through the redirection server and the method further includes the step of receiving instructions by the redirection server to modify at least a portion of the user's rule set through one or more of the user side of the redirection server and the network side of the redirection server.

26. The method of claim 25, further including the step of modifying at least a portion of the user's rule set as a function of one or more of: time, data transmitted to or from the user, and location or locations the user accesses.

27. The method of claim 25, further including the step of removing or reinstating at least a portion of the user's rule set as a function of one or more of: time, the data transmitted to or from the user and a location or locations the user accesses.

28. The system of claim 1, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP (Internet Protocol) service.

29. The system of claim 1, wherein the individualized rule set includes an initial temporary rule set and a standard rule set, and wherein the redirection server is configured to utilize the temporary rule set for an initial period of time and to thereafter utilize the standard rule set.

30. The system of claim 1, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a request type and a destination address.

31. The system of claim 1, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule redirecting the data to a new destination address based on a request type and an attempted destination address.

32. The method of claim 8, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP (Internet Protocol) service.

33. The method of claim 8, wherein the individualized rule set includes an initial temporary rule set and a standard rule set, and wherein the redirection server is configured to utilize the temporary rule set for an initial period of time and to thereafter utilize the standard rule set.

34. The method of claim 8, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a request type and a destination address.

35. The method of claim 8, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule redirecting the data to a new 20 destination address based on a request type and an attempted destination address.

36. A system comprising:

- a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

- wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

- wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

- wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

- wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP (Internet Protocol) service.

37. A system comprising:

- a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

- wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

- wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

- wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the modified rule set includes an initial temporary rule set and a standard rule set, and wherein the redirection server is configured to utilize the temporary rule set for an initial period of time and to thereafter utilize the standard rule set.

38. A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a request type and a destination address.

39. A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule redirecting the data to a new destination address based on a request type and an attempted destination address.

40. The method of claim 25, wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP (Internet Protocol) service.

41. The method of claim 25, wherein the modified rule set includes an initial temporary rule set and a standard rule set, and wherein the redirection server is configured to utilize the temporary rule set for an initial period of time and to thereafter utilize the standard rule set.

42. The method of claim 25, wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a request type and a destination address.

43. The method of claim 25, wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule redirecting the data to a new destination address based on a request type and an attempted destination address.

44. A system comprising:

- a database with entries correlating each of a plurality of user IDs with an individualized rule set;

- a dial-up network server that receives user IDs from users' computers;

- a redirection server connected between the dial-up network server and a public network,

and

an authentication accounting server connected to the database, the dial-up network server and the redirection server;

- wherein the dial-up network server communicates a first user ID for one of the users' computers and a temporarily assigned network address for the first user ID to the authentication accounting server;

- wherein the authentication accounting server accesses the database and communicates the individualized rule set that correlates with the first user ID and the temporarily assigned network address to the redirection server; and

- wherein data directed toward the public network from the one of the users' computers are processed by the redirection server according to the individualized rule set.

45. The system of claim 44, wherein the redirection server further provides control over a plurality of data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

46. The system of claim 44, wherein the redirection server further blocks the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

47. The system of claim 44, wherein the redirection server further allows the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

48. The system of claim 44, wherein the redirection server further redirects the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

49. The system of claim 44, wherein the redirection server further redirects the data from the users' computers to multiple destinations as a function of the individualized rule set.

50. The system of claim 44, wherein the database entries for a plurality of the plurality of users' IDs are correlated with a common individualized rule set.

51. The system of claim 44, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP (Internet Protocol) service.

52. The system of claim 44, wherein the individualized rule set includes an initial temporary rule set and a standard rule set, and wherein the redirection server is configured to utilize the temporary rule set for an initial period of time and to thereafter utilize the standard rule set.

53. The system of claim 44, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a request type and a destination address.

54. The system of claim 44, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule redirecting the data to a new destination address based on a request type and an attempted destination address.

55. The system of claim 44, wherein the redirection server is configured to redirect data from the users' computers by replacing a first destination address in an IP (Internet Protocol) packet header by a second destination address as a function of the individualized rule set.

56. In a system comprising a database with entries correlating each of a plurality of user IDs with an individualized rule set; a dial-up network server that receives user IDs from users' computers; a redirection server connected between the dial-up network server and a public network, and an authentication accounting server connected to the database, the dial-up network server and the redirection servers, a method comprising the steps of:

communicating a first user ID for one of the users' computers and a temporarily assigned network address for the first user ID from the dial-up network server to the authentication accounting server;

communicating the individualized rule set that correlates with the first user ID and the temporarily assigned network address to the redirection server from the authentication accounting server; and

processing data directed toward the public network from the one of the users' computers according to the individualized rule set.

57. The method of claim 56, further including the step of controlling a plurality of data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

58. The method of claim 56, further including the step of blocking the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

59. The method of claim 56, further including the step of allowing the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

60. The method of claim 56, further including the step of redirecting the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

61. The method of claim 56, further including the step of redirecting the data from the users' computers to multiple destinations a function of the individualized rule set.

62. The method of claim 56, further including the step of creating database entries for a plurality of the plurality of users' IDs, the plurality of users' ID further being correlated with a common individualized rule set.

63. The method of claim 56, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP (Internet Protocol) service.

64. The method of claim 56, wherein the individualized rule set includes an initial temporary rule set and a standard rule set, and wherein the redirection server is configured to utilize the temporary rule set for an initial period of time and to thereafter utilize the standard rule set.

65. The method of claim 56, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a request type and a destination address.

66. The method of claim 56, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule redirecting the data to a new destination address based on a request type and an attempted destination address.

67. The method of claim 56, wherein the redirection server is configured to redirect data from the users' computers by replacing a first destination address in an IP (Internet Protocol) packet header by a second destination address as a function of the individualized rule set.

68. A system comprising:

a redirection server connected between a user computer and a public network, the redirection server programmed with a users' rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address; and

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses.

69. The system of claim 68, wherein the redirection server is configured to allow modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of time.

70. The system of claim 68, wherein the redirection server is configured to allow modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of the data transmitted to or from the user.

71. The system of claim 68, wherein the redirection server is configured to allow modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of the location or locations the user accesses.

72. The system of claim 68, wherein the redirection server is configured to allow the removal or reinstatement of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of time.

73. The system of claim 68, wherein the redirection server is configured to allow the removal or reinstatement of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of the data transmitted to or from the user.

74. The system of claim 68, wherein the redirection server is configured to allow the removal or reinstatement of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of the location or locations the user accesses.

75. The system of claim 68, wherein the redirection server is configured to allow the removal or reinstatement of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location or locations the user accesses.

76. The system of claim 68, wherein the redirection server has a user side that is connected to a computer using the temporarily assigned network address and a network side connected to a computer network and wherein the computer using the temporarily assigned network address is connected to the computer network through the redirection server.

77. The system of claim 68 wherein instructions to the redirection server to modify the rule set are received by one or more of the user side of the redirection server and the network side of the redirection server.

78. The system of claim 68, wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP (Internet Protocol) service.

79. The system of claim 68, wherein the modified rule set includes an initial temporary rule set and a standard rule set, and wherein the redirection server is configured to utilize the temporary rule set for an initial period of time and to thereafter utilize the standard rule set.

80. The system of claim 68, wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a request type and a destination address.

81. The system of claim 68, wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule redirecting the data to a new destination address based on a request type and an attempted destination address.

82. The system of claim 68, wherein the redirection server is configured to redirect data from the users' computers by replacing a first destination address in an IP (Internet Protocol) packet header by a second destination address as a function of the modified rule set.

83. In a system comprising a redirection server connected between a user computer and a public network, the redirection server containing a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address wherein the user's rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network; a method comprising the step of:

modifying at least a portion of the user's rule set while the user's rule set remains correlated to the temporarily assigned network address in the redirection server; and

wherein the redirection server has a user side that is connected to a computer using the temporarily assigned network address and a network address and a network side connected to a computer network; and

wherein the computer using the temporarily assigned network address is connected to the computer network through the redirection server and the method further includes the step of receiving instructions by the redirection server to modify at least a portion of the user's rule set through one or more of the user side of the redirection server and the network side of the redirection server.

84. The method of claim 83, further including the step of modifying at least a portion of the user's rule set as a function of one or more of time, data transmitted to or from the user, and location or locations the user accesses.

85. The method of claim 83, further including the step of removing or reinstating at least a portion of the user's rule set as a function of one or more of time, the data transmitted to or from the user and a location or locations the user accesses.

86. The method of claim 83, wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP (Internet Protocol) service.

87. The method of claim 83, wherein the modified rule set includes an initial temporary rule set and a standard rule set, and wherein the redirection server is configured to utilize the temporary rule set for an initial period of time and to thereafter utilize the standard rule set.

88. The method of claim 83, wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a request type and a destination address.

89. The method of claim 83, wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule redirecting the data to a new destination address based on a request type and an attempted destination address.

90. The method of claim 83, wherein the redirection server is configured to redirect data from the users' computers by replacing a first destination address in an IP (Internet Protocol) packet header by a second destination address as a function of the individualized rule set.

Certificate of Service

It is hereby certified that the attached Cover Letter for Supplemental Patent Owner's Rebuttal Brief and Marked-Up Pages 4 and 13, Supplemental Patent Owner's Rebuttal Brief Under 37 CFR §41.71 (including a Claims Appendix), and a copy of this Certificate of Service **are being served on April 22, 2014 by first class mail** on third party requesters at third party requesters' addresses of record:

David L. McCombs
Haynes & Boone, LLP
2323 Victory Avenue, Suite 700
Dallas, TX 75219

[for *inter partes* Proceeding No. 95/002,035]

James J. Wong
2108 Gossamer Ave.
Redwood City, CA 94065

[for *ex parte* Proceeding No. 90/012,342]

 /Abe Hershkovitz/
Abraham Hershkovitz

Electronic Acknowledgement Receipt

EFS ID:	18826422
Application Number:	95002035
International Application Number:	
Confirmation Number:	1745
Title of Invention:	USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM
First Named Inventor/Applicant Name:	6779118
Customer Number:	40401
Filer:	Abraham Hershkovitz
Filer Authorized By:	
Attorney Docket Number:	RI1341006F
Receipt Date:	22-APR-2014
Filing Date:	12-SEP-2012
Time Stamp:	21:44:12
Application Type:	inter partes reexam

Payment information:

Submitted with Payment	no
------------------------	----

File Listing:

Document Number	Document Description	File Name	File Size(Bytes)/ Message Digest	Multi Part /.zip	Pages (if appl.)
1	Trans Letter filing of a response in a reexam	RI1341006F-A11_Transmittal-of-Suppl-Rbttl-Brf.pdf	160274 <small>191cd519c6e79b9d519dcf287d041b792da4da36</small>	no	1

Warnings:

Information:

2	Rebuttal Brief - Owner	RI1341006F- R1341006D_Cover-Letter-for- Suppl-Rebuttal-Brief.pdf	120111 6890e370e54c4d6e1e89fd80e599871401c 6f6d0	no	2
Warnings:					
Information:					
3	Rebuttal Brief - Owner	RI1341006F-R1341006D_Suppl- Rebuttal-Brief_MarkedUp- Page-4.pdf	128261 b2faa06b17631155ecb086bf842e273e3e9 dba4f	no	1
Warnings:					
Information:					
4	Rebuttal Brief - Owner	RI1341006F-R1341006D_Suppl- Rebuttal-Brief_MarkedUp- Page-13.pdf	134799 0eb14c133bfe8746d807543498b6024be0 78caf	no	1
Warnings:					
Information:					
5		RI1341006F- R1341006D_Supplemental- Rebuttal-Brief.pdf	338580 d127515990cea7a5d1c0f2877e834dc06b9 a7197	yes	34
	Multipart Description/PDF files in .zip description				
	Document Description		Start	End	
	Rebuttal Brief - Owner		1	33	
	Reexam Certificate of Service		34	34	
Warnings:					
Information:					
Total Files Size (in bytes):			882025		
<p>This Acknowledgement Receipt evidences receipt on the noted date by the USPTO of the indicated documents, characterized by the applicant, and including page counts, where applicable. It serves as evidence of receipt similar to a Post Card, as described in MPEP 503.</p> <p><u>New Applications Under 35 U.S.C. 111</u> If a new application is being filed and the application includes the necessary components for a filing date (see 37 CFR 1.53(b)-(d) and MPEP 506), a Filing Receipt (37 CFR 1.54) will be issued in due course and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the filing date of the application.</p> <p><u>National Stage of an International Application under 35 U.S.C. 371</u> If a timely submission to enter the national stage of an international application is compliant with the conditions of 35 U.S.C. 371 and other applicable requirements a Form PCT/DO/EO/903 indicating acceptance of the application as a national stage submission under 35 U.S.C. 371 will be issued in addition to the Filing Receipt, in due course.</p> <p><u>New International Application Filed with the USPTO as a Receiving Office</u> If a new international application is being filed and the international application includes the necessary components for an international filing date (see PCT Article 11 and MPEP 1810), a Notification of the International Application Number and of the International Filing Date (Form PCT/RO/105) will be issued in due course, subject to prescriptions concerning national security, and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the international filing date of the application.</p>					



HERSHKOVITZ & ASSOCIATES, PLLC

PATENT AGENCY

2845 DUKE STREET, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

TEL. 703-370-4800 ~ FACSIMILE 703-370-4809

patent@hershkovitz.net ~ www.hershkovitz.net

Inventor: Koichiro Ikudome et al.

Art Unit: 3992

Reexamination Proceeding: 95/002,035 (MAIN)
(based on U.S. Patent No. 6,779,118)

Confirmation No.: 1745

Reexamination Filed: September 12, 2012

Examiner: Jalatee Worjloh

For: USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM

Mail Stop "inter partes Reexam"
Attn.: Central Reexamination Unit
Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 23313-1450

Honorable Commissioner:

Transmitted herewith are PATENT OWNER'S REBUTTAL BRIEF UNDER 37 CFR §41.71 AND CLAIMS APPENDIX, and a Certificate of Service in the above-captioned Proceeding.

The fee has been calculated as shown below:

Claims After Amendment	No. of Claims Previously Paid	Present Extra	Small Entity		Large Entity	
			Rate	Fee	Rate	Fee
*Total Claims:			x 30=	\$	x 60=	\$
**Indep. Claims:			x125=	\$	x250=	\$
Extension Fee for _____ Months				\$		\$
Other: Rebuttal Brief				\$		\$2,000.00
Total:				\$	Total:	\$2,000.00

Fee Payment made through EFS.

Payment is made herewith by Credit Card (see attached Form PTO-2038).

The Director is hereby authorized to charge all fees, including those under 37 CFR §§1.16 and 1.17, which are required for entry of the papers submitted herewith, and any fees which may be required to maintain pendency of this Proceeding, to Deposit Account No. 50-2929.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge all fees under 37 CFR § 1.18 which may be required to complete issuance of this application to Deposit Account No. 50-2929.

Respectfully submitted,
Koichiro Ikudome et al.

Date: April 7, 2014

/Abe Hershkovitz/
Abraham Hershkovitz
Registration No. 45,294

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor: Koichiro Ikudome

Art Unit 3992

Merged Reexam Proceeding No. 95/002,035 (Main)
and Reexam Proceeding No. 90/012,342
(Based on US 6,779,118 C1)

Conf. No. 1745
Conf. No. 5786

Examiner Jalatee Worjloh

Filed: September 12, 2012 (Main) and June 8, 2012

For: USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM

PATENT OWNER'S REBUTTAL BRIEF UNDER 37 CFR §41.71

Mail Stop "*inter partes* Reexam"
Attn.: Central Reexamination Unit
Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 23313-1450

Honorable Commissioner:

As Appellant, Patent Owner respectfully submits this Rebuttal Brief under 37 CFR §41.71 responsive to the Examiner's Answer mailed on March 6, 2014 in the above-identified merged *inter partes/ex parte* Reexamination Proceedings ("the present Proceedings") for underlying US Patent No. 6,779,118 ("the '118 Patent"), and to Respondent's Brief filed on January 8, 2014 by third party requester ("Requester").

The fee for Patent Owner's Rebuttal Brief is being submitted concurrently through EFS-Web. However, the Office is authorized to charge any fee in connection herewith or any fees necessary to preserve the pendency of these Proceedings, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-2929, referencing Docket No. RI1341006F.

As required by 37 C.F.R. §1.943(c), Patent Owner's Rebuttal Brief is 15 pages or fewer, excluding the Claims Appendix that is presented herewith for the convenience of the Board.

(A) Requester's Respondent Brief

Due to page limitations in this Rebuttal Brief, Patent Owner will only address the first ones of the unsupported or inaccurate remarks in the Respondent Brief filed by Requester on January 8, 2014, since the Respondent Brief is substantially reiteration of the Examiner's remarks from the Right of Appeal Notice ("RAN") and attorney comments regarding those Examiner's remarks, neither of which impact the irrefutable and factual evidence of the validity and patentability of the claims of the '118 Patent.

Specifically, on page 1 (and with reference to footnote number 1 on page 2), Requester has made the completely erroneous statement that Patent Owner "concedes the invalidity of claims 2-7, 9-14, 28-35, and 44-67, which were rejected as obvious over US 5,848,233 to Radia in view of the Admitted Prior Art and further in view of US 6,154,775 to Coss." Patent Owner categorically rebuts this statement, and any and all other such inaccurate remarks. Patent Owner has not conceded and does not concede the validity or patentability of any claim proposed, pending, issued or cancelled in either the original patent, a previous Proceeding or the present Proceedings. The reality is that what is factually taught in the prior art, and the *lack* of teaching therein, is incontrovertible proof that the claimed invention defines over all art cited and applied, alone or in any reasonable combination.

Further, Requester asserts in footnote 2 on page 5 of the Respondent Brief that:

Requester also proposed rejecting claims 26-27 and 36-43 as obvious over Radia in view of Wong'727 (*sic.*) and the Admitted Prior Art in the detailed analysis adopted by the Examiner. *See* RAN at 21; Request Ex. BB at 55-102. Their omission from the rejection appears to be a clerical oversight, not the result of a determination on the merits.

However, upon review of the listed rejections of the claims in the RAN on page 20, it is clear that only claims 7, 14, 16-24, 50-56, and 62-90 are identified as being rejected over Radia in view of Wong '727 and further in view of Admitted Prior Art ("APA"), and the same is true in the RAN on page 21, the page cited by Petitioner. Additionally, in the Examiner's Answer, a completely separate paper issued after the RAN, the same proposed rejection (obvious over Radia in view of Wong and further in view of APA) is made for only claims 7, 14, 16-24, 50-56 and 62-90. Nowhere in the RAN or the Examiner's Answer are claims 26, 27 and/or 36-43 of the '118 Patent rejected under that combination of art. Accordingly, it is presumed that such ground of rejection has been withdrawn for those claims.

Since it appears that the Respondent Brief is substantially merely the same previously-presented attorney opinions that has no weight over factual evidence, particularly with regard to the factual evidence of the reduction to practice of the invention disclosed only in the '118 Patent that was presented in the Inventors' Declarations, Patent Owner hereby rebuts all inaccurate or unsupported attorney comments in the Respondent Brief and will not deal further with the contents of the Respondent Brief.

(B) The Examiner's Answer

As the statements and position taken by the Examiner in the RAN appear to be substantially reflected in the Examiner's Answer, Patent Owner directs the specific rebuttal of the Examiner's Answer to the maintained rejections of the novel and unobvious claims in view of the lack of teaching in the prior art and hindsight use of the exclusive disclosure found only in the '118 Patent. Patent Owner also rebuts the lack of proper weight and consideration given to the substantive evidence of reduction to practice furnished by the Inventors' Declarations.

(C) Issues to be Reviewed

As the Examiner's Answer indicates on page 2, every ground of rejection made in the Office Action dated September 9, 2013, from which Appeal is being taken, is maintained. Accordingly, Patent Owner submits that the following issues are being reviewed in this Rebuttal Brief:

1. Whether Willens in combination with RFC2138, Stockwell or "Admitted Prior Art" (APA), alone or in combination, discloses or renders obvious the limitations of: "the redirection server...configured to allow automated modification of...the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address." The rejections under this issue include:

Claims 16-18, 23, 24, 26, 36-43, 68-71, 76-84 and 86-90 as being obvious over Willens in view of RFC2138 and Stockwell; and

Claims 16-18, 23, 24, 26, 36-43, 68-71, 76-84 and 86-90 as being obvious over Willens in view of RFC2138 and APA.

2. Whether Radia in view of Wong '727, Stockwell, Wong '178 or APA, alone or in any reasonable combination, discloses or renders obvious "the redirection server...configured to allow automated modification of...the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network

address.” The Examiner agrees with Patent Owner that as to claims 24, 26, 40-43, and 83-90, instructions are received by the redirection server to modify the rule set. However, the Examiner now maintains the rejection on modified ground. Therefore, the rejections under this issue continue to include:

Claims 16-24, 26-27, 36-43 and 68-90 as being obvious over Radia in view of Wong '727, and further in view of Stockwell; and

Claims 16-24 and 68-90 as being obvious over Radia in view of Wong '727, and further in view of APA.

3. (Withdrawn) The Examiner has withdrawn the rejection of Claims 40-43 as being obvious over He, Zenchelsky, Fortinsky, and APA.

4. Whether Coss is prior art citable against the '118 Patent in view of the Declarations of the Inventors under 37 CFR §1.131.

5. If Coss is properly citable prior art against the '118 Patent, whether Coss in view of APA renders obvious “the redirection server...configured to allow automated modification of...the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address.” The rejections under this issue include:

Claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-43 and 68-90 as being obvious over Coss in view of APA.

(D) Defective Grounds of Rejection Due to Lack of *prima facie* Obviousness

Initially, Patent Owner respectfully points out it has been held that, “...when the prior art teaches away from the claimed solution..., obviousness cannot be proven merely by showing that a known composition could have been modified by routine experimentation or solely on the expectation of success; **it must be shown that those of ordinary skill in the art would have had some apparent reason to modify the known composition in a way that would result in the claimed composition.**” *Ex parte Whallen II*, 2008 Pat. App. LEXIS 25, 21–22; 89 U.S.P.Q.2D 1078 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 2008) (emphasis added).

Not once has the Examiner shown where there is any motivation or any reason whatsoever given anywhere in Willens (**except by the improper hindsight knowledge of the exclusive teaching of the '118 Patent that is being improperly used in all rejections**) to modify Willens to achieve the novel claimed invention of the '118 Patent, particularly with

regard to the inventive steps of configuring the redirection server to allow automatic modification of the rule set during the user's session.

That is, no credible line of reasoning has been given as to why any person having ordinary skill in the art could find the invention claimed in the '118 Patent to be obvious in light of the teachings of the references because the factual contents of the references have not been correctly interpreted. Instead, individual components in the prior art have been alleged to read on the elements of the novel invention disclosed only in the '118 Patent. However, in doing so, it has been made even clearer that the components in the prior art are **not** the same and do **not** function the same way as in the claimed invention.

The explanation as to how the teachings, and the lack of teachings, in the prior art verifies that the rejections of the appealed claims of the '118 Patent are defective is discussed in detail hereinbelow.

(E) Willens

1. Willens Requires That the Filter (Rule Set) Be *Maintained (Not Modified)* After Being Downloaded To the Communications Server 14 – a Teaching That Directly Contradicts the “Modification” Requirement of the '118 Patent Claims

In the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner's argument for rejection of the claims based on Willens is essentially the same as previously given, that is: (1) the Willens' permit list (also referred to as "sitelist") and a filter ("rule set") are the same; and (2) Willens discloses that the permit list can be updated on a daily or hourly basis; and therefore (3) Willens teaches modification of the rule set as claimed in the '118 Patent. The disclosure and requirements of Willens do not support this argument.

The Examiner's argument is erroneous because (a) Willens teaches that the filter alone is downloaded to the communications server (14) and integrated with the client software (44); (b) Willens teaches that the only sites ever stored in cache are *user requested sites*, not sites from the permit list; (c) the Willens' sitelist (permit list), against which a user requested site is compared, is stored and maintained ***exclusively in the remote network access server (18) and is never downloaded to the communications server (14) and is never stored in the cache (50)***; and (d) the comparison between the user requested site and the list of sites included in the sitelist is ***always*** done in the remote network server (18) and ***never*** in the communications server (14).

Accordingly, adding or removing a website from a site list (such as the “PTA List”) in the network access server (18) does not change the filter downloaded and integrated with the user software in the communications server (14). See Willens 5:34-36. Therefore, the PTA List ***cannot*** be a “filter” (rule set), because any modification of the PTA List (sitelist) in the access server (18) does not change the rule set downloaded in the communications server (14). Furthermore, even assuming (*arguendo*) the Examiner’s contention that the sitelist was a rule set, the only modification taught by Willens is done in the network access server (18). The ‘118 Patent claims ***require*** that modification be done to the rule set (whether or not including a sitelist) ***while it is resident in the redirection server*** and acting to process data packets from the user during a user session. As discussed above, the sitelist of Willens is ***never*** resident in the communications server, where the ‘118 Patent claims require that the modification be done to the rule set in the redirection server during a user session. Willens not only does not teach the rule set of the ‘118 Patent that must be downloaded into the redirection server for modification, Willens ***teaches away from*** the novel rule set claimed in the ‘118 Patent because the “rule set” (sitelist) that the Examiner contends is shown by Willens that is downloaded to the communications server is ***never modified while resident in the communications server***, as required by each of the ‘118 Patent claims on appeal.

As to the Willens “filter” in the communications server, the Examiner is still ignoring the explicit teaching of Willens that, once the filter (rule set) is downloaded and integrated with the user software, that filter “...is ***maintained*** in the server 14 for the rest of the user 22’s session.” See Willens, Abstract and 5:25-26. According to www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/, the plain meaning of “maintain” is “to cause [something] to exist or continue *without changing*.” Simply stated, once downloaded into the communications server 14, Willens’ filter (rule set) is ***not modified***. By contrast, the ‘118 Patent claims on appeal each ***require*** that the rule set resident in the redirection server be able to change, i.e., be “modified,” ***during*** a user session.¹

The only support cited by the Examiner that the PTA List (sitelist) is a rule set is Willens 5:5-27:

When user 22 logs in through the communications server 14, the RADIUS client software 45 first determines **if** user 22 is authorized by checking his password through RADIUS server 16, utilizing user profiles 46. The user

¹ A “user session” in the ‘118 Patent is the period during which the rule set resident in the redirection server is correlated with the temporarily assigned network address (TANA) to “control data passing between the user and the public network.” This corresponds to “session” as used in Willens.

profiles 46 also identify a filter "F(Timmy)" in his user profile 46. After checking user 22's authorization, the RADIUS server 16 supplies the filter identification through the RADIUS client 45 software along with the verification acknowledgment for the user 22 for use by client software 44 for controlling access by the user 22 to Internet sites. The client software 44 then checks to see if the filter "F(Timmy)" is stored locally in cache 50. If it is, the client software 44 uses it for controlling access. If not, the client software 44 sends a lookup request to the network access server 18, which stores the centralized permitted sitelist and the filters to be used as masks for checking access classifications of requested sites, to download the filter "F(Timmy)", which is maintained in the server 14 memory for the rest of the user 22's session. (emphasis added)

However, this section of Willens requires just the opposite. The Examiner's summary of this section contends that the user profile identifies a *filter* named "F(Timmy)"; the client software searches for that *filter* "F(Timmy)", first in local cache and next in the remote access server (18); and then downloads the *filter* "F(Timmy)" to the communications server (14). Patent Owner agrees with this summary as far as it goes. However, omitted from the Examiner's summary is the fact that the *filter* "F(Timmy)" is the *only* thing downloaded to the server 14. Further omitted is the unambiguous requirement of Willens that the filter be *maintained in the communications server "for the rest of the user 22's session."* Accordingly, the version of the filter "F(Timmy)" that is downloaded into the communications server 14 is not modified in the communications server 14.

If the sitelist (the "PTA list" being one example), was an actual rule set used to grant or deny access as contended by the Examiner, then the PTA list would necessarily have been downloaded to the server (14) associated with the user, since that is where the claims of the '118 Patent require that modification to the rule set be done. **Willens teaches the opposite.** Indeed, a key feature of Willens was to provide "for a central, server based permit list..." (Willens 4:40-43). In short, *Willens teaches that the sitelists are exclusively maintained at the centralized network access server (18)* so that they are available to multiple users 22, 32, 34, and 36 (Willens 5:27-31).

The Examiner seems also to infer that the sitelists are stored in cache. However, the only sites stored in cache are sites *requested by the user*. See Willens 5:27-31. This again confirms the teaching of Willens that the sitelists are *exclusively stored on the central network access server (18)* so as to be available to multiple users, and so again, **teaches away** from the rule set claimed in the '118 Patent.

The position of the Examiner is further undercut because Willens discloses that the site requested by a user and the sitelist are compared by the network access server 18, *not* the communications server where a version of the filter is downloaded.

...the server 14 sends a filter lookup request to server 18. This lookup [request] contains the list name "PTA list" and the site Timmy [the requestor] is trying to access

(www.playboy.com). *The server 18 searches list 52* ["PTA List"] and sends back the result. Based on the result, the *server 14 either permits or denies access* and updates its local cache [with the requested site]. Willens 6:1-7. (emphasis added)

Therefore, it is the server 18 that does the comparison of the *requested* site from the communications server 14 with the set of websites stored under the name "PTA List" *in the server 18*. The "result" sent to the server 14 is *not* a sitelist or website, but simply information that the requested site is either present or not present in the server 18 sitelist. That "result" is used by server 14 to either allow or disallow access (the rule's function). **Willens does not teach or disclose the communication of any website or sitelist from the server 18 to the communications server 14.**

For each of the above reasons, the Willens' sitemlists and filters (rule set) are distinct elements, and the PTA List cannot be a rule set as posited by the Examiner². As such, the filter downloaded in the communications server is not modified as required by the '118 claims on appeal, and updating of the sitelist is done exclusively in the network server 18, not in the communications server 14 as required by the '118 Patent.

2. Modification of the Rule Set

The Examiner argues that Willens does teach that the redirection server is configured to allow modification of the rule set because the filters of Willens define rules and the "PTA List" is a "rule." For the reasons discussed above, the Examiner's position is completely contrary to the teaching and requirements of Willens, and the rejections on that ground should therefore be reversed.

The Examiner also conjectures regarding the disclosure of Willens 5:9 and 18-26 as follows: "In Willens, while a user is logged in, the client software can send a lookup request to the network access server to download filters." However, the actual quote in context is as follows:

When user 22 logs in ... Willens 5:9

...

The client software 44 then checks to see if the *filter "F(Timmy)"* is stored locally in cache 50. If it is, the client software 44 uses it [the filter "F(Timmy)"] for controlling access. If not, **the client software 44 sends a lookup request to the network access server 18, which stores the centralized permitted site list** and the filters to be used as masks for checking access classifications of requested sites, **to download the *filter "F(Timmy)"***, which is maintained in the server 14 memory for the rest of the user 22's session. Willens 5:18-26

...

² The Examiner's citation of the '118 Patent specification as justification for defining the Willens sitelist as a filter is a classic example of improper hindsight reconstruction. This is particularly true *since Willens teaches just the opposite* – that the filter and sitelist are separate and distinct. Even if the '118 Patent taught that its rule set included the identity of one or more allowed or disallowed websites, that teaching cannot be used to conflate Willens filter and sitelist *where Willens explicitly teaches just the opposite.*

The server [18] software also automatically maintains the permit list by downloading updated versions of the list over the internet and compiling the list for use by the client software 42. Willens 5:40-44 (emphasis added)

First, to insure accuracy, the words used by Willens are “when a user logs in”, and not “while a user is logged in,” the former describing the initial log in and the latter describing user actions during a user session.

Secondly, the Examiner summarizes this section from Willens as support for the proposition that the communications server (14) receives “updated versions of the list” and therefore the communications server (14) allows modification of the rule set. However, as discussed in detail above, nothing in Willens discloses or suggests that a sitelist is ever communicated from the network server (18) to the communications server (14). In fact, **Willens teaches just the opposite**. Specifically, Willens teaches that it is the network server (18) that compares the user requested site against the sitelist eliminating any need to communicate a sitelist to each individual communications server (14). Indeed, the only information returned is the “result” of the comparison done by the network server (18) – that a comparison was found or not found. Willens does the comparison at a central site rather than a number of separate communications server sites to avoid having to send large lists of websites to the individual communications servers to do the comparison. See Willens 4:40-45.

For the above reasons, the Willens’ communications server (14) does not “allow modification of the rule set” in the communications server (14). The rejection of the claims based on Willens is therefore erroneous and must be withdrawn.

(F) Stockwell

Non-Obviousness Over Willens In View Of Stockwell

The Examiner continues to maintain this obviousness rejection on several grounds.

First, the Examiner still posits that Willens teaches modification of the rule set downloaded in the communications server. However, it is unmistakable that, for the reasons discussed above, the version of the rule set (filter) downloaded into the communications server 14 is maintained for the duration of the user session, and is not modified during a user session by

the communications server 14 as required by the '118 Patent claims on appeal. The Examiner's obviousness rejection is again therefore incorrect and must therefore be withdrawn.

Secondly, the Examiner interposes for the first time a new ground of rejection based on Stockwell, namely that Stockwell teaches cache entries and their expiration, "thereby ensuring that automatic updates received by the Choice Net server 18 will propagate down to the communications server 14 in a timely fashion." However, as described above, Willens teaches that all comparisons of the sitelist against a user requested site are done *by the server 18*. Only prior *user requested sites* are stored in cache. The sitelists from the server (18) are never communicated to the communications server 14, and there is no teaching, no suggestion for modification, and indeed no need in Willens to "propagate" those sitelists from the server (18) to the communications server (14). The Examiner's rejection on this ground is also erroneous and must be withdrawn.

(G) Radia.

1. The Examiner's Position That the '118 Claims Do Not Limit Modification to the Redirection Server is Erroneous

Apparatus claims 16-23, 36-39 and 68-82 each include the limitations:

"redirection server programmed with a user's rule set" and "wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automatic modification of a least a portion of the rule set as a function of [a defined parameter]."

Apparatus claim 24 includes the additional limitation:

"wherein instructions to the redirection server to modify the rule set are received by ... the redirection server."

Method claims 26, 40-43 and 83-90 include the following language:

"the redirection server containing a user's rule set" and "receiving instructions by the redirection server to modify at least a portion of the user's rule set...."

Additionally, all of the above claims require that the rule set programmed in the redirection server include functionality to *"control data passing between the user and a public network."*

Patent Owner's position is that the above claim language requires that the modification of the rule set be done in the redirection server, and that it is only the redirection server that actually makes any modification to be done to the rule set, whether in response to extrinsic instructions or not, as discussed in Patent Owner's Appellant Brief filed in this Proceeding, which is incorporated herein by reference.

The Examiner takes a contrary position that the above language "does not limit the modification to the redirection server," arguing that the embodiment in the '118 Patent at 8:3-11 "permits an outsider server to make modification to the rule set," and reciting from *Yamamoto* that, during Reexamination,

claims are given their broadest possible interpretation consistent with the specification. The Examiner then argues that the ANCS server is an outsider server that makes modification to the rule set programmed in the router.

Again, the Examiner's analysis is erroneous for several reasons.

First, as discussed more fully in Patent Owner's Appellant Brief, the Examiner's interpretation of the embodiment in the '118 Patent at 8:3-11 is erroneous. As unambiguously recited in the '118 Patent 8:3-4, a website sends an "authorization," but the *action* of "deleting" of the redirection from the rule set in response to that authorization is done *by the redirection server, not by the website sending the authorization*. Furthermore, if the authorization to delete was sufficient without involving the redirection server to actually do the deleting, then sending the authorization to the redirection server would be superfluous and unnecessary. Also, the '118 Patent claims unambiguously require that rule set be the one programmed (contained) in the redirection server. As such, changing the rule set without involving the redirection server is *impossible*. Radia does not disclose, and the Examiner does not explain, how the ANCS server or any other outside website could change the rule set programmed in the redirection server as required by the '118 Patent claims without necessarily involving the redirection server itself³. The Examiner's interpretation is therefore not supported by this or any other embodiment in the '118 Patent.

Second, the '118 Patent claims require that the rule set being modified be the rule set resident ("programmed" or "contained") in the redirection server, which is therefore an integral part of the redirection server. The ANCS of Radia creates a rule set and then downloads that rule set into a router. However, Radia does not teach or suggest any modification to a rule set already downloaded (configured) in the router while that rule set is being used to process data packets between the user and the internet.

Third, whether the "*redirection server is configured to allow automatic modification*" or "*instructions to the redirection server to modify the rule set are received by...the redirection server,*" the claims of the '118 Patent require that the redirection server control the modification process. This is consistent with the specification which states at '118 Patent 4:52-53, "the redirection server performs *all* the central tasks of the system" (emphasis added).

Finally, interpreting the claims broadly enough to enable the rule set to be modified directly by an external website, as imagined by the Examiner, would effectively read the "redirection server configured to allow" limitation out of the claims by permitting the rule set to be modified with or without control by the redirection server. While Patent Owner understands that claims should be given their broadest *reasonable* interpretation during Reexamination, an interpretation that effectively reads the "redirection

³ The sentence in the '118 Patent at 8:6-10 states that "modifications" other than redirection are possible in the prior example, but regardless of the type, this example is still based on the fact that it is the redirection server that does the "modifying."

server configured to allow,” or any other functional limitation, out of the claims is *not* reasonable. In *Randall May Int’l Inc. v Deg Music Prods., Inc.*, 378 Fed. App’x. 989, 994 (Fed. Cir. 2010), the Court held that it was legal error to interpret a claim in such a way that a limitation was read out of the claim “because all the limitations in a claim must be considered meaningful.” The Supreme Court applied this construction principle in *Warner Jenkinson Co. v. Hilton Davis Chemical*, 520 U.S. 17 (1997), stating that “[i]t is important to ensure that the application of the doctrine [of equivalents], even as to an individual element, is not allowed such broad play as to effectively eliminate that element in its entirety.” *Id* at 29.

The Examiner’s interpretation is defective, since under the Examiner’s interpretation, the limitation “the redirection server is configured to allow,” for example in Claim 16, or the limitation “receiving instructions by the redirection server to modify...the user’s rule set...,” would be rendered meaningless surplusage since the claim would cover modification whether or not the redirection server was a participant.

For each of the above reasons, in addition to those presented in Patent Owner’s Appellant Brief, the Examiner’s expansive interpretation must be reversed.

2. Radia Itself Precludes an Interpretation That the Router and ANCS Can Be Combined to Defined the Claimed Redirection Server

The Examiner also contends that, even if the claims required modification by the redirection server, Radia’s ANCS (112) and router (106) can be combined and, as combined, teach the redirection server required by the ‘118 Patent claims. The ‘118 Patent claims all require that the rule set programmed in the redirection server include functionality to “*control data passing between the user and a public network.*” The ANCS does not receive data packets, does not process data packets and therefore cannot “control data passing between the user and the public network.” In Radia, the router is disclosed and described as performing this function. Furthermore, while Radia expressly teaches that the router (redirection server) can be a combination of one or more components, each of those components ***must “forward packets originating at the client system.”*** Radia at 7:2-5. The ANCS does not “forward packets originating at the client system,” and indeed, does not process packets at all. The ANCS therefore does not meet the express requirement imposed by Radia itself for combining components to process data packets, as is required of the redirection server in the ‘118 Patent. For the above reasons, as well as for the reasons stated in Patent Owner’s Appellant Brief, the ANCS and router cannot therefore be combined. Indeed, ***Radia expressly teaches just the opposite.*** The Examiner’s rejection on this ground must therefore be withdrawn.

3. Combining Radia And Stockwell

Radia does not teach or suggest modifying the rule set (used to process data packets from the user) by the router while the rule set is configured in the router. Stockwell likewise does teach or disclose modifying a rule set (used to process data packets from the user) by the router while the rule set is configured in the router. Combining Radia and Stockwell does not make obvious a requirement of the claims absent from both references but required by the '118 Patent claim language, such as in claim 16, that recites "*a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set ... to control data passing between the user and a public network...wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of...the rule set....*"

For each of the above reasons, the rejections based on a combination of Radia and Stockwell must be withdrawn.

H. Coss

1. The Examiner's Finding of Insufficiency of the Evidence in the Inventors' Declarations is Erroneously Based on Authority Applicable Only to Interference Proceedings

Patent Owner has submitted two Declarations, including receipts showing the purchase of supplies and a Report dated August 14, 1997, to demonstrate *actual* reduction to practice before the effective date of the Coss reference. This evidence was submitted to establish invention (reduction to practice) of the '118 Patent prior to the effective date of the Coss reference, not to support a count in interference.

The Examiner has rejected the sufficiency of this factual evidence first on the grounds that the Declarations fail to prove "diligence." However, again the Examiner errs because in this case, evidence of diligence is not required since the evidence of *actual* reduction to practice was dated August 14, 1997, *before the effective date of the reference*. Under 37 CFR §1.131(b), where the evidence of reduction to practice occurs before the critical date, evidence of "diligence" is *irrelevant*. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection based on the sufficiency of the evidence to show diligence is therefore without legal merit or foundation, and must be reversed.

The Examiner has also rejected the sufficiency of the evidence to establish a reduction to practice in the US. However, Exhibit B shows that all of the components purchased to implement the invention were purchased in the United States of America (See Exhibit A to the Inventor Declarations under 37 CFR §1.131). Furthermore, the location of employment for both Inventors was Pasadena, California (Yeung Declaration, paragraph 4; Ikudome Declaration, paragraphs 5-8; and Exhibit B). This evidence is sufficient to show both conception and reduction to practice in Pasadena, California within the United States. By contrast, the Examiner has neither cited evidence nor presented any evidence-based inference

that would suggest reductions to practice other than in the United States. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection based on the sufficiency of the evidence to show reduction to practice in the U.S. is without foundation and must therefore also be reversed.

Finally, the Examiner has rejected the sufficiency of the evidence to show actual reduction, stating that "to establish actual reduction to practice, a showing of the invention in a physical or tangible form that shows every element of the *count*" (emphasis added) is required, citing *Wetmore v. Quick*, 536 F.2d 937, 942 (CCPA 1976) and MPEP 2138.05. However, again, these citations apply only to determine priority of invention in *interference* proceedings and *are not applicable to swearing behind a reference to remove that reference as prior art pursuant to 37 CFR §1.131*. To swear behind a reference, a "declaration under 37 CFR 1.131 is required to show no more than what the reference shows. *In re Stryker*, 435 F.2d. 1340 (CCPA 1971)... If the [declaration] contains facts showing a completion of the invention commensurate with the extent of the invention as claimed is shown in the reference or activity, the ...declaration is sufficient, whether or not it is a showing of the identical disclosure of the reference or the identical subject matter involved in the activity." MPEP §715.02. The Declaration is sufficient if it establishes possession of the basic invention. *In re Spiller*, 500 F.2d 1170 (CCPA 1974), MPEP 715.02.

Accordingly, the Examiner, in applying the interference standard, erred. The Declarations to swear behind a reference do not need to show "a physical or tangible form that shows every element of the count." Indeed, there is no "count" against which this standard can even be measured when the purpose of the Declaration is to remove a reference as prior art rather than show priority of invention.

Under the proper standard, the Inventor Declarations submitted by Patent Owner are sufficient to show that the Inventors possessed the invention as of August 14, 1997, before the September 12, 1997 effective filing date of Coss. Exhibit B appended to the Declarations shows that the Inventors, prior to the effective date of Coss, actually demonstrated dynamic rules. See, *e.g.*, Exhibit B, page 6, Step 4, where, during a user session, the redirection rule was removed, dynamically changing the rules. This was the feature for which Coss was cited ("Coss teaches dynamic rules which are included with the access rules as a need arises⁴"). Accordingly, the Inventor Declarations as submitted are sufficient to remove Coss as a reference, and all rejections based on Coss must therefore be reversed.

⁴ By this recitation, Patent Owner does not concede that Coss is invalidating prior art under §103, but merely that the Inventor Declarations and their Exhibits show dynamic rule changing, the reason the Examiner cites Coss.

2. Coss Combined With APA Does Not Teach or Suggest the Invention

Even if Coss were arguably proper prior art (which it is not), there is nothing in Coss to suggest the modification proposed by the Examiner, alone or in combination with the APA as more fully discussed in Patent Owner's Appellant Brief.

Conclusion

For the above reasons, Appellant (Patent Owner) respectfully requests reversal of all of the Examiner's rejections of the claims on appeal.

Appellant also respectfully requests reversal of the Examiner's improper handling of the Inventor Declarations Under 37 CFR §1.131, and withdrawal of Coss as prior art.

Appellant further respectfully requests remand to the Examiner for issuance of a Notice of Intent to Issue a Reexamination Certificate of all the claims on appeal.

Evidence of service of this Rebuttal Brief on third party requesters is attached hereto.

Please direct any questions to the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC

/Abe Hershkovitz/

Abraham Hershkovitz
Reg. No. 45,294

Stephen Marcus
Reg. No. 64,075

Attachments:
Claims Appendix (For the Convenience of the Board)
Certificate of Service

Date: April 7, 2014

HERSHKOVITZ & ASSOCIATES, PLLC
2845 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
TEL: (703) 370-4800
FAX: (703) 370-4809
E-MAIL: patent@hershkovitz.net

Claims Appendix*1. (Cancelled in Reexamination Certificate) (Reproduced for the Convenience of the Board)*

A system comprising:

a database with entries correlating each of a plurality of user IDs with an individualized rule set;

a dial-up network server that receives user IDs from users' computers;

a redirection server connected to the dial-up network server and a public network, and an authentication accounting server connected to the database, the dial-up network server and the redirection server;

wherein the dial-up network server communicates a first user ID for one of the users' computers and a temporarily assigned network address for the first user ID to the authentication accounting server;

wherein the authentication accounting server accesses the database and communicates the individualized rule set that correlates with the first user ID and the temporarily assigned network address to the redirection server; and

wherein data directed toward the public network from the one of the users' computers are processed by the redirection server according to the individualized rule set.

2. The system of claim 1, wherein the redirection server further provides control over a plurality of data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

3. The system of claim 1, wherein the redirection server further blocks the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

4. The system of claim 1, wherein the redirection server further allows the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

5. The system of claim 1, wherein the redirection server further redirects the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

6. The system of claim 1, wherein the redirection server further redirects the data from the users' computers to multiple destinations as a function of the individualized rule set.
7. The system of claim 1, wherein the database entries for a plurality of the plurality of users' IDs are correlated with a common individualized rule set.
8. *(Cancelled from Reexamination Certificate)(Reproduced for the Convenience of the Board)*
In a system comprising a database with entries correlating each of a plurality of user IDs with an individualized rule set; a dial-up network server that receives user IDs from users' computers; a redirection server connected to the dial-up network server and a public network, and an authentication accounting server connected to the database, the dial-up network server and the redirection server, the method comprising the steps of:
- communicating a first user ID for one of the users' computers and a temporarily assigned network address for the first user ID from the dial-up network server to the authentication accounting server;
 - communicating the individualized rule set that correlates with the first user ID and the temporarily assigned network address to the redirection server from the authentication accounting server;
 - and processing data directed toward the public network from the one of the users' computers according to the individualized rule set.
9. The method of claim 8, further including the step of controlling a plurality of data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.
10. The method of claim 8, further including the step of blocking the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.
11. The method of claim 8, further including the step of allowing the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

12. The method of claim 8, further including the step of redirecting the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

13. The method of claim 8, further including the step of redirecting the data from the users' computers to multiple destinations a function of the individualized rule set.

14. The method of claim 8, further including the step of creating database entries for a plurality of the plurality of users' IDs, the plurality of users' ID further being correlated with a common individualized rule set.

15. *(Cancelled from Reexamination Certificate) (Reproduced for the Convenience of the Board)*

A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address; wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address; and

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses.

16. A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of time.

17. A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of the data transmitted to or from the user.

18. A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of the location or locations the user accesses.

19. A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow the removal or reinstatement of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of time.

20. A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow the removal or reinstatement of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of the data transmitted to or from the user.

21. A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow the removal or reinstatement of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of the location or locations the user accesses.

22. A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow the removal or reinstatement of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location or locations the user accesses.

23. A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the redirection server has a user side that is connected to a computer using the temporarily assigned network address and a network side connected to a computer network and wherein the computer using the temporarily assigned network address is connected to the computer network through the redirection server.

24. The system of claim 23 wherein instructions to the redirection server to modify the rule set are received by one or more of the user side of the redirection server and the network side of the redirection server.

25. *(Cancelled from Reexamination Certificate) (Reproduced for the Convenience of the Board)*

In a system comprising a redirection server containing a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address wherein the user's rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network; the method comprising the step of:

modifying at least a portion of the user's rule set while the user's rule set remains correlated to the temporarily assigned network address in the redirection server; and

wherein the redirection server has a user side that is connected to a computer using the temporarily assigned network address and a network address and a network side connected to a computer network and

wherein the computer using the temporarily assigned network address is connected to the computer network through the redirection server and the method further includes the step of receiving instructions by the redirection server to modify at least a portion of the user's rule set through one or more of the user side of the redirection server and the network side of the redirection server.

26. The method of claim 25, further including the step of modifying at least a portion of the user's rule set as a function of one or more of: time, data transmitted to or from the user, and location or locations the user accesses.

27. The method of claim 25, further including the step of removing or reinstating at least a portion of the user's rule set as a function of one or more of: time, the data transmitted to or from the user and a location or locations the user accesses.

28. The system of claim 1, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP (Internet Protocol) service.

29. The system of claim 1, wherein the individualized rule set includes an initial temporary rule set and a standard rule set, and wherein the redirection server is configured to utilize the temporary rule set for an initial period of time and to thereafter utilize the standard rule set.

30. The system of claim 1, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a request type and a destination address.

31. The system of claim 1, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule redirecting the data to a new destination address based on a request type and an attempted destination address.

32. The method of claim 8, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP (Internet Protocol) service.

33. The method of claim 8, wherein the individualized rule set includes an initial temporary rule set and a standard rule set, and wherein the redirection server is configured to utilize the temporary rule set for an initial period of time and to thereafter utilize the standard rule set.

34. The method of claim 8, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a request type and a destination address.

35. The method of claim 8, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule redirecting the data to a new 20 destination address based on a request type and an attempted destination address.

36. A system comprising:

- a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

- wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

- wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

- wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

- wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP (Internet Protocol) service.

37. A system comprising:

- a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

- wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

- wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

- wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the modified rule set includes an initial temporary rule set and a standard rule set, and wherein the redirection server is configured to utilize the temporary rule set for an initial period of time and to thereafter utilize the standard rule set.

38. A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a request type and a destination address.

39. A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule redirecting the data to a new destination address based on a request type and an attempted destination address.

40. The method of claim 25, wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP (Internet Protocol) service.

41. The method of claim 25, wherein the modified rule set includes an initial temporary rule set and a standard rule set, and wherein the redirection server is configured to utilize the temporary rule set for an initial period of time and to thereafter utilize the standard rule set.

42. The method of claim 25, wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a request type and a destination address.

43. The method of claim 25, wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule redirecting the data to a new destination address based on a request type and an attempted destination address.

44. A system comprising:

- a database with entries correlating each of a plurality of user IDs with an individualized rule set;

- a dial-up network server that receives user IDs from users' computers;

- a redirection server connected between the dial-up network server and a public network,

and

an authentication accounting server connected to the database, the dial-up network server and the redirection server;

- wherein the dial-up network server communicates a first user ID for one of the users' computers and a temporarily assigned network address for the first user ID to the authentication accounting server;

- wherein the authentication accounting server accesses the database and communicates the individualized rule set that correlates with the first user ID and the temporarily assigned network address to the redirection server; and

- wherein data directed toward the public network from the one of the users' computers are processed by the redirection server according to the individualized rule set.

45. The system of claim 44, wherein the redirection server further provides control over a plurality of data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

46. The system of claim 44, wherein the redirection server further blocks the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

47. The system of claim 44, wherein the redirection server further allows the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

48. The system of claim 44, wherein the redirection server further redirects the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

49. The system of claim 44, wherein the redirection server further redirects the data from the users' computers to multiple destinations as a function of the individualized rule set.

50. The system of claim 44, wherein the database entries for a plurality of the plurality of users' IDs are correlated with a common individualized rule set.

51. The system of claim 44, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP (Internet Protocol) service.

52. The system of claim 44, wherein the individualized rule set includes an initial temporary rule set and a standard rule set, and wherein the redirection server is configured to utilize the temporary rule set for an initial period of time and to thereafter utilize the standard rule set.

53. The system of claim 44, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a request type and a destination address.

54. The system of claim 44, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule redirecting the data to a new destination address based on a request type and an attempted destination address.

55. The system of claim 44, wherein the redirection server is configured to redirect data from the users' computers by replacing a first destination address in an IP (Internet Protocol) packet header by a second destination address as a function of the individualized rule set.

56. In a system comprising a database with entries correlating each of a plurality of user IDs with an individualized rule set; a dial-up network server that receives user IDs from users' computers; a redirection server connected between the dial-up network server and a public network, and an authentication accounting server connected to the database, the dial-up network server and the redirection servers, a method comprising the steps of:

communicating a first user ID for one of the users' computers and a temporarily assigned network address for the first user ID from the dial-up network server to the authentication accounting server;

communicating the individualized rule set that correlates with the first user ID and the temporarily assigned network address to the redirection server from the authentication accounting server; and

processing data directed toward the public network from the one of the users' computers according to the individualized rule set.

57. The method of claim 56, further including the step of controlling a plurality of data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

58. The method of claim 56, further including the step of blocking the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

59. The method of claim 56, further including the step of allowing the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

60. The method of claim 56, further including the step of redirecting the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

61. The method of claim 56, further including the step of redirecting the data from the users' computers to multiple destinations a function of the individualized rule set.

62. The method of claim 56, further including the step of creating database entries for a plurality of the plurality of users' IDs, the plurality of users' ID further being correlated with a common individualized rule set.

63. The method of claim 56, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP (Internet Protocol) service.

64. The method of claim 56, wherein the individualized rule set includes an initial temporary rule set and a standard rule set, and wherein the redirection server is configured to utilize the temporary rule set for an initial period of time and to thereafter utilize the standard rule set.

65. The method of claim 56, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a request type and a destination address.

66. The method of claim 56, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule redirecting the data to a new destination address based on a request type and an attempted destination address.

67. The method of claim 56, wherein the redirection server is configured to redirect data from the users' computers by replacing a first destination address in an IP (Internet Protocol) packet header by a second destination address as a function of the individualized rule set.

68. A system comprising:

a redirection server connected between a user computer and a public network, the redirection server programmed with a users' rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address; and

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses.

69. The system of claim 68, wherein the redirection server is configured to allow modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of time.

70. The system of claim 68, wherein the redirection server is configured to allow modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of the data transmitted to or from the user.

71. The system of claim 68, wherein the redirection server is configured to allow modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of the location or locations the user accesses.

72. The system of claim 68, wherein the redirection server is configured to allow the removal or reinstatement of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of time.

73. The system of claim 68, wherein the redirection server is configured to allow the removal or reinstatement of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of the data transmitted to or from the user.

74. The system of claim 68, wherein the redirection server is configured to allow the removal or reinstatement of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of the location or locations the user accesses.

75. The system of claim 68, wherein the redirection server is configured to allow the removal or reinstatement of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location or locations the user accesses.

76. The system of claim 68, wherein the redirection server has a user side that is connected to a computer using the temporarily assigned network address and a network side connected to a computer network and wherein the computer using the temporarily assigned network address is connected to the computer network through the redirection server.

77. The system of claim 68 wherein instructions to the redirection server to modify the rule set are received by one or more of the user side of the redirection server and the network side of the redirection server.

78. The system of claim 68, wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP (Internet Protocol) service.

79. The system of claim 68, wherein the modified rule set includes an initial temporary rule set and a standard rule set, and wherein the redirection server is configured to utilize the temporary rule set for an initial period of time and to thereafter utilize the standard rule set.

80. The system of claim 68, wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a request type and a destination address.

81. The system of claim 68, wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule redirecting the data to a new destination address based on a request type and an attempted destination address.

82. The system of claim 68, wherein the redirection server is configured to redirect data from the users' computers by replacing a first destination address in an IP (Internet Protocol) packet header by a second destination address as a function of the modified rule set.

83. In a system comprising a redirection server connected between a user computer and a public network, the redirection server containing a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address wherein the user's rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network; a method comprising the step of:

modifying at least a portion of the user's rule set while the user's rule set remains correlated to the temporarily assigned network address in the redirection server; and

wherein the redirection server has a user side that is connected to a computer using the temporarily assigned network address and a network address and a network side connected to a computer network; and

wherein the computer using the temporarily assigned network address is connected to the computer network through the redirection server and the method further includes the step of receiving instructions by the redirection server to modify at least a portion of the user's rule set through one or more of the user side of the redirection server and the network side of the redirection server.

84. The method of claim 83, further including the step of modifying at least a portion of the user's rule set as a function of one or more of time, data transmitted to or from the user, and location or locations the user accesses.

85. The method of claim 83, further including the step of removing or reinstating at least a portion of the user's rule set as a function of one or more of time, the data transmitted to or from the user and a location or locations the user accesses.

86. The method of claim 83, wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP (Internet Protocol) service.

87. The method of claim 83, wherein the modified rule set includes an initial temporary rule set and a standard rule set, and wherein the redirection server is configured to utilize the temporary rule set for an initial period of time and to thereafter utilize the standard rule set.

88. The method of claim 83, wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a request type and a destination address.

89. The method of claim 83, wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule redirecting the data to a new destination address based on a request type and an attempted destination address.

90. The method of claim 83, wherein the redirection server is configured to redirect data from the users' computers by replacing a first destination address in an IP (Internet Protocol) packet header by a second destination address as a function of the individualized rule set.

Certificate of Service

It is hereby certified that the attached Patent Owner's Rebuttal Brief (including a Claims Appendix) and a copy of this Certificate of Service **are being served on April 7, 2014 by first class mail** on third party requesters at third party requesters' addresses of record:

David L. McCombs
Haynes & Boone, LLP
2323 Victory Avenue, Suite 700
Dallas, TX 75219

[for *inter partes* Proceeding No. 95/002,035]

James J. Wong
2108 Gossamer Ave.
Redwood City, CA 94065

[for *ex parte* Proceeding No. 90/012,342]

 /Abe Hershkovitz/
Abraham Hershkovitz

Electronic Patent Application Fee Transmittal

Application Number:	95002035
Filing Date:	12-Sep-2012
Title of Invention:	USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM
First Named Inventor/Applicant Name:	6779118
Filer:	Abraham Hershkovitz
Attorney Docket Number:	RI1341006F

Filed as Large Entity

inter partes reexam Filing Fees

Description	Fee Code	Quantity	Amount	Sub-Total in USD(\$)
Basic Filing:				
Pages:				
Claims:				
Miscellaneous-Filing:				
Petition:				
Patent-Appeals-and-Interference:				
Filing Appeal Brief Inter Partes Reexam	1404	1	2000	2000

Post-Allowance-and-Post-Issuance:

Extension-of-Time:

Description	Fee Code	Quantity	Amount	Sub-Total in USD(\$)
Miscellaneous:				
Total in USD (\$)				2000

Electronic Acknowledgement Receipt

EFS ID:	18696414
Application Number:	95002035
International Application Number:	
Confirmation Number:	1745
Title of Invention:	USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM
First Named Inventor/Applicant Name:	6779118
Customer Number:	40401
Filer:	Abraham Hershkovitz
Filer Authorized By:	
Attorney Docket Number:	RI1341006F
Receipt Date:	07-APR-2014
Filing Date:	12-SEP-2012
Time Stamp:	19:09:43
Application Type:	inter partes reexam

Payment information:

Submitted with Payment	yes
Payment Type	Credit Card
Payment was successfully received in RAM	\$2000
RAM confirmation Number	6531
Deposit Account	
Authorized User	

File Listing:

Document Number	Document Description	File Name	File Size(Bytes)/ Message Digest	Multi Part	Pages Total

1	Trans Letter filing of a response in a reexam	RI1341006F-A10_Transmittal-of-Rbttl-Brf.pdf	161985 3bddbfff0286fce6ad889f3c922a7ab528717e35c	no	1
Warnings:					
Information:					
2		RI1341006F-R1341006D-A10_Rebuttal-Brief.pdf	350455 8d69e076a00b8eaaa482b6bf8878e3a472722c7d	yes	34
	Multipart Description/PDF files in .zip description				
	Document Description		Start	End	
	Rebuttal Brief - Owner		1	33	
	Reexam Certificate of Service		34	34	
Warnings:					
Information:					
3	Fee Worksheet (SB06)	fee-info.pdf	30200 19d2f5432c25246c098aac21039bb086a2d7e3b	no	2
Warnings:					
Information:					
Total Files Size (in bytes):			542640		
<p>This Acknowledgement Receipt evidences receipt on the noted date by the USPTO of the indicated documents, characterized by the applicant, and including page counts, where applicable. It serves as evidence of receipt similar to a Post Card, as described in MPEP 503.</p> <p><u>New Applications Under 35 U.S.C. 111</u> If a new application is being filed and the application includes the necessary components for a filing date (see 37 CFR 1.53(b)-(d) and MPEP 506), a Filing Receipt (37 CFR 1.54) will be issued in due course and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the filing date of the application.</p> <p><u>National Stage of an International Application under 35 U.S.C. 371</u> If a timely submission to enter the national stage of an international application is compliant with the conditions of 35 U.S.C. 371 and other applicable requirements a Form PCT/DO/EO/903 indicating acceptance of the application as a national stage submission under 35 U.S.C. 371 will be issued in addition to the Filing Receipt, in due course.</p> <p><u>New International Application Filed with the USPTO as a Receiving Office</u> If a new international application is being filed and the international application includes the necessary components for an international filing date (see PCT Article 11 and MPEP 1810), a Notification of the International Application Number and of the International Filing Date (Form PCT/RO/105) will be issued in due course, subject to prescriptions concerning national security, and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the international filing date of the application.</p>					



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
90/012,342 + 95/002,035 40401 7590 Hershkovitz & Associates, PLLC 2845 Duke Street Alexandria, VA 22314	06/08/2012 03/06/2014	6779118	R1341006-D	5786
EXAMINER WORJLOH, JALATEE				
		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
		3992		
		MAIL DATE DELIVERY MODE		
		03/06/2014 PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
95/002,035 90/012342 40401	09/12/2012 7590 03/06/2014	6779118	R11341006F	1745
Hershkovitz & Associates, PLLC 2845 Duke Street Alexandria, VA 22314			EXAMINER WORJLOH, JALATEE	
			ART UNIT 3992	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 03/06/2014	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Transmittal of Communication to Third Party Requester <i>Inter Partes</i> Reexamination	Control No.	Patent Under Reexamination	
	95/002,035 and 90/012,342	6779118	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jalatee Worjloh	3992	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address. --

_____ (THIRD PARTY REQUESTER'S CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS) _____

James J. Wong
2108 Gossamer Ave.
Redwood City, CA 94065

Enclosed is a copy of the latest communication from the United States Patent and Trademark Office in the above-identified reexamination proceeding. 37 CFR 1.903.

Prior to the filing of a Notice of Appeal, each time the patent owner responds to this communication, the third party requester of the *inter partes* reexamination may once file written comments within a period of 30 days from the date of service of the patent owner's response. This 30-day time period is statutory (35 U.S.C. 314(b)(2)), and, as such, it cannot be extended. See also 37 CFR 1.947.

If an *ex parte* reexamination has been merged with the *inter partes* reexamination, no responsive submission by any *ex parte* third party requester is permitted.

All correspondence relating to this *inter partes* reexamination proceeding should be directed to the **Central Reexamination Unit** at the mail, FAX, or hand-carry addresses given at the end of the communication enclosed with this transmittal.

Transmittal of Communication to Third Party Requester <i>Inter Partes</i> Reexamination	Control No.	Patent Under Reexamination	
	95/002,035 and 90/012342	6779118	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jalatee Worjloh	3992	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address. --

(THIRD PARTY REQUESTER'S CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS)

David L. McCombs
Haynes & Boone, LLP
2323 Victory Avenue, Suite 700
Dallas, Texas 75219

Enclosed is a copy of the latest communication from the United States Patent and Trademark Office in the above-identified reexamination proceeding, 37 CFR 1.903.

Prior to the filing of a Notice of Appeal, each time the patent owner responds to this communication, the third party requester of the *inter partes* reexamination may once file written comments within a period of 30 days from the date of service of the patent owner's response. This 30-day time period is statutory (35 U.S.C. 314(b)(2)), and, as such, it cannot be extended. See also 37 CFR 1.947.

If an *ex parte* reexamination has been merged with the *inter partes* reexamination, no responsive submission by any *ex parte* third party requester is permitted.

All correspondence relating to this *inter partes* reexamination proceeding should be directed to the **Central Reexamination Unit** at the mail, FAX, or hand-carry addresses given at the end of the communication enclosed with this transmittal.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Application Number: 95/002,035 and 90/012,342
Filing Date: September 12, 2012 (for '-35) and June 8, 2012 (for '342)
Appellant(s): Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC

For Patent Owner: Abraham HersHKovitz (Reg. No. 45,294)
For Appellant: David L. McCombs (Reg. No. 32, 271)

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed December 9, 2013 and Respondent Brief Filed
January 8, 2014.

(1) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

Every ground of rejection set forth in the Office action dated September 9, 2013 from which the appeal is taken is being maintained by the examiner except for the grounds of rejection (if any) listed under the subheading "WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS." New grounds of rejection (if any) are provided under the subheading "NEW GROUNDS OF REJECTION."

Status of the Claims

- Claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-24, and 26-90 are rejected.
- Claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-43, and 68-90 are on appeal.
- The rejection of claims 40-43 as being obvious over He, Zenchelsky, Fortinsky, and Admitted Prior Art (APA) has been withdrawn.

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

- Claims 16-18, 23, 24, 26, 36-43, 68-71, 76-84, and 86-90 as being obvious over Willens in view of RFC 2138 and Stockwell;
- Claims 16-18, 23, 24, 26, 36-43, 68-71, 76-84, and 86-90 as being obvious over Willens in view of RFC2138 and Admitted Prior Art;
- Claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-43, and 68-90 as being obvious over Radia in view of Wong '727 and further in view of Stockwell;
- Claims 16-24 and 68-90 as being obvious over Radia in view of Wong '727 and further in view of Admitted Prior Art;
- Claims 43 as being obvious over He, Zenchelsky, and Admitted Prior Art;

Art Unit: 3992

- Claims 43, 83, and 86-90 as being obvious over He, Zenchelsky, Fortinsky and the Admitted Prior Art;
- Claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-43, and 68-90 as being obvious over Coss in view of Admitted Prior Art.

The grounds of rejection on appeal are hereby incorporated by references from the Right of Appeal Notice dated September 9, 2013.

WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS

The following grounds of rejection are not presented for review on appeal because they have been withdrawn by the examiner.

Claims 40-43 as being obvious over He, Zenchelsky, Fortinsky, and APA.

Claims 40-43 depend on claim 25, which recites "...the method further includes the step of receiving instructions by the redirection server to modify at least a portion of the user's rule set..." The rejection relied upon Fig. 10 and col. 17, lines 19-27 of He for teaching this limitation. Although He discloses automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set, the reference does not expressly teach receiving instructions by the redirection server to modify at least a portion of the user's rule set. Instead, at col. 17, lines 19-27, He teaches providing a database tool "for the system security administrator to create, delete, disable and modify a user account," but does not indicate that instructions to modify the user's rule set are received. Thus, the rejection of claims 40-43 in view of He, Zenchelsky, and APA is withdrawn.

Art Unit: 3992

(2) Response to Argument

Willens

PO: Patent Owner argues that "PTA list" is not a "rule set," but instead the list is a specific example of a list of web sites, i.e. a "site list." It is noted that claim 16 recites a "plurality of functions used to control..."

TPR: Requester submits that Willens teaches that one example rule is "the rule permit 'PTA List.'" Willens, 5:66. The list of websites included on the "PTA List" is an integral part of this rule, and changing the list of websites on the "PTA List" unambiguously changes the meaning of the rule "permit 'PTA List.'" Thus, modifying the list of websites incorporated into a rule is a "modification of at least a portion of the rule set."

Examiner: The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Patent Owner. The '118 patent specification describes the rule set at col. 4, lines 41-49 as follows:

The rule sets specify elements or conditions about the user's session. Rule sets may contain data about a type of service which may or may not be accessed, a location, which may or may not be accessed, how long to keep the rule set active, under what condition the rule set should be removed, when and how to modify the rule set during a session.

Willens teaches a permitted site list (PTA list), which includes information regarding which sites the user can access. The rule sets of '118 patent indicates that "rule sets may contain data about a type of service which may or may not be accessed, a location which may or may not be accessed..." which is the same as the information in Willens' permitted site list.

As per the limitation of claim 16, "wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control passing between the user and a public network," the Office action relied upon col. 5, lines 17-18 and 58-66; col. 6, line 10-16 in the rejection.

Willens discloses the following at col. 6, lines 15 and 16:

Art Unit: 3992

"Firewall filters are defined as an explicit set of rules based on either permit or deny syntax."

As indicated in the Office action, the permit and deny actions are "a plurality of functions used to control passing between the user and a public network."

Willens also teaches when the user logs into the communication server (redirection server), the RADIUS client software determines if he is authorized by utilizing the user's profiles, which identify a filter "F(Timmy)." The client software then checks to see if the filter is stored locally in cache. If it is, the client software uses it for controlling access. If not, the software sends a lookup request to the network access server, which stores the centralized permitted site list and the filters for checking access classification of requested sites, to download the filter "F(Timmy)." See col. 5, lines 5-27. PTA list is a rule set used to grant or deny access.

PO: Patent Owner argues that the cache of Willens does not have an associated temporarily assigned network address (TANA). The '118 patent claims recite "...a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address..."

Examiner: The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Patent Owner. The user profile, which includes the use filters, can be stored in cache. See col. 5, lines 9-25. Also, the Office Action relied upon col. 5, lines -17 and 60-67; col. 6, lines 1-15 and 35-46 for teaching "a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address."

Willens teaches at col. 6, lines 35-46:

The source and destination addresses in the header packet are used to identify the user, allowing selection of the appropriate user filter, and to identify the site for which the user desires access. An example source address identifying a user might be:
192.168.51.50

Art Unit: 3992

An example destination address identifying a site requested by the user might be:

172.16.3.4

The server 14 uses such addresses in packet headers for making decision on the handling of IP packets, such as for firewall security.

As the citation shows, there is a relationship/correlation between the user filter and the address (i.e. the user's rule set and temporarily assigned network address).

Modification of Rule Set

PO: Patent Owner argues that Willens teaches the updating of the permit list, which is not a filter (rule set) correlated with the TANA programmed in the communication server as the claims in the '118 Patent require. It is asserted that the only modification that is taught by Willens is modification of the uncorrelated site list, not the filters. Willens teaches that the only automatic modification done is the modification of the site list, not the rule set that the site list modification occurs at any time and regardless of correlation to a TANA and the modification occurs in the ChoiceNet Server 18 and not in the communication server 14.

TPR: Requester submits that in Willens, the local cache of allowed websites stored on communications server 14 is modified every time the use accesses a new allowable website. The cached list of allowed websites is "at least a portion of the rule set." The updates to the local cache occur while the user is logged into the communication server 14 with a temporary network address. Thus, Willens teaches that the communication server 14 is "configured to allow modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address" as recited in the claim.

Furthermore, Willens' ChoiceNet server 18 "automatically maintains the permit list by downloading updated versions of the list over the Internet and compiling the list for use by the

Art Unit: 3992

client software 42, perhaps "on a daily or hourly bases." Willens, 5:41-44, 4:43,44. The "client software 42" is the packet filter on communication server 14 (the "redirection server"). Thus, the rules applied by communication server 14-such as the F(Timmy) rule set, which incorporates the "PTA List" of updateable websites-may be automatically modified every hour.

Examiner: The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Patent Owner that Willens fails to teach "wherein the redirection server is configured to allow modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of time." The filters of Willens not only define the rules, but also the PTA list. The rule sets of '118 patent indicates that "rule sets may contain data about a type of service which may or may not accessed, a location which may or may not be accessed...," which is the same as the information in Willens' permitted site list.

In Willens, while a user is logged in, the client software can send a lookup request to the network access server to download filters. The server software automatically maintains the permit list by downloading updated versions of the list over the Internet and compiling the list for use by the client software. See col. 5, lines 9-46. Also, Willens teaches updating the list daily or hourly (see col. 4, lines 40-45). Since the client software 44, which is part of the communications server (see fig. 3) receives the updated versions of the list, the communications server allows modification of the rule set. Hence, the redirection server of Willens is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as required by the claim.

Non-Obviousness over Willens in view of Stockwell

PO: Patent owner asserts that while Willens, Stockwell and the '118 Patent may be in the same field, the discussion (in regards to Willens in section I(D)) demonstrates that the rule set

Art Unit: 3992

modification limitations of the '118 Patent are not taught or suggested by Willens, and are not taught or suggested by Stockwell. Therefore, Willens either alone or in combination with Stockwell fails to teach modification of a rule set correlated with a TANA programmed in the redirection server and no rationale as to why those differences would be obvious to one skilled in the art.

TPR: Requester submits that the adopted analysis includes detailed finding regarding the disclosure of each prior art reference, the differences between the prior art and the claims (e.g., Willens does not teach redirection *per se*, and the level of ordinary skill in the art as reflected in the admitted and applied prior art. Furthermore, the examiner's adopted analysis includes detailed explanation of why a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the references as used in the rejection.

Examiner: The Examiner notes that Willens teaches modification of a rule set correlated with TANA as discussed above (see page 6). Stockwell teaches that cache entries should only be relied on before their expiration, thus avoiding the use of stale data (see col. 8, lines 30-33). Thus, it would have been obvious to apply a similar expiration timer to the cache entries in Willens communication server 14, thereby ensuring that automatic updates received by the ChoiceNet server 18 will propagate down to the communications server 14 in a timely fashion.

Rejection of claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-43, 68-90 as being obvious over Radia in view of Wong '727 and Stockwell/APA and further in view of Wong '178

PO: Patent Owner asserts that Radia only teaches that the ANCS, not the router/modem, replaces one filter with another filter by reconfiguring the router/modem with a new rule from the

Art Unit: 3992

SMS/ANCS based on a detected event. Nothing in Radia teaches or suggests that the redirection server (router/modem) actually does or actively enables the modification. Also, Patent Owner submits that Radia does not teach or suggest that the router or IP packet filter configured in router modify the IP packet filter while it is correlated with a temporarily assigned network address.

Patent owner states that only claims 16-23, 36-39, and 68-82 include the language “configured to allow modification” and claims 24, 26, 40-43, and 83-90 recite different language that requires that the redirection server do the modifying of the rule set while it is correlated with a TANA. Claim 24 recites “instructions to the redirection server to modify the rule set...” and claims 26, 40-43 and 83-90 each recite “receiving instructions by the redirection server to modify the rule set...” Each of these claims requires that instructions be given to the redirection server.

TPR: Requester submits that Radia’s router corresponds to claimed “redirection user” that processes users’ data “according to the individualized rule set.” It is noted that Radia teaches modifying a user’s rule set. In Radia, after the user successfully logs in, the router is updated with user’s packet filter, thus allowing the user access to network resources according to the user’s individualized rule set. See Radia, 10:6-14. Thus, the user's packet filter is modified after the user has obtained a temporary network address and communicated with login server.

Also, Patent Owner has admitted in related litigation that the redirection server may be composed of multiple components: LinkSmart’s Infringement Contentions, Request Ex. D2 at 18. The Patent Office may rely on the Patent Owner's claim interpretation in litigation as an admission regarding the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim. See MPEP 2658, 2258.

Requester notes that Patent Owner provides no argument for why claims 26 and 40-43 should be interpreted as including an "instructions" limitation. It would be improper and contrary to the broadest reasonable interpretation to treat claims 26 and 40-43 as if they recited such as limitation. Thus, the Patent Owner's arguments relating to "instructions" are not applicable to claims 26 and 40-43.

With respect to claim 24, the detailed analysis adopted by the Examiner shows that the router 106 (the redirection server) receives instructions to modify its filtering rules from the ANCS-server 112 (Radia, 6:64-7:8). The router 106 receives instructions including, for example, the detailed filtering rules included in the user's filtering profile 400. Thus, the Examiner's analysis shows (and Radia teaches) "instructions to the redirection server to modify the rule set."

Regarding Patent Owner's argument that the Examiner has misread the '118 Patents description of allowing an outside server to make rule set modifications, the specification states that the use of authorization is merely preferred, not required. Also, none of claims 24 and 83-90 recite any limitation relating to authorization.

Examiner: Regarding claims 16-23, 36-39, and 68-82, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with Patent Owner. These claims recite "redirection server is configure to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set," which does not limit the modification to the redirection server. At least one embodiment of the system permits an outsider server to make modification to the rule set. Specifically, col. 8, lines 3-11 recites:

The web site then sends an authorization to the redirection server that deletes the redirection to the questionnaire web site from the rule set for the user who successfully completed the questionnaire. Of course, the type of modification an outside server can make to a rule set on the redirection server is not limited to deleting a redirection rule, but can include any other type of modification to the rule set that is supported by the redirection server as discussed above.

During reexamination, claims are given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification and limitations in the specification are not read into the claims (*In re Yamamoto*, 740 F.2d 1569, 222 USPQ 934 (Fed. Cir. 1984)).

As per claims 24, 26, 40-43, and 83-90, the Examiner agrees with Patent Owner that instructions are received by the redirection server to modify the rule set. However, modification of the rule set or the redirection server being programmed to modify the rule set is not recited in the claim. The claim merely recites "...instructions to the redirection server to modify the rule set are received...", which is disclosed by Radia. Specifically, the reference teaches the router 106 receives instruction to modify its filtering rules from the ANCS server 112, illustrated in Fig. 1 as located on the network site the router. Radia at 6:66-77:8 recites:

In step 604, the ANCS 11 uses the single filtering rule 404 included in the filtering profile 400 to establish a packet filter for IP packets originating from the client system 102b. The packet filter is established by reconfiguring one or more of the components of the network 100 that forward packets originating at the client system 102b. For example, in some cases that packet filter may be established by reconfiguring the modem 104b connected to the client system 102. Alternatively, the packet filter may be established by reconfigured router 106.

The claims do not require the modification, but merely receiving instructions to modify the rule set. If it is assumed that modification is required in this claim language, the Office action notes that ANCS together with the router of Radia teach the redirection server. See page 6 of Exhibit BB. Therefore, modification is occurring at the redirection server (ANCS combined with router).

Art Unit: 3992

Combining Radia and Stockwell

PO: Patent Owner incorporates by reference the argument against combining Stockwell and Willens.

TPR: Requester submits that Patent Owner is incorrect to argue that the claims are nonobvious merely because neither Radia nor Stockwell are anticipation references, and the error in the argument explains the Examiner's basis for citing *In re Keller*. "One cannot show non-obviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on a combination of reference's." *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413 (CCPA 1981).

Examiner: The Examiner agrees with the Requester. Also, Radia and Stockwell are both directed to providing a configurable network device that provides IP packet filtering. Stockwell includes a teaching that a network device, such as a firewall, can redirect a communication to an alternate destination. It would have been obvious to incorporate this redirection feature into the packet filters of Radia. The redirection feature would improve similar device (the filtering capabilities of Radia) in the same way. See MPEP 2143. The combination is also obvious because it requires only applying a known technique (redirection) to known device (the packet filters of Radia) to yield predictable results (a packet filter with the ability to redirect packets). See MPEP 2143. Radia teaches blocking and it would be obvious to extend blocking to include Stockwell's redirecting feature.

Art Unit: 3992

Rejection of Claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-43 and 68-90 as Being Obvious Over Coss in view of

Admitted Prior Art

PO: Patent Owner argues that “in the earlier *ex parte* Reexamination Proceeding 90/009,301 for the ‘118, the Primary Examiner held that Provisional Application No. 60/084, 014 filed May 4, 1998 (the ‘014 Application) clearly supports the disclosure in the ‘118 Patent... Indeed, the August 14, 1997 Technical Report that was attached to each of the 37 C.F.R. §1.131 Declaration is essentially identical to the disclosure of the ‘014 Application.”

TPR: Requester notes that the claims have changed since the Order, in particular, that reexamination proceeding resulted in the cancellation of all of the original independent claims and amendments to numerous others. In this reexamination, the Patent Owner has presented new claims. Thus, the Patent Owner has not shown that the Technical Innovation Report supports the claims as they stand now.

The Technical Innovation Report does not provide 112 support for a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address as recited in claim 16.

Examiner: As per the earlier *ex parte* reexamination proceeding, the examiner stated that the claims are entitled to the May 4, 1998 priority date of the provisional application. In this proceeding, Patent Owner argues that the provisionally reference is the same as the Technical Report document filed August 14, 1997; therefore, the claims should be given a priority date of August 14, 1997.

Upon further review, the Examiner notes that Patent Owner has established conception, but fails to show due diligence from a date prior to the date of reduction to practice of the Coss reference to either a constructive reduction to practice or an actual reduction to practice.

Art Unit: 3992

37 CFR 1.131 (b) provides three ways in which one can establish prior invention of the claimed subject matter. The showing of facts must be sufficient to show:

(a) actual reduction to practice of the invention prior to the effective date of the reference; or

(b) conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the reference with due diligence

from prior to the reference date to a subsequent (actual) reduction to practice; or

(c) conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the reference coupled with due

diligence from prior to the reference date to the filing date of the application (construction

reduction to practice). See MPEP 715.07 III.

Evidence in the form of exhibits may accompany the affidavit or declaration. Each exhibit relied upon should be specially referred to in the affidavit or declaration, in terms of what it is relied upon to show." MPEP 715.06. In this case, the declaration fails to explain which facts are being relied on to prove diligence. Also, Patent Owner has failed to provide evidence to fully account for the time period during which due diligence must be established.

An applicant must account for the entire period during which diligence is required. GouM v. Schawlow, 363 F.2d 908, 919, 150 USPQ 634, 643 (CCPA 1966) (Merely stating that there were no weeks or months that the invention was not worked on is not enough.); In re Harry, 333 F.2d 920, 923, 142 USPQ 164, 166 (CCPA 1964)(statement that the subject matter "was diligently reduced to practice" is not a showing but a mere pleading). A 2-day period lacking activity has been held to be fatal. In re Mulder, 716 F.2d 1542, 1545, 219 USPQ 189, 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (37 CFR 1.131 issue); Fitzgerald v. Arbib, 268 F.2d 763, 766, 122 USPQ 530, 532 (CCPA 1959) (Less than 1 month of inactivity during critical period. Efforts to exploit an invention commercially do not constitute diligence in reducing it to practice. An actual reduction to practice in the case of a design for a three-dimensional article requires that it should be embodied in some structure other than a mere drawing.); Kendall v. Searles, 173 F. 2d 986, 993, 81 USPQ 363, 369 (CCPA 1949) (Diligence requires that applicants must be specific as to dates and facts.)

The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a reduction to practice of the invention in this country or a NAFTA or WTO member country prior to the effective date of the Coss

Art Unit: 3992

reference. To establish actual reduction to practice, a showing of the invention in a physical or tangible form that shows every element of the count. *Wetmore v. Quick*, 536 F.2d 937, 942, 190 USPQ 223, 227 (CCPA 1976). For an actual reduction to practice, the invention must have been sufficiently tested to demonstrate that it will work for its intended purpose, but it need not be in commercially satisfactory stage of development. See, e.g., *Scott v. Finney*, 34 F.3d 1058, 1062, 32 USPQ2d 1115, 1118-19 (Fed. Cir. 1994). MPEP 2138.05.

PO: Patent Owner argues that Coss does not teach a redirection server be configured to allow automated modification of the rule set correlated to the TANA, as taught in, e.g., claims 16-23 and 36-39 of the '118 Patent. Coss does not teach or suggest correlation between a user's rule set and a TANA for that user's computer. Coss does not explicitly disclose that the firewall 211 is configured to allow automated modification of a least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address.

TPR: Requester submits that Coss teaches "a single firewall can support multiple users, each with a separate security policy." Coss, 3:31-33. Coss also teaches that rules are associated with an IP address, such as a source or destination IP address. See Coss, 4:4-11 and Fig. 3. The Admitted Prior Art teaches that it was known to provide temporary IP network addresses to users, and the Examiner determined that it would have been obvious to associate Coss' security rules with a temporarily assigned IP address. One cannot show non-obviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on a combination of references. *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 314 (CCPS 1981).

Art Unit: 3992

Examiner: The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Patent Owner. Coss teaches dynamic rules which are included with the access rules as a need arises. These rules can be loaded at any time to authorize specific network sessions. See col. 8, lines 24-36. The rules of Coss authorizes specific network session, which is the same as the rule set of '118 Patent (i.e. "type of service which may or may not be accessed, a location, which may or may not be accessed.")

As per Coss not teaching a temporarily assigned network address, the Office action states that at page 340 and 341 of Request that the Coss does not teach the rule set being correlated to a temporarily assigned network address, but that this is an obvious over the Admitted Prior Art. Specifically, pages 340 and 341 recite the following:

Cosset al. do not explicitly disclose the firewall 211 is programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address.

"In prior art systems as shown in FIG. 1 when an Internet user establishes a connection with an Internet Service Provider (ISP), the user first makes a physical connection between their computer 100 and a dial-up networking server 102, the user provides to the dial-up networking server their user ID and password. The dial-up networking server then passes the user ID and password, along with a temporary Internet Protocol (IP) address for use by the user to the ISP's authentication and accounting server 104. A detailed description of the IP communications protocol is discussed in *Internetworking with TCP/IP*, 3rd ed., Douglas Comer, Prentice Hall, 1995, which is fully incorporated herein by reference. The authentication and accounting server, upon verification of the user ID and password using a database 106 would send an authorization message to the dial-up networking server 102 to allow the user to use the temporary IP address assigned to that user by the dial-up networking server and then logs the connection and assigned IP address. For the duration of that session, whenever the user would make a request to the Internet 110 via a gateway 108, the end user would be identified by the temporarily assigned IP address." [" 118 patent, 1st paragraph of Background of the Invention section, emphasis added] Firewall 211 is programmed with a user's rule set correlated to an IP address. It would have been obvious that this IP address may be temporarily assigned. A first reason is this is simply combining prior art elements (temporary IP addresses) to known methods (assigning a user with an IP address) to yield predictable results. A second reason is this would allow dial-up users to temporarily connect their computers to the user site 201, as suggested by the APA systems.

Art Unit: 3992

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jalatee Worjloh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3992

Conferees:

/Fred Ferris/

/Woo H. Choi/

Requirement to pay appeal forwarding fee. In order to avoid dismissal of the instant appeal in any application or ex parte reexamination proceeding, 37 CFR 41.45 requires payment of an appeal forwarding fee within the time permitted by 37 CFR 41.45(a), unless appellant had timely paid the fee for filing a brief required by 37 CFR 41.20(b) in effect on March 18, 2013.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

95/002,035 Y	09/12/2012	6779118	R11341006F	1745
---------------------	------------	---------	------------	------

90/012342

40401	7590	03/06/2014
-------	------	------------

Hershkovitz & Associates, PLLC
2845 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER

WORLOH, JALATEE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3992

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

03/06/2014

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
90/012,342 + 95/002035	06/08/2012	6779118	R1341006-D	5786
40401	7590	03/06/2014	EXAMINER	
Herskovitz & Associates, PLLC 2845 Duke Street Alexandria, VA 22314			WORLOH, JALATEE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3992	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/06/2014	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Transmittal of Communication to
Third Party Requester
Inter Partes Reexamination**

Control No.	Patent Under Reexamination	
95/002,035 and 90/012,342	6779118	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Jalatee Worjloh	3992	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address. --

(THIRD PARTY REQUESTER'S CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS)

James J. Wong
2108 Gossamer Ave.
Redwood City, CA 94065

Enclosed is a copy of the latest communication from the United States Patent and Trademark Office in the above-identified reexamination proceeding. 37 CFR 1.903.

Prior to the filing of a Notice of Appeal, each time the patent owner responds to this communication, the third party requester of the *inter partes* reexamination may once file written comments within a period of 30 days from the date of service of the patent owner's response. This 30-day time period is statutory (35 U.S.C. 314(b)(2)), and, as such, it cannot be extended. See also 37 CFR 1.947.

If an *ex parte* reexamination has been merged with the *inter partes* reexamination, no responsive submission by any *ex parte* third party requester is permitted.

All correspondence relating to this *inter partes* reexamination proceeding should be directed to the **Central Reexamination Unit** at the mail, FAX, or hand-carry addresses given at the end of the communication enclosed with this transmittal.

Transmittal of Communication to Third Party Requester Inter Partes Reexamination	Control No.	Patent Under Reexamination	
	95/002,035 and 90/012342	6779118	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jalatee Worjloh	3992	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address. --

____ (THIRD PARTY REQUESTER'S CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS) ____

David L. McCombs
Haynes & Boone, LLP
2323 Victory Avenue, Suite 700
Dallas, Texas 75219

Enclosed is a copy of the latest communication from the United States Patent and Trademark Office in the above-identified reexamination proceeding, 37 CFR 1.903.

Prior to the filing of a Notice of Appeal, each time the patent owner responds to this communication, the third party requester of the *inter partes* reexamination may once file written comments within a period of 30 days from the date of service of the patent owner's response. This 30-day time period is statutory (35 U.S.C. 314(b)(2)), and, as such, it cannot be extended. See also 37 CFR 1.947.

If an *ex parte* reexamination has been merged with the *inter partes* reexamination, no responsive submission by any *ex parte* third party requester is permitted.

All correspondence relating to this *inter partes* reexamination proceeding should be directed to the **Central Reexamination Unit** at the mail, FAX, or hand-carry addresses given at the end of the communication enclosed with this transmittal.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Application Number: 95/002,035 and 90/012,342
Filing Date: September 12, 2012 (for '35) and June 8, 2012 (for '342)
Appellant(s): Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC

For Patent Owner: Abraham Hershkovitz (Reg. No. 45,294)
For Appellant: David L. McCombs (Reg. No. 32, 271)

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed December 9, 2013 and Respondent Brief Filed
January 8, 2014.

Art Unit: 3992

(1) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

Every ground of rejection set forth in the Office action dated September 9, 2013 from which the appeal is taken is being maintained by the examiner except for the grounds of rejection (if any) listed under the subheading "WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS." New grounds of rejection (if any) are provided under the subheading "NEW GROUNDS OF REJECTION."

Status of the Claims

- Claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-24, and 26-90 are rejected.
- Claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-43, and 68-90 are on appeal.
- The rejection of claims 40-43 as being obvious over He, Zenchelsky, Fortinsky, and Admitted Prior Art (APA) has been withdrawn.

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

- Claims 16-18, 23, 24, 26, 36-43, 68-71, 76-84, and 86-90 as being obvious over Willens in view of RFC 2138 and Stockwell;
- Claims 16-18, 23, 24, 26, 36-43, 68-71, 76-84, and 86-90 as being obvious over Willens in view of RFC2138 and Admitted Prior Art;
- Claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-43, and 68-90 as being obvious over Radia in view of Wong '727 and further in view of Stockwell;
- Claims 16-24 and 68-90 as being obvious over Radia in view of Wong '727 and further in view of Admitted Prior Art;
- Claims 43 as being obvious over He, Zenchelsky, and Admitted Prior Art;

Art Unit: 3992

- Claims 43, 83, and 86-90 as being obvious over He, Zenchelsky, Fortinsky and the Admitted Prior Art;
- Claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-43, and 68-90 as being obvious over Coss in view of Admitted Prior Art.

The grounds of rejection on appeal are hereby incorporated by references from the Right of Appeal Notice dated September 9, 2013.

WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS

The following grounds of rejection are not presented for review on appeal because they have been withdrawn by the examiner.

Claims 40-43 as being obvious over He, Zenchelsky, Fortinsky, and APA.

Claims 40-43 depend on claim 25, which recites "...the method further includes the step of receiving instructions by the redirection server to modify at least a portion of the user's rule set..." The rejection relied upon Fig. 10 and col. 17, lines 19-27 of He for teaching this limitation. Although He discloses automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set, the reference does not expressly teach receiving instructions by the redirection server to modify at least a portion of the user's rule set. Instead, at col. 17, lines 19-27, He teaches providing a database tool "for the system security administrator to create, delete, disable and modify a user account," but does not indicate that instructions to modify the user's rule set are received. Thus, the rejection of claims 40-43 in view of He, Zenchelsky, and APA is withdrawn.

Art Unit: 3992

(2) Response to Argument

Willens

PO: Patent Owner argues that "PTA list" is not a "rule set," but instead the list is a specific example of a list of web sites, i.e. a "site list." It is noted that claim 16 recites a "plurality of functions used to control..."

TPR: Requester submits that Willens teaches that one example rule is "the rule permit 'PTA List.'" Willens, 5:66. The list of websites included on the "PTA List" is an integral part of this rule, and changing the list of websites on the "PTA List" unambiguously changes the meaning of the rule "permit 'PTA List.'" Thus, modifying the list of websites incorporated into a rule is a "modification of at least a portion of the rule set."

Examiner: The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Patent Owner. The '118 patent specification describes the rule set at col. 4, lines 41-49 as follows:

The rule sets specify elements or conditions about the user's session. Rule sets may contain data about a type of service which may or may not be accessed, a location, which may or may not be accessed, how long to keep the rule set active, under what condition the rule set should be removed, when and how to modify the rule set during a session.

Willens teaches a permitted site list (PTA list), which includes information regarding which sites the user can access. The rule sets of '118 patent indicates that "rule sets may contain data about a type of service which may or may not be accessed, a location which may or may not be accessed..." which is the same as the information in Willens' permitted site list.

As per the limitation of claim 16, "wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control passing between the user and a public network," the Office action relied upon col. 5, lines 17-18 and 58-66; col. 6, line 10-16 in the rejection.

Willens discloses the following at col. 6, lines 15 and 16:

Art Unit: 3992

"Firewall filters are defined as an explicit set of rules based on either permit or deny syntax."

As indicated in the Office action, the permit and deny actions are "a plurality of functions used to control passing between the user and a public network."

Willens also teaches when the user logs into the communication server (redirection server), the RADIUS client software determines if he is authorized by utilizing the user's profiles, which identify a filter "F(Timmy)." The client software then checks to see if the filter is stored locally in cache. If it is, the client software uses it for controlling access. If not, the software sends a lookup request to the network access server, which stores the centralized permitted site list and the filters for checking access classification of requested sites, to download the filter "F(Timmy)." See col. 5, lines 5-27. PTA list is a rule set used to grant or deny access.

PO: Patent Owner argues that the cache of Willens does not have an associated temporarily assigned network address (TANA). The '118 patent claims recite "...a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address..."

Examiner: The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Patent Owner. The user profile, which includes the use filters, can be stored in cache. See col. 5, lines 9-25. Also, the Office Action relied upon col. 5, lines 17 and 60-67; col. 6, lines 1-15 and 35-46 for teaching "a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address."

Willens teaches at col. 6, lines 35-46:

*The source and destination addresses in the header packet are used to identify the user, allowing selection of the appropriate user filter, and to identify the site for which the user desires access. An example source address identifying a user might be:
192.168.51.50*

Art Unit: 3992

*An example destination address identifying a site requested by the user might be:
172.16.3.4*

The server 14 uses such addresses in packet headers for making decision on the handling of IP packets, such as for firewall security.

As the citation shows, there is a relationship/correlation between the user filter and the address (i.e. the user's rule set and temporarily assigned network address).

Modification of Rule Set

PO: Patent Owner argues that Willens teaches the updating of the permit list, which is not a filter (rule set) correlated with the TANA programmed in the communication server as the claims in the '118 Patent require. It is asserted that the only modification that is taught by Willens is modification of the uncorrelated site list, not the filters. Willens teaches that the only automatic modification done is the modification of the site list, not the rule set that the site list modification occurs at any time and regardless of correlation to a TANA and the modification occurs in the ChoiceNet Server 18 and not in the communication server 14.

TPR: Requester submits that in Willens, the local cache of allowed websites stored on communications server 14 is modified every time the use accesses a new allowable website. The cached list of allowed websites is "at least a portion of the rule set." The updates to the local cache occur while the user is logged into the communication server 14 with a temporary network address. Thus, Willens teaches that the communication server 14 is "configured to allow modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address" as recited in the claim.

Furthermore, Willens' ChoiceNet server 18 "automatically maintains the permit list by downloading updated versions of the list over the Internet and compiling the list for use by the

Art Unit: 3992

client software 42, perhaps "on a daily or hourly bases." Willens, 5:41-44, 4:43,44. The "client software 42" is the packet filter on communication server 14 (the "redirection server"). Thus, the rules applied by communication server 14-such as the F(Timmy) rule set, which incorporates the "PTA List" of updateable websites-may be automatically modified every hour.

Examiner: The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Patent Owner that Willens fails to teach "wherein the redirection server is configured to allow modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of time." The filters of Willens not only define the rules, but also the PTA list. The rule sets of '118 patent indicates that "rule sets may contain data about a type of service which may or may not accessed, a location which may or may not be accessed..." which is the same as the information in Willens' permitted site list.

In Willens, while a user is logged in, the client software can send a lookup request to the network access server to download filters. The server software automatically maintains the permit list by downloading updated versions of the list over the Internet and compiling the list for use by the client software. See col. 5, lines 9-46. Also, Willens teaches updating the list daily or hourly (see col. 4, lines 40-45). Since the client software 44, which is part of the communications server (see fig. 3) receives the updated versions of the list, the communications server allows modification of the rule set. Hence, the redirection server of Willens is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as required by the claim.

Non-Obviousness over Willens in view of Stockwell

PO: Patent owner asserts that while Willens, Stockwell and the '118 Patent may be in the same field, the discussion (in regards to Willens in section I(D)) demonstrates that the rule set

Art Unit: 3992

modification limitations of the '118 Patent are not taught or suggested by Willens, and are not taught or suggested by Stockwell. Therefore, Willens either alone or in combination with Stockwell fails to teach modification of a rule set correlated with a TANA programmed in the redirection server and no rationale as to why those differences would be obvious to one skilled in the art.

TPR: Requester submits that the adopted analysis includes detailed finding regarding the disclosure of each prior art reference, the differences between the prior art and the claims (e.g., Willens does not teach redirection *per se*, and the level of ordinary skill in the art as reflected in the admitted and applied prior art. Furthermore, the examiner's adopted analysis includes detailed explanation of why a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the references as used in the rejection.

Examiner: The Examiner notes that Willens teaches modification of a rule set correlated with TANA as discussed above (see page 6). Stockwell teaches that cache entries should only be relied on before their expiration, thus avoiding the use of stale data (see col. 8, lines 30-33). Thus, it would have been obvious to apply a similar expiration timer to the cache entries in Willens communication server 14, thereby ensuring that automatic updates received by the ChoiceNet server 18 will propagate down to the communications server 14 in a timely fashion.

Rejection of claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-43, 68-90 as being obvious over Radia in view of Wong '727 and Stockwell/APA and further in view of Wong '178

PO: Patent Owner asserts that Radia only teaches that the ANCS, not the router/modem, replaces one filter with another filter by reconfiguring the router/modem with a new rule from the

Art Unit: 3992

SMS/ANCS based on a detected event. Nothing in Radia teaches or suggests that the redirection server (router/modem) actually does or actively enables the modification. Also, Patent Owner submits that Radia does not teach or suggest that the router or IP packet filter configured in router modify the IP packet filter while it is correlated with a temporarily assigned network address.

Patent owner states that only claims 16-23, 36-39, and 68-82 include the language "configured to allow modification" and claims 24, 26, 40-43, and 83-90 recite different language that requires that the redirection server do the modifying of the rule set while it is correlated with a TANA. Claim 24 recites "instructions to the redirection server to modify the rule set..." and claims 26, 40-43 and 83-90 each recite "receiving instructions by the redirection server to modify the rule set..." Each of these claims requires that instructions be given to the redirection server.

TPR: Requester submits that Radia's router corresponds to claimed "redirection user" that processes users' data "according to the individualized rule set." It is noted that Radia teaches modifying a user's rule set. In Radia, after the user successfully logs in, the router is updated with user's packet filter, thus allowing the user access to network resources according to the user's individualized rule set. See Radia, 10:6-14. Thus, the user's packet filter is modified after the user has obtained a temporary network address and communicated with login server.

Also, Patent Owner has admitted in related litigation that the redirection server may be composed of multiple components: LinkSmart's Infringement Contentions, Request Ex. D2 at 18. The Patent Office may rely on the Patent Owner's claim interpretation in litigation as an admission regarding the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim. See MPEP 2658, 2258.

Art Unit: 3992

Requester notes that Patent Owner provides no argument for why claims 26 and 40-43 should be interpreted as including an "instructions" limitation. It would be improper and contrary to the broadest reasonable interpretation to treat claims 26 and 40-43 as if they recited such as limitation. Thus, the Patent Owner's arguments relating to "instructions" are not applicable to claims 26 and 40-43.

With respect to claim 24, the detailed analysis adopted by the Examiner shows that the router 106 (the redirection server) receives instructions to modify its filtering rules from the ANCS server 112 (Radia, 6:64-7:8). The router 106 receives instructions including, for example, the detailed filtering rules included in the user's filtering profile 400. Thus, the Examiner's analysis shows (and Radia teaches) "instructions to the redirection server to modify the rule set."

Regarding Patent Owner's argument that the Examiner has misread the '118 Patents description of allowing an outside server to make rule set modifications, the specification states that the use of authorization is merely preferred, not required. Also, none of claims 24 and 83-90 recite any limitation relating to authorization.

Examiner: Regarding claims 16-23, 36-39, and 68-82, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with Patent Owner. These claims recite "redirection server is configure to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set," which does not limit the modification to the redirection server. At least one embodiment of the system permits an outsider server to make modification to the rule set. Specifically, col. 8, lines 3-11 recites:

The web site then sends an authorization to the redirection server that deletes the redirection to the questionnaire web site from the rule set for the user who successfully completed the questionnaire. Of course, the type of modification an outside server can make to a rule set on the redirection server is not limited to deleting a redirection rule, but can include any other type of modification to the rule set that is supported by the redirection server as discussed above.

Art Unit: 3992

During reexamination, claims are given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification and limitations in the specification are not read into the claims (*In re Yamamoto*, 740 F.2d 1569, 222 USPQ 934 (Fed. Cir. 1984)).

As per claims 24, 26, 40-43, and 83-90, the Examiner agrees with Patent Owner that instructions are received by the redirection server to modify the rule set. However, modification of the rule set or the redirection server being programmed to modify the rule set is not recited in the claim. The claim merely recites "...instructions to the redirection server to modify the rule set are received...", which is disclosed by Radia. Specifically, the reference teaches the router 106 receives instruction to modify its filtering rules from the ANCS server 112, illustrated in Fig. 1 as located on the network site the router. Radia at 6:66-77:8 recites:

In step 604, the ANCS 11 uses the single filtering rule 404 included in the filtering profile 400 to establish a packet filter for IP packets originating from the client system 102b. The packet filter is established by reconfiguring one or more of the components of the network 100 that forward packets originating at the client system 102b. For example, in some cases that packet filter may be established by reconfiguring the modem 104b connected to the client system 102. Alternatively, the packet filter may be established by reconfigured router 106.

The claims do not require the modification, but merely receiving instructions to modify the rule set. If it is assumed that modification is required in this claim language, the Office action notes that ANCS together with the router of Radia teach the redirection server. See page 6 of Exhibit BB. Therefore, modification is occurring at the redirection server (ANCS combined with router).

Art Unit: 3992

Combining Radia and Stockwell

PO: Patent Owner incorporates by reference the argument against combining Stockwell and Willens.

TPR: Requester submits that Patent Owner is incorrect to argue that the claims are nonobvious merely because neither Radia nor Stockwell are anticipation references, and the error in the argument explains the Examiner's basis for citing *In re Keller*. "One cannot show non-obviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on a combination of reference's." *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413 (CCPA 1981).

Examiner: The Examiner agrees with the Requester. Also, Radia and Stockwell are both directed to providing a configurable network device that provides IP packet filtering. Stockwell includes a teaching that a network device, such as a firewall, can redirect a communication to an alternate destination. It would have been obvious to incorporate this redirection feature into the packet filters of Radia. The redirection feature would improve similar device (the filtering capabilities of Radia) in the same way. See MPEP 2143. The combination is also obvious because it requires only applying a known technique (redirection) to known device (the packet filters of Radia) to yield predictable results (a packet filter with the ability to redirect packets). See MPEP 2143. Radia teaches blocking and it would be obvious to extend blocking to include Stockwell's redirecting feature.

Art Unit: 3992

Rejection of Claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-43 and 68-90 as Being Obvious Over Coss in view of Admitted Prior Art

PO: Patent Owner argues that “in the earlier *ex parte* Reexamination Proceeding 90/009,301 for the ‘118, the Primary Examiner held that Provisional Application No. 60/084, 014 filed May 4, 1998 (the ‘014 Application) clearly supports the disclosure in the ‘118 Patent... Indeed, the August 14, 1997 Technical Report that was attached to each of the 37 C.F.R. §1.131 Declaration is essentially identical to the disclosure of the ‘014 Application.”

TPR: Requester notes that the claims have changed since the Order, in particular, that reexamination proceeding resulted in the cancellation of all of the original independent claims and amendments to numerous others. In this reexamination, the Patent Owner has presented new claims. Thus, the Patent Owner has not shown that the Technical Innovation Report supports the claims as they stand now.

The Technical Innovation Report does not provide 112 support for a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address as recited in claim 16.

Examiner: As per the earlier *ex parte* reexamination proceeding, the examiner stated that the claims are entitled to the May 4, 1998 priority date of the provisional application. In this proceeding, Patent Owner argues that the provisionally reference is the same as the Technical Report document filed August 14, 1997; therefore, the claims should be given a priority date of August 14, 1997.

Upon further review, the Examiner notes that Patent Owner has established conception, but fails to show due diligence from a date prior to the date of reduction to practice of the Coss reference to either a constructive reduction to practice or an actual reduction to practice.

Art Unit: 3992

37 CFR 1.131 (b) provides three ways in which one can establish prior invention of the claimed subject matter. The showing of facts must be sufficient to show:

(a) actual reduction to practice of the invention prior to the effective date of the reference; or

(b) conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the reference with due diligence

from prior to the reference date to a subsequent (actual) reduction to practice; or

(c) conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the reference coupled with due

diligence from prior to the reference date to the filing date of the application (construction reduction to practice). See MPEP 715.07 III.

Evidence in the form of exhibits may accompany the affidavit or declaration. Each exhibit relied upon should be specially referred to in the affidavit or declaration, in terms of what it is relied upon to show." MPEP 715.06. In this case, the declaration fails to explain which facts are being relied on to prove diligence. Also, Patent Owner has failed to provide evidence to fully account for the time period during which due diligence must be established.

An applicant must account for the entire period during which diligence is required. GouM v. Schawlow, 363 F.2d 908, 919, 150 USPQ 634, 643 (CCPA 1966) (Merely stating that there were no weeks or months that the invention was not worked on is not enough.); In re Harry, 333 F.2d 920, 923, 142 USPQ 164, 166 (CCPA 1964)(statement that the subject matter "was diligently reduced to practice" is not a showing but a mere pleading). A 2-day period lacking activity has been held to be fatal. In re Mulder, 716 F.2d 1542, 1545, 219 USPQ 189, 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (37 CFR 1.131 issue); Fitzgerald v. Arbib, 268 F.2d 763, 766, 122 USPQ 530, 532 (CCPA 1959) (Less than 1 month of inactivity during critical period. Efforts to exploit an invention commercially do not constitute diligence in reducing it to practice. An actual reduction to practice in the case of a design for a three-dimensional article requires that it should be embodied in some structure other than a mere drawing.); Kendall v. Searles, 173 F. 2d 986, 993, 81 USPQ 363, 369 (CCPA 1949) (Diligence requires that applicants must be specific as to dates and facts.)

The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a reduction to practice of the invention in this country or a NAFTA or WTO member country prior to the effective date of the Coss

Art Unit: 3992

reference. To establish actual reduction to practice, a showing of the invention in a physical or tangible form that shows every element of the count. *Wetmore v. Quick*, 536 F.2d 937, 942, 190 USPQ 223, 227 (CCPA 1976). For an actual reduction to practice, the invention must have been sufficiently tested to demonstrate that it will work for its intended purpose, but it need not be in commercially satisfactory stage of development. See, e.g., *Scott v. Finney*, 34 F.3d 1058, 1062, 32 USPQ2d 1115, 1118-19 (Fed. Cir. 1994). MPEP 2138.05.

PO: Patent Owner argues that Coss does not teach a redirection server be configured to allow automated modification of the rule set correlated to the TANA, as taught in, e.g., claims 16-23 and 36-39 of the '118 Patent. Coss does not teach or suggest correlation between a user's rule set and a TANA for that user's computer. Coss does not explicitly disclose that the firewall 211 is configured to allow automated modification of a least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address.

TPR: Requester submits that Coss teaches "a single firewall can support multiple users, each with a separate security policy." Coss, 3:31-33. Coss also teaches that rules are associated with an IP address, such as a source or destination IP address. See Coss, 4:4-11 and Fig. 3. The Admitted Prior Art teaches that it was known to provide temporary IP network addresses to users, and the Examiner determined that it would have been obvious to associate Coss' security rules with a temporarily assigned IP address. One cannot show non-obviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on a combination of references. *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 314 (CCPS 1981).

Art Unit: 3992

Examiner: The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Patent Owner. Coss teaches dynamic rules which are included with the access rules as a need arises. These rules can be loaded at any time to authorize specific network sessions. See col. 8, lines 24-36. The rules of Coss authorizes specific network session, which is the same as the rule set of '118 Patent (i.e. "type of service which may or may not be accessed, a location, which may or may not be accessed.")

As per Coss not teaching a temporarily assigned network address, the Office action states that at page 340 and 341 of Request that the Coss does not teach the rule set being correlated to a temporarily assigned network address, but that this is an obvious over the Admitted Prior Art. Specifically, pages 340 and 341 recite the following:

Cosset al. do not explicitly disclose the firewall 211 is programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address.

"In prior art systems as shown in FIG. 1 when an Internet user establishes a connection with an Internet Service Provider (ISP), the user first makes a physical connection between their computer 100 and a dial-up networking server 102, the user provides to the dial-up networking server their user ID and password. The dial-up networking server then passes the user ID and password, along with a temporary Internet Protocol (IP) address for use by the user to the ISP's authentication and accounting server 104. A detailed description of the IP communications protocol is discussed in Internetworking with TCP/IP, 3rd ed., Douglas Comer, Prentice Hall, 1995, which is fully incorporated herein by reference. The authentication and accounting server, upon verification of the user ID and password using a database 106 would send an authorization message to the dial-up networking server 102 to allow the user to use the temporary IP address assigned to that user by the dial-up networking server and then logs the connection and assigned IP address. For the duration of that session, whenever the user would make a request to the Internet 110 via a gateway 108, the end user would be identified by the temporarily assigned IP address." [" 118 patent, 1st paragraph of Background of the Invention section, emphasis added] Firewall 211 is programmed with a user's rule set correlated to an IP address. It would have been obvious that this IP address may be temporarily assigned. A first reason is this is simply combining prior art elements (temporary IP addresses) to known methods (assigning a user with an IP address) to yield predictable results. A second reason is this would allow dial-up users to temporarily connect their computers to the user site 201, as suggested by the APA systems.

Art Unit: 3992

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jalatee Worjloh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3992

Conferees:

/Fred Ferris/

/Woo H. Choi/

Requirement to pay appeal forwarding fee. In order to avoid dismissal of the instant appeal in any application or ex parte reexamination proceeding, 37 CFR 41.45 requires payment of an appeal forwarding fee within the time permitted by 37 CFR 41.45(a), unless appellant had timely paid the fee for filing a brief required by 37 CFR 41.20(b) in effect on March 18, 2013.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
95/002,035 901012342	09/12/2012	6779118	RI1341006F	1745
40401	7590	02/19/2014	EXAMINER	
Herskovitz & Associates, PLLC 2845 Duke Street Alexandria, VA 22314			WORJLOH, JALATEE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3992	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/19/2014	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patents and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Date: **MAILED**

FEB 19 2014

CENTRAL REEXAMINATION UNIT

THIRD PARTY REQUESTER'S CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS

David L. McCombs
HAYNES & BOONE, LLP, IP Section
2323 Victory Ave., Suite 700
Dallas, TX 75219

**Transmittal of Communication to Third Party Requester
Inter Partes Reexamination**

REEXAMINATION CONTROL NO. : 95002035 + 90012342
PATENT NO. : 6779118
ART UNIT : 3993

Enclosed is a copy of the latest communication from the United States Patent and Trademark Office in the above-identified reexamination proceeding. 37 CFR 1.903.

Prior to the filing of a Notice of Appeal, each time the patent owner responds to this communication, the third party requester of the inter partes reexamination may once file written comments within a period of 30 days from the date of service of the patent owner's response. This 30-day time period is statutory (35 U.S.C. 314(b)(2)), and, as such, it cannot be extended. See also 37 CFR 1.947.

If an ex parte reexamination has been merged with the inter partes reexamination, no responsive submission by any ex parte third party requester is permitted.

All correspondence relating to this inter partes reexamination proceeding should be directed to the Central Reexamination Unit at the mail, FAX, or hand-carry addresses given at the end of the communication enclosed with this transmittal.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAILED

FEB 19 2014

Hershkoviz & Associates, LLC
2845 Duke Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

(For Patent Owner)

CENTRAL REEXAMINATION UNIT

David L. McCombs
Haynes & Boone, LLP
2323 Victory Avenue, Suite 700
Dallas, Texas 75219

(For the *Inter Partes* Requester)

James J. Wong
2108 Gossamer Avenue
Redwood City, California 94065

(For the *Ex Parte* Requester)

In re Ikudome et al.
Inter Partes Reexamination Proceeding
Control No.: 95/002,035
Filed: July 12, 2012
Patent No. 6,779,118 C1

:
:
:
:
:
: DECISION ON PETITION
: UNDER 37 CFR § 1.181

In re Ikudome et al.
Ex Parte Reexamination Proceeding
Control No.: 90/012,342
Filed: June 8, 2012
Patent No. 6,779,118 C1

:
:
:
:
:
:

This is a decision on the petition filed by the Third Party Requester (the "Requester") on October 4, 2013, entitled "PETITION UNDER 37 CFR § 1.181 TO STRIKE PATENT OWNER'S UNTIMELY DECLARATIONS FROM THE RECORD" and the opposition paper filed by Patent Owner on November 4, 2013, entitled "OPPOSITION TO PETITION TO STRIKE PATENT OWNER'S DECLARATIONS".

The petition and the opposition are before the Director of the Central Reexamination Unit.

The Requester's petition is denied for the reasons discussed below. The opposition paper is granted to the extent the petition is denied.

Review of Relevant Facts

- U.S. Patent No. 6,779,118 (the “118 patent”) issued on August 17, 2004.
- A corrected request for *inter partes* reexamination was filed September 12, 2012 and assigned control no. 95/002,035. Reexamination was requested of claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-24, and 26-90 of the ‘118 patent.
- In an order mailed October 19, 2012 (the “Order”), the *inter partes* request was granted. In the first Office action on the merits mailed concurrently, all claims under reexamination were rejected.
- On January 17, 2013, the Patent Owner timely filed a response to the first Office action.
- On February 15, 2013, the Requester filed comments.
- On March 20, 2013, a decision merging the 95/002,035 and 90/012,342 proceedings was mailed.
- On April 29, 2013, an Action Closing Prosecution (“ACP”) was mailed in the merged proceeding.
- On June 28, 2013, the Patent Owner filed a response to the ACP, including a declaration by Moon Tai Yeung and a declaration by Koichiro Ikudome.
- On July 26, 2013 the Requester filed comments.
- On September 9, 2013, the Examiner issued a Right of Appeal Notice (“RAN”).
- On October 4, 2013, the Requester timely filed the instant petition.
- On November 4, 2013, the Patent Owner filed the instant paper opposing the Requester’s petition.

Relevant Regulations and Procedures

37 CFR §1.181 Petition to the Director.

(a) Petition may be taken to the Director:

- (1) From any action or requirement of any examiner in the *ex parte* prosecution of an application, or in *ex parte* or *inter partes* prosecution of a reexamination proceeding which is not subject to appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences or to the court;
- (2) In cases in which a statute or the rules specify that the matter is to be determined directly by or reviewed by the Director; and

(3) To invoke the supervisory authority of the Director in appropriate circumstances. For petitions in interferences, see § 1.644. (emphasis added).

37 CFR §1.116 Amendments and affidavits or other evidence after final action and prior to appeal

(e) An affidavit or other evidence submitted after a final rejection or other final action (§1.113) in an application or in an *ex parte* reexamination filed under §1.510, or an action closing prosecution (§1.949) in an inter partes reexamination filed under §1.913 but before or on the same date as of filing an appeal (§41.31 or §41.61 of this title), may be admitted upon a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit and other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented.

Decision

The Requester requests that the declarations by Moon Tai Yeung and Koichiro Ikudome, along with the evidence submitted as exhibits to those declarations, be stricken from the record and not considered on the merits because the Patent Owner has not complied with the required procedure for entry of such materials following an Action Closing Prosecution. According to the Requester, “[t]he Examiner’s decision to allow them [the declarations and evidence] entry is contrary to the procedure required under 37 CFR 1.116(e) and should be corrected by striking the untimely Yeung and Ikudome declarations and evidence from the record”. Petition, page 4. Thus, the main issue in this petition is whether the Examiner followed the Office’s rules and procedures in deciding to consider the declarations filed after ACP.

The record indicates that, in response to the ACP, the Patent Owner argued that the declarations should be entered “because (1) they are necessary to eliminate Coss as ‘prior art’ and (2) they could not have been presented earlier since the inventors did not have a recollection of the evidence establishing an earlier reduction to practice than Coss until after the Examiner’s mailing of the ACP”. See Patent Owner’s Response to ACP filed June 28, 2013, page 18.

In response, on page 18 of the Comments filed on July 26, 2013 (“Comments”), the Requester argued that the late-filed declarations should be denied entry because patent owner failed to demonstrate such “good and sufficient reasons” because the file history of *ex parte* proceeding 90/012,342 contains the following statement:

If necessary, Patent Owner is prepared to file Affidavits under 37 CFR §1.131 in support of prior conception and reduction to practice before the filing date of Coss.

The Requester asserted that "Since Patent Owner was '*prepared to file Affidavits*' after the first Office Action but chose not to, the declarations submitted following the Action Closing Prosecution *could have been* provided earlier". See Comments, page 18 (emphasis in original).

After considering the Patent Owner's response and the Requester's comments, the Examiner decided to consider the declarations submitted after ACP and concluded that the evidence presented is insufficient to overcome the rejections applied in the ACP. RAN, pages 17-19.


On this record, the Requester has failed show that the Examiner has not followed the Office rules and procedures by entering the declaration and evidence absent the "showing of good and sufficient reasons" that is required under 37 CFR 1.116(e). The Patent Owner's statements and the Requester's arguments regarding the declarations were before the Examiner when the decision to enter the declaration was made. Assigning weight to evidence, assessing credibility of statements made on the record, and evaluating merits of arguments is part of the examiner's duty. If the examiner determined, after considering all statements, evidence, and arguments, that the Patent Owner's statements amount to "showing of good and sufficient reasons", the examiner has not failed to follow the Office's rules and procedures. The fact that the Requester does not agree with the conclusion reached by the Examiner does not mean that the Examiner has failed to follow the Office's rules and procedures.

Patent Owner's statement that the Patent Owner is "prepared to file Affidavits" does not necessarily conflict with the later statement that "the inventors did not have a recollection of the evidence establishing an earlier reduction to practice than Coss until after the Examiner's mailing of the ACP" as the Requester suggests. The preparation for the filing of a declaration would include asking the inventors to start investigating the events that are the subject of the declaration by searching for documents etc., which is not inconsistent with one of the inventors statement in the declaration that he "began an investigation in May 2013 to see if we had any documents dated before that date that described the invention and could support an earlier conception and possibly reduction to practice date". Declaration of Koichiro Ikudome filed on June 28, 2013, paragraph 4. This statement indicates that the inventor was not sure whether he had documents necessary to support conception until the search was conducted.

In the absence of conflicting evidence, the Examiner must accept as true factual statements made by declarants. Thus, it is within the Examiner's discretion to conclude that the Patent Owner's statement is not inconsistent with statements in the submitted declarations. Accordingly, the Requester's petition to strike Patent Owner's declaration is denied. The Patent Owner's paper filed in opposition to the Requester's petition is granted to the extent the petition is denied.

CONCLUSION

1. The October 4, 2013 third party requester's petition is denied.
2. The Patent Owner's opposition paper filed November 4, 2013 is granted to the extent the petition is denied.
3. Telephone inquiries related to this decision should be directed to Woo H. Choi, Supervisory Patent Reexamination Specialist, at (571) 272-4179 or Daniel Ryman, Supervisory Patent Reexamination Specialist, at (571) 272-.



Irem Yucel, Director
Central Reexamination Unit

Litigation Search Report CRU 3999

Reexam Control No. 95/002,035

TO: Jalatee Worjloh
Location: CRU
Art Unit: 3992
Date: 01/16/14
Merged: 90/012,342

From: Patricia Volpe
Location: CRU 3999
MDE 429B
Phone: (571) 272-6825
Patricia.volpe@uspto.gov

Search Notes

Litigation search for U.S. Patent Number: **6,779,118**

CLOSED - Linksmart Wireless Technology Llc V. T-Mobile Usa Inc Et Al

8:12cv522

- 1) I performed a KeyCite Search in Westlaw, which retrieves all history on the patent including any litigation.
- 2) I performed a search on the patent in Lexis CourtLink for any open dockets or closed cases.
- 3) I performed a search in Lexis in the Federal Courts and Administrative Materials databases for any cases found.
- 4) I performed a search in Lexis in the IP Journal and Periodicals database for any articles on the patent.
- 5) I performed a search in Lexis in the news databases for any articles about the patent or any articles about litigation on this patent.



Date of Printing: Jan 16, 2014

KEYCITE

H US PAT 6779118 USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM, Assignee: Auriq Systems, Inc. (Aug 17, 2004)

History

Direct History

=> 1 **USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM**, US PAT 6779118, 2004 WL 1841593 (U.S. PTO Utility Aug 17, 2004)

Construed by

H 2 Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC v. T-Mobile USA, Inc., 2010 WL 2640402, 2010 Markman 2640402 (E.D.Tex. Jun 30, 2010) (NO. 2:08-CV-264-DF-CE) (Markman Order Version)

Related References

H 3 Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC v. T-Mobile USA, Inc., 2010 WL 3816679 (E.D.Tex. Sep 02, 2010) (NO. 208CV264)

Report and Recommendation Adopted by

H 4 Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC v. T-Mobile USA, Inc., 2010 WL 3816677 (E.D.Tex. Sep 27, 2010) (NO. 208CV264)

Court Documents

Trial Court Documents (U.S.A.)

E.D.Tex. Trial Pleadings

- 5 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. 1. T-MOBILE USA, INC.; 2. Wayport, Inc.; 3. AT&T, Inc.; 4. AT&T Mobility, LLC; 5. Lodgenet Interactive Corp.; 6. Ibahn General Holdings Corp.; 7. Ethostream, LLC; 8. Hot Point Wireless, Inc.; 9. Netnearu Corp.; 10. Pronto Networks, Inc.; 11. Aptilo N, 2008 WL 3538408 (Trial Pleading) (E.D.Tex. Jul. 1, 2008) **Complaint and Demand for Jury Trial** (NO. 08CV00264)
- 6 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants., 2008 WL 4355636 (Trial Pleading) (E.D.Tex. Aug. 21, 2008) **Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC'S Reply to Ethostream, LLC'S Counterclaim** (NO. 208CV00264)
- 7 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants., 2008 WL 4355637 (Trial Pleading) (E.D.Tex. Aug. 29, 2008) **Answer and Counterclaim** (NO. 208CV00264)
- 8 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. (1) T-MOBILE USA, INC., (2)

© 2014 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

- Wayport, Inc., (3) AT&T, Inc., (4) AT&T Mobility, LLC, (5) Lodgenet Interactive Corp., (6) ibahn General Holdings Corp., (7) Ethostream, LLC, (8) Hot Point Wireless, Inc., (9) Netnearu Corp., (10) Pronto Networks, Inc. (11, 2008 WL 5369919 (Trial Pleading) (E.D.Tex. Sep. 12, 2008) **Defendant ibahn General Holdings Corp.'s Answer and Counterclaims to Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC's Complaint** (NO. 208-CV-00264-TJW-CE)
- 9 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC.; Wayport, Inc.; At&t, Inc.; AT&T Mobility, LLC; Lodgenet Interactive Corporation; Ibahn General Holdings Corp.; Ethostream, LLC; Hot Point Wireless, Inc.; Netnearu Corp.; Pronto Networks, Inc.; Aptilo Networks, Inc.; Freefi Network, 2008 WL 5369920 (Trial Pleading) (E.D.Tex. Sep. 12, 2008) **Defendant Aptilo Networks, Inc.'s Answer, Affirmative Defenses and Counterclaims to Plaintiff's Complaint for Patent Infringement** (NO. 208-CV-264TJW-CE)
- 10 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. 1. T-MOBILE USA, INC.; 2. Wayport, Inc.; 3. AT&T, Inc.; Jury 4. AT&T Mobility, LLC; 5. Lodgenet Interactive Corp.; 6. Ibahn General Holdings Corp.; 7. Ethostream, LLC; 8. Hot Point Wireless, Inc.; 9. Netnearu Corp.; 10. Pronto Networks, Inc.; 11. Apt, 2008 WL 5369909 (Trial Pleading) (E.D.Tex. Sep. 15, 2008) **Defendant Marriott International, Inc.'s Answer and Counterclaims to Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC's Complaint** (NO. 208-CV-00264-TJW-CE)
- 11 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants., 2008 WL 5369910 (Trial Pleading) (E.D.Tex. Sep. 15, 2008) **Wayport, Inc.'s Answer, Defenses, and Counterclaims to Complaint** (NO. 208-CV-00264-TJW-CE)
- 12 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC. et al., Defendants., 2008 WL 5369911 (Trial Pleading) (E.D.Tex. Sep. 15, 2008) **Defendant Barnes & Noble Booksellers, Inc. Answer to Plaintiff's Complaint** (NO. 208-CV-00264-TJW-CE)
- 13 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants., 2008 WL 5369912 (Trial Pleading) (E.D.Tex. Sep. 15, 2008) **McDonald's Corp.'s Answer, Defenses, and Counterclaims to Complaint** (NO. 208-CV-00264-TJW-CE)
- 14 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants., 2008 WL 5369913 (Trial Pleading) (E.D.Tex. Sep. 15, 2008) **Meraki, Inc.'s Answer, Defenses, and Counterclaims to Complaint** (NO. 208-CV-00264-TJW-CE)
- 15 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants., 2008 WL 5369914 (Trial Pleading) (E.D.Tex. Sep. 15, 2008) **Best Western International, Inc.'s Answer to Plaintiff's Complaint and Counterclaims** (NO. 208-CV-00264-TJW-CE)
- 16 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC.; et al., Defendants., 2008 WL 5369921 (Trial Pleading) (E.D.Tex. Sep. 15, 2008) **T-Mobile USA, Inc.'s Answer and Counterclaims** (NO. 208-CV-00264-TJW-CE)
- 17 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, Inc. et al., Defendants., 2008 WL 5369922 (Trial Pleading) (E.D.Tex. Sep. 15, 2008) **Defendant Mail Boxes Etc., Inc.'s Answer to Plaintiff's Complaint** (NO. 208-CV-00264-TJW)
- 18 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC.; Wayport, Inc.; AT&T, Inc.; AT&T Mobility, LLC; Lodgenet Interactive Corporation; Ibahn General Holdings Corp.; Ethostream, LLC; Hot Point Wireless, Inc.; Netnearu Corp.; Pronto

- Networks, Inc.; Aptilo Networks, Inc.; Freefi Network, 2008 WL 5369915 (Trial Pleading) (E.D.Tex. Sep. 19, 2008) **Ramada Worldwide, Inc.'s Answer to Complaint and Counterclaims** (NO. 208-CV-00264-TJW-CE)
- 19 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants., 2008 WL 5369916 (Trial Pleading) (E.D.Tex. Sep. 19, 2008) **Pronto Networks, Inc.'s Answer, Defenses, and Counterclaims to the Complaint** (NO. 208-CV-00264-TJW-CE)
- 20 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. 1. T-MOBILE USA, INC.; 2. Wayport, Inc.; 3. AT&T, Inc.; 4. AT&T Mobility, LLC; 5. Lodgenet Interactive Corp.; 6. Ibahn General Holdings Corp.; 7. Ethostream, LLC; 8. Hot Point Wireless, Inc.; 9. Netnearu Corp.; 10. Pronto Networks, Inc.; 11. Aptilo N, 2008 WL 5369917 (Trial Pleading) (E.D.Tex. Sep. 22, 2008) **Defendant Freefi Networks, Inc.'s Answer and Counterclaims to Original Complaint** (NO. 208CV00264TJW)
- 21 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants. BEST WESTERN INTERNATIONAL, INC., Third-Party Plaintiff, v. BESTCOMM NETWORKS, INC. and Nomadix, Inc., Third-Party Defendants., 2009 WL 5819738 (Trial Pleading) (E.D.Tex. Nov. 13, 2009) **Third Party Complaint of Best Western International, Inc.** (NO. 208CV00264)
- 22 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendant., 2009 WL 5819739 (Trial Pleading) (E.D.Tex. Nov. 20, 2009) **Ramada Worldwide, Inc.'s Amended Answer to Complaint and Counterclaims** (NO. 208CV00264)
- 23 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendant., 2009 WL 5819740 (Trial Pleading) (E.D.Tex. Nov. 20, 2009) **Ethostream, LLC's Amended Answer and Counterclaim** (NO. 208CV00264)
- 24 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants., 2010 WL 3050903 (Trial Pleading) (E.D.Tex. May 7, 2010) **Best Western International, Inc.'s First Amended Answer, Defenses and Counterclaims** (NO. 208-CV-00264-TJW-CE)
- 25 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants. Best Western International, Inc., Third-Party Plaintiff, v. Bestcomm Networks, Inc. and Nomadix, Inc., Third-Party Defendants., 2010 WL 4953062 (Trial Pleading) (E.D.Tex. Oct. 7, 2010) **First Amended Third Party Complaint of Best Western International, Inc.** (NO. 208-CV-00264-DF-CE, 208-CV-00304-DF-CE, 208-CV-00385-DF-CE, 209-CV-00026-DF-CE)

E.D.Tex. Expert Testimony

- 26 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants. And Related Counterclaims., 2008 WL 8039590 (Expert Report and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. 2008) **Declaration of Tal Lavian, Ph.D. in Support of Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC's Response to Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment of Invalidity for Indefiniteness Under 35 U.S.** (NO. 208-CV-00264-DF-CE, 208-CV-00304-DF-CE, 208-CV-00385-DF-CE, 209-CV-00026-DF-CE)
- 27 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGIES, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants., 2010 WL 3711476 (Expert Report and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. Apr. 14, 2010) **Declaration of Kevin Jeffay, Ph.D.** (NO. 208-CV-00264-DF-CE, 208-CV-00304-DF-CE,

- 208-CV-00385-DF-CE, 209-CV-00026-DF-CE)
- 28 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., Wayport, Inc., At&t, Inc., At&t Mobility, LLC, Lodgenet Interactive Corporation, Ibahn General Holdings Corp., Ethostream, LLC, Hot Point Wireless Inc., Netnearu Corp., Pronto Networks, Ic., Aptilo Networks, Inc., Freefi Networks,, 2010 WL 3842257 (Expert Deposition) (E.D.Tex. Apr. 22, 2010) (**Deposition of Kevin Jeffay, Ph.D.**) (NO. 208-CV-00264-TJW-CE)
- 29 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendant., 2010 WL 3711477 (Expert Report and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. Apr. 30, 2010) **Declaration Of Tal Lavian, Ph.D. in Support of Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC'S Reply Claim Construction Brief** (NO. 208-CV-00264-DF-CE, 208-CV-00304-DF-CE, 208-CV-00385-DF-CE, 209-CV-00026-DF-CE)

E.D.Tex. Trial Motions, Memoranda And Affidavits

- 30 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, Inc. et al., Defendants., 2008 WL 5369918 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. Sep. 22, 2008) **Defendant At&T Mobility LLC's Motion to Dismiss** (NO. 208-CV-00264-TJW-CE)
- 31 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC.; et al., Defendants; Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC, Plaintiff, v. Cisco Systems, Inc.; Et Al., Defendants; Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC, Plaintiff, v. SBC Internet Services, Inc. d/b/a AT&T Internet Services, Defendants;, 2009 WL 721149 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. Jan. 23, 2009) **Joint Motion to Consolidate** (NO. 208-CV-00264TJW-CE, 208-CV-00304-DF-CE, 208-CV-00385-TJW, 209-CV-00026-TJW-CE)
- 32 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC.; et al., Defendants; Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC, Plaintiff, v. Cisco Systems, Inc.; et al., Defendants; Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC, Plaintiff, v. SBC Internet Services, Inc. d/b/a At&t Internet Services, Defendants;, 2009 WL 721433 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. Jan. 23, 2009) **Joint Motion to Consolidate** (NO. 208-CV-00264-TJW-CE, 208-CV-00304-DF-CE, 208-CV-00385-TJW, 209-CV-00026-TJW-CE)
- 33 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants., 2009 WL 714069 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. Feb. 27, 2009) **Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC's Motion for Default Judgment Against Hot Point Wireless, Inc. and Second Rule LLC** (NO. 208-CV-00264-DF-CE)
- 34 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al, Defendants. Best Western International, Inc., Third-Party Plaintiff, v. Bestcomm Networks, Inc. and Nomadix, Inc., Third-Party Defendants., 2010 WL 974673 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. Feb. 25, 2010) **Third-Party Defendant Nomadix, Inc.'s Motion to Strike or Dismiss Third-Party Complaint of Best Western International, Inc.** (NO. 208-CV-00264-DF-CE, 208-CV-00304-DF-CE, 208-CV-00385-DF-CE, 209-CV-00026-DF-CE)
- 35 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants., 2010 WL 2155255 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. Mar. 19, 2010) **Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC's Opening Claim Construction Brief** (NO. 208CV00264)
- 36 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al.,

- Defendants. BEST WESTERN INTERNATIONAL, INC., Third-Party Plaintiff, v. BESTCOMM NETWORKS, INC. and Nomadix, Inc., Third-Party Defendants., 2010 WL 2155256 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. Mar. 31, 2010) **Best Western International's Opposition to Nomadix's Motion to Strike or Dismiss Third Party Complaint** (NO. 208CV00264)
- 37 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants. BEST WESTERN INTERNATIONAL, INC., Third-Party Plaintiff, v. BESTCOMM NETWORKS, NOMADIX, INC., Third-Party Defendants. BESTCOMM NETWORKS, INC., Third-Party Defendant, v. NOMADIX, INC., Third-Party Defendant., 2010 WL 2155257 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. Apr. 16, 2010) **Nomadix, Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss Bestcomm Networks, Inc.'s Crossclaims** (NO. 208CV00264)
- 38 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants., 2010 WL 2155258 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. Apr. 16, 2010) **Claim Construction Brief of Defendants** (NO. 208CV00264)
- 39 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants., 2010 WL 2155259 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. Apr. 19, 2010) **Best Western's Supplemental Claim Construction Brief** (NO. 208CV00264)
- 40 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants., 2010 WL 2155260 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. Apr. 29, 2010) **Defendants' Motion to Exclude the Expert Declaration of Dr. Tal Lavian in Support of Plaintiff's Claim Construction Reply Brief** (NO. 208CV00264)
- 41 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants., 2010 WL 2155261 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. Apr. 30, 2010) **Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC's Reply Claim Construction Brief** (NO. 208CV00264)
- 42 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants. And Related Counterclaims., 2010 WL 3050762 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. May 7, 2010) **iBAHN's Claim Construction Surreply Brief** (NO. 208-CV-00264-DF-CE, 208-CV-00304-DF-CE, 208-CV-00385-DF-CE, 209-CV-00026-DF-CE)
- 43 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants. And Related Counterclaims., 2010 WL 3050763 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. May 11, 2010) **Claim Construction Sur-Reply Brief of Defendants** (NO. 208-CV-00264-DF-CE, 208-CV-00304-DF-CE, 208-CV-00385-DF-CE, 209-CV-00026-DF-CE)
- 44 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants., 2010 WL 3050764 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. May 17, 2010) **Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment of Invalidity for Indefiniteness under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2** (NO. 208-CV-00264-DF-CE, 208-CV-00304-DF-CE, 208-CV-00385-DF-CE, 209-CV-00026-DF-CE)
- 45 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants. And Related Counterclaims., 2010 WL 3050765 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. May 17, 2010) **Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC's Response to Defendants' Motion to Exclude the Expert Declaration of Dr. Tal LA Vian Addressing the Declaration of Dr. Kevin Jeffay** (NO. 208-CV-00264-DF-CE,

- 208-CV-00304-DF-CE, 208-CV-00385-DF-CE, 209-CV-00026-DF-CE)
- 46 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al, Defendants. And Related Counterclaims., 2010 WL 3050766 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. May 23, 2010) **Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC's Response to Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment of Invalidity for Indefiniteness under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2** (NO. 208-CV-00264-DF-CE, 208-CV-00304-DF-CE, 208-CV-00385-DF-CE, 209-CV-00026-DF-CE)
- 47 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al, Defendants., 2010 WL 3050767 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. Jun. 2, 2010) **Defendants' Reply in Support of Their Motion for Partial Summary Judgment of Invalidity for Indefiniteness under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2** (NO. 208-CV-00264-DF-CE, 208-CV-00304-DF-CE, 208-CV-00385-DF-CE, 209-CV-00026-DF-CE)
- 48 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants. And Related Counterclaims., 2010 WL 4927709 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. Sep. 15, 2010) **Defendants' Motion for a Stay Pending the Reexamination of the Patent in Suit** (NO. 208-CV-00264-DF-CE, 208-CV-00304-DF-CE, 208-CV-00385-DF-CE, 209-CV-00026-DF-CE)
- 49 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Linksmart, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants., 2010 WL 4927710 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. Oct. 7, 2010) **Defendant Choice Hotels International, Inc.'s Reply in Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment of Non-Infringement** (NO. 208-CV-00264-DF-CE, 208-CV-00304-DF-CE, 208-CV-00385-DF-CE, 209-CV-00026-DF-CE)

E.D.Tex. Exhibits

- 50 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC. et al., 2010 WL 4024689 (Exhibit) (E.D.Tex. Mar. 31, 2010) **Direct Sales Agreement** (NO. 208CV00264)
- 51 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC. et al., 2010 WL 4024690 (Exhibit) (E.D.Tex. Mar. 31, 2010) **Nomadix, Inc. Reseller Agreement** (NO. 208CV00264)

E.D.Tex. Expert Resumes

- 52 Kevin Jeffay, curriculum vitae filed in Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC V. T-Mobile USA, Inc. et al, 2010 WL 5779215 (Court-filed Expert Resume) (E.D.Tex. Jan. 18, 2010) **Expert Resume of Kevin Jeffay** (NO. 208CV00264)
- 53 Tal Lavian, Ph.D., curriculum vitae filed in Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC v. T-Mobile USA, Inc., et al, 2010 WL 3515006 (Court-filed Expert Resume) (E.D.Tex. May 23, 2010) **Expert Resume of Tal Lavian** (NO. 208CV00264)

E.D.Tex. Trial Filings

- 54 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants; Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC, Plaintiff, v. Cisco Systems, Inc., et al., Defendants; Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC, Plaintiff, v. SBC Internet Services, Inc. D/

- B/A AT&T Internet Services, Defendants;, 2009 WL 3147057 (Trial Filing) (E.D.Tex. Jun. 1, 2009) **Joint Case Management Report** (NO. 208-CV-00264-DF-CE, 208-CV-00304-DF-CE, 208-CV-00385-DF-CE, 209-CV-00026-DF-CE)
- 55 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants; Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC, Plaintiff, v. Cisco Systems, Inc., et al., Defendants; Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC, Plaintiff, v. SBC Internet Services, Inc. D/ B/A AT&T Internet Services, Defendants;, 2009 WL 3147069 (Trial Filing) (E.D.Tex. Jun. 1, 2009) **Joint Case Management Report** (NO. 208-CV-00264-DF-CE, 208-CV-00304-DF-CE, 208-CV-00385-DF-CE, 209-CV-00026-DF-CE)
- 56 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants; Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC, Plaintiff, v. Cisco Systems, Inc., et al., Defendants; Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC, Plaintiff, v. SBC Internet Services, Inc. D/ B/A AT&T Internet Services, Defendants;, 2009 WL 3147139 (Trial Filing) (E.D.Tex. Jun. 1, 2009) **Joint Case Management Report** (NO. 208-CV-00264-DF-CE, 208-CV-00304-DF-CE, 208-CV-00385-DF-CE, 209-CV-00026-DF-CE)
- 57 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC. et al., 2010 WL 1733529 (Trial Filing) (E.D.Tex. Feb. 19, 2010) **Claim Construction Chart** (NO. 208CV00264)
- 58 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., 2010 WL 3053062 (Trial Filing) (E.D.Tex. May 14, 2010) **Agreed Constructions** (NO. 08CV00264)

E.D.Tex. Verdicts, Agreements and Settlements

- 59 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC.; Wayport, Inc.; AT&T, Inc.; AT&T Mobility, LLC; Lodgenet Interactive Corp.; Ibahn General Holdings Corp.; Ethostream, LLC; Hot Point Wireless, Inc.; Netnearu Corp.; Pronto Networks, Inc.; Freefi Networks, Inc.; MerakI, Inc. Second, 2008 WL 5533263 (Verdict, Agreement and Settlement) (E.D.Tex. Dec. 9, 2008) **Jury** (NO. 208CV00264)
- 60 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants; Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC, Plaintiff, v. Cisco Systems, Inc., et al., Defendants; Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC, Plaintiff, v. SBC Internet Services, Inc. d/b/a AT&T Internet Services, Defendants;, 2009 WL 3147112 (Verdict, Agreement and Settlement) (E.D.Tex. Jun. 1, 2009) **Joint Case Management Report** (NO. 208-CV-00264-DF-CE, 208-CV-00304-DF-CE, 208-CV-00385-DF-CE, 209-CV-00026-DF-CE)
- 61 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants. And Related Counterclaims., 2012 WL 2091453 (Verdict, Agreement and Settlement) (E.D.Tex. Apr. 4, 2012) **Joint Motion to Dismiss All Remaining Defendants** (NO. 208CV00264JRGRSP, 2:08-CV-00304-DF-CE, 2:08-CV-00385-DF-CE, 2:09-CV-00026-DF-CE)
- 62 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants. Best Western International, Inc., Third-Party Plaintiff, v. Bestcomm Networks, Inc. and Nomadix, Inc., Third-Party Defendants. Bestcomm Networks, Inc., Third-Party Defendant, v. Nomadix, Inc., Third-Party Defen, 2012 WL 2091454 (Verdict, Agreement and Settlement) (E.D.Tex. Apr. 4, 2012) **Stipulated Dismissal of Third-Party Complaint and Cross Claim Without Prejudice** (NO. 2:08-CV-00264-DF-CE, 2:08-CV-00304-DF-CE,

2:08-CV-00385-DF-CE, 2:09-CV-00026-DF-CE)

Dockets (U.S.A.)

E.D.Tex.

- 63 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC v. T-MOBILE USA, INC. ET AL, NO. 2:08cv00264 (Docket) (E.D.Tex. Jul. 1, 2008)

Expert Court Documents (U.S.A.)

E.D.Tex. Expert Testimony

- 64 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants. And Related Counterclaims., 2008 WL 8039590 (Expert Report and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. 2008) **Declaration of Tal Lavian, Ph.D. in Support of Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC's Response to Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment of Invalidity for Indefiniteness Under 35 U.S.** (NO. 208-CV-00264-DF-CE, 208-CV-00304-DF-CE, 208-CV-00385-DF-CE, 209-CV-00026-DF-CE)
- 65 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGIES, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants., 2010 WL 3711476 (Expert Report and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. Apr. 14, 2010) **Declaration of Kevin Jeffay, Ph.D.** (NO. 208-CV-00264-DF-CE, 208-CV-00304-DF-CE, 208-CV-00385-DF-CE, 209-CV-00026-DF-CE)
- 66 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., Wayport, Inc., At&t, Inc., At&t Mobility, LLC, Lodgenet Interactive Corporation, Ibahn General Holdings Corp., Ethostream, LLC, Hot Point Wireless Inc., Netnearu Corp., Pronto Networks, Ic., Aptilo Networks, Inc., Freefi Networks., 2010 WL 3842257 (Expert Deposition) (E.D.Tex. Apr. 22, 2010) **Deposition of Kevin Jeffay, Ph.D.** (NO. 208-CV-00264-TJW-CE)
- 67 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendant., 2010 WL 3711477 (Expert Report and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. Apr. 30, 2010) **Declaration Of Tal Lavian, Ph.D. in Support of Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC'S Reply Claim Construction Brief** (NO. 208-CV-00264-DF-CE, 208-CV-00304-DF-CE, 208-CV-00385-DF-CE, 209-CV-00026-DF-CE)

E.D.Tex. Trial Motions, Memoranda And Affidavits

- 68 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants., 2010 WL 2155260 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. Apr. 29, 2010) **Defendants' Motion to Exclude the Expert Declaration of Dr. Tal Lavian in Support of Plaintiff's Claim Construction Reply Brief** (NO. 208CV00264)
- 69 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., et al., Defendants., 2010 WL 2155261 (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) (E.D.Tex. Apr. 30, 2010) **Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC's Reply Claim Construction Brief** (NO. 208CV00264)

E.D.Tex. Expert Resumes

- 70 Kevin Jeffay, curriculum vitae filed in Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC V. T-Mobile USA, Inc. et al, 2010 WL 5779215 (Court-filed Expert Resume) (E.D.Tex. Jan. 18, 2010) **Expert Resume of Kevin Jeffay** (NO. 208CV00264)
- 71 Tal Lavian, Ph.D., curriculum vitae filed in Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC v. T-Mobile USA, Inc., et al, 2010 WL 3515006 (Court-filed Expert Resume) (E.D.Tex. May 23, 2010) **Expert Resume of Tal Lavian** (NO. 208CV00264)

E.D.Tex.

- 72 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC v. T-MOBILE USA, INC. ET AL, NO. 2:08cv00264 (Docket) (E.D.Tex. Jul. 1, 2008)

Patent Family

- 73 AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM FOR INTERNET COMMUNICATION, Derwent World Patents Legal 2000-072306+

Assignments

- 74 Action: ASSIGNMENT OF ASSIGNORS INTEREST (SEE DOCUMENT FOR DETAILS).
Number of Pages: 012, (DATE RECORDED: Jul 02, 2008)
- 75 ACTION: ASSIGNMENT OF ASSIGNORS INTEREST (SEE DOCUMENT FOR DETAILS).
NUMBER OF PAGES: 003, (DATE RECORDED: Jun 29, 1999)

Patent Status Files

- .. Patent Suit(See LitAlert Entries),
- .. Patent Suit(See LitAlert Entries),
- .. Request for Re-Examination, (OG DATE: Aug 28, 2012)
- .. Request for Re-Examination, (OG DATE: Aug 14, 2012)
- .. Request for Re-Examination, (OG DATE: Jul 24, 2012)
- .. Request for Re-Examination, (OG DATE: Apr 10, 2012)
- .. Re-Examination Certificate, (OG DATE: Mar 27, 2012)
- .. Patent Suit(See LitAlert Entries),
- .. Patent Suit(See LitAlert Entries),
- .. Patent Suit(See LitAlert Entries),
- .. Patent Suit(See LitAlert Entries),
- .. Request for Re-Examination, (OG DATE: Dec 02, 2008)
- .. Patent Suit(See LitAlert Entries),

Docket Summaries

- 89 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY LLC v. T-MOBILE USA INC ET AL, (C.D.CAL.

- Apr 05, 2012) (NO. 8:12CV00522), (28 USC 1331)
- 90 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY LLC v. TJ HOSPITALITY LTD ET AL, (E.D.TEX. Jul 29, 2010) (NO. 2:10CV00277), (15 USC 1126 PATENT INFRINGEMENT)
- 91 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY LLC v. SIX CONTINENTS HOTELS INC ET AL, (E.D.TEX. Jan 21, 2009) (NO. 2:09CV00026), (28 USC 1338 PATENT INFRINGEMENT)
- 92 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC v. SBC INTERNET SERVICES, INC., (E.D.TEX. Oct 09, 2008) (NO. 2:08CV00385), (15 USC 1126 PATENT INFRINGEMENT)
- 93 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC v. CISCO SYSTEMS, INC. ET AL, (E.D.TEX. Aug 04, 2008) (NO. 2:08CV00304), (35 USC 271 PATENT INFRINGEMENT)
- 94 LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC v. T-MOBILE USA, INC. ET AL, (E.D.TEX. Jul 01, 2008) (NO. 2:08CV00264), (15 USC 1126 PATENT INFRINGEMENT)

Litigation Alert

- 95 Derwent LitAlert P2013-38-86 (Apr 05, 2012) Action Taken: ORDER BY JUDGE ANDREW J GUILFORD, GRANTING STIPULATION TO STAY CASE PENDING PREPARATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT 161 MADE JS-6 CASE TERMINATED
- 96 Derwent LitAlert P2012-16-134 (Apr 05, 2012) Action Taken: CAUSE - 28 USC 1331 - COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT
- 97 Derwent LitAlert P2010-36-12 (Jul 29, 2010) Action Taken: 15 USC 1126 - COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT
- 98 Derwent LitAlert P2009-07-58 (Jan 21, 2009) Action Taken: Complaint
- 99 Derwent LitAlert P2009-06-09 (Aug 04, 2008) Action Taken: Complaint
- 100 Derwent LitAlert P2008-47-12 (Jul 01, 2008) Action Taken: Complaint

Prior Art (Coverage Begins 1976)

- © 101 METHOD OF PROVIDING TEMPORARY ACCESS OF A CALLING UNIT TO AN ANONYMOUS UNIT, US PAT 6157829 Assignee: Motorola, Inc., (U.S. PTO Utility 2000)
- © 102 SECURITY SYSTEM FOR INTERNET PROVIDER TRANSACTION, US PAT 5845070 Assignee: Auric Web Systems, Inc., (U.S. PTO Utility 1998)
- © 103 SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR DATABASE ACCESS CONTROL, US PAT 5696898 Assignee: Lucent Technologies Inc., (U.S. PTO Utility 1997)
- © 104 SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROVIDING PEER LEVEL ACCESS CONTROL ON A NETWORK, US PAT 6233686 Assignee: AT & T Corp., (U.S. PTO Utility 2001)

US District Court Civil Docket

U.S. District - California Central
(Southern Division - Santa Ana)

8:12cv522

Linksmart Wireless Technology Llc v. T-Mobile USA Inc et al

This case was retrieved from the court on Wednesday, January 08, 2014

Date Filed: **04/05/2012**

Assigned To: **Judge Andrew J. Guilford**

Referred To: **Magistrate Judge Arthur
Nakazato**

Nature of
suit: **Patent (830)**

Cause: **Fed. Question: Trademark**

Lead Docket: **None**

Other Docket: **None**

Jurisdiction: **Federal Question**

Class Code: **CLOSED**

Closed: **06/26/2013**

Statute: **28:1331**

Jury Demand: **Both**

Demand Amount: **\$75,000**

NOS Description: **Patent**

Litigants

Linksmart Wireless Technology Llc
Plaintiff

Attorneys

Andrew David Weiss
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Russ August and Kabat
12424 Wilshire Boulevard 12th Floor
Los Angeles , CA 90025
USA
310-826-7474
Fax: 310-826-6991
Email: Aweiss@raklaw.Com

Irene Y Lee
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Russ August and Kabat
12424 Wilshire Boulevard 12th Floor
Los Angeles , CA 90025
USA
310-826-7474
Fax: 310-826-6991
Email: Ilee@raklaw.Com

Larry C Russ
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Russ August and Kabat
12424 Wilshire Boulevard 12th Floor
Los Angeles , CA 90025
USA
310-826-7474
Fax: 310-826-6991
Email: Lruss@raklaw.Com

Marc A Fenster
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Russ August and Kabat
12424 Wilshire Boulevard 12th Floor
Los Angeles , CA 90025
USA
310-826-7474
Fax: 310-826-6991
Email: Mafenster@raklaw.Com

Michael T Boardman
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Russ August and Kabat
12424 Wilshire Boulevard 12th Floor
Los Angeles , CA 90025
USA
310-826-7474
Fax: 310-826-6991
Email: Mboardman@raklaw.Com

Noah A Levine
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
7 World Trade Center
New York , NY 10007
USA
212-230-8875
Fax: 212-230-8888
Email: Noah.Levine@wilmerhale.Com

Robert F Gookin
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Russ August and Kabat
12424 Wilshire Avenue 12th Floor
Los Angeles , CA 90025
USA
310-826-7474
Fax: 310-826-6991
Email: Rgookin@raklaw.Com

T-Mobile USA Inc
[Term: 10/08/2013]
Defendant

Adam P Romero
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
7 World Trade Center
New York , NY 10007
USA
212-295-6422
Fax: 212-230-8888
Email: Adam.Romero@wilmerhale.Com

Bethany M Stevens
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
350 South Grand Avenue Suite 2100
Los Angeles , CA 90071
USA
213-443-5300
Fax: 213-443-5400
Email: Bethany.Stevens@wilmerhale.Com

David Bassett
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
399 Park Avenue
New York , NY 10022
USA
212-230-8800
Fax: 212-230-8888
Email: David.Bassett@wilmerhale.Com

Erin Greenfield Mehta
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
399 Park Avenue
212-295-644
New York , NY 10022
USA
Fax: 213-230-8888
Email: Erin.Mehta@wilmerhale.Com

Kate Saxton
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
60 State Street
Boston , MA 02109
USA
617-526-6253
Fax: 617-526-5000
Email: Kate.Saxton@wilmerhale.Com

Kirk Ruthenberg
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Dentons US LLP
130 K Street Nw Suite 600 East Tower
Washington , DC 20005
USA
202-408-6410
Fax: 202-408-6399
Email: Kirk.Ruthenberg@dentons.Com

Michael D Jay
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
[Term: 10/04/2012]
Boies, Schiller & Flexner LLP
401 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 850
Santa Monica , CA 90401
USA
310-752-2400
Fax: 310-752-2490
Email: Mjay@bsflp.Com

Nandan R Padmanabhan
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
[Term: 05/08/2013]
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
350 South Grand Avenue Suite 2100
Los Angeles , CA 90071
USA
213-443-5300

Fax: 213-443-5400
Email: Nandan.Padmanabhan@wilmerhale.Com

Noah A Levine
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
7 World Trade Center
New York , NY 10007
USA
212-230-8875
Fax: 212-230-8888
Email: Noah.Levine@wilmerhale.Com

Sadaf R Abdullah
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
7 World Trade Center
New York , NY 10007
USA
212-937-7247
Fax: 212-230-8888
Email: Sadaf.Abdullah@wilmerhale.Com

Zachary Paul Piccolomini
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
60 State Street
Boston , MA 02109
USA
617-526-6027
Fax: 617-526-5000
Email: Zachary.Piccolomini@wilmerhale.Com

Lodgenet Interactive Corp
Defendant

Douglas J Beteta
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Morrison and Foerster LLP
555 West 5th Street Suite 3500
Los Angeles , CA 90013-1024
USA
213-892-5200
Fax: 213-892-5454
Email: Dbeteta@mofo.Com

Mark E Ungerman
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Ungerman IP
2305 Calvert St Nw
Washington , DC 20008
USA
202-461-3200
Fax: 202-461-3200
Email: Mungerman@ungermanip.Com

Ibahn General Holdings Corp
Defendant

Grant E Kinsel
LEAD ATTORNEY; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Perkins Coie LLP
1888 Century Park East Suite 1800
Los Angeles , CA 90067-1721
USA

310-788-9900
Fax: 310-788-3399
Email: Gkinsel@perkinscoie.Com

Adam P Romero
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
7 World Trade Center
New York , NY 10007
USA
212-295-6422
Fax: 212-230-8888
Email: Adam.Romero@wilmerhale.Com

Michael D Broaddus
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Perkins Coie LLP
1201 Third Avenue Suite 4900
Seattle , WA 98101-3099
USA
206-359-8694
Fax: 206-359-9694
Email: Mbroaddus@perkinscoie.Com

Michael J Song
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Perkins Coie LLP
1888 Century Park East Suite 1800
Los Angeles , CA 90067-1721
USA
310-788-9900
Fax: 310-788-3399
Email: Msong@perkinscoie.Com

Ethostream Llc
[Term: 10/10/2013]
Defendant

Adam P Romero
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
7 World Trade Center
New York , NY 10007
USA
212-295-6422
Fax: 212-230-8888
Email: Adam.Romero@wilmerhale.Com

Brian G Gilpin
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Godfrey and Kahn SC
780 North Water Street
Milwaukee , WI 53202
USA
414-273-3500
Fax: 414-273-5198
Email: Bgilpin@gklaw.Com

David M Stein
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Akin Gump Strauss Hauer and Feld LLP
633 West Fifth Street Suite 5000
Los Angeles , CA 90071
USA

213-254-1200
Fax: 213-229-1001
Email: Dstein@akingump.Com

James D Peterson
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Godfrey and Kahn SC
One East Main Street
Po Box 2719
Madison , WI 53701-2719
USA
608-257-3911
Fax: 608-257-0609
Email: Jpeterson@gklaw.Com

Ramada Worldwide Inc
[Term: 09/16/2013]
Defendant

Adam P Romero
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
7 World Trade Center
New York , NY 10007
USA
212-295-6422
Fax: 212-230-8888
Email: Adam.Romero@wilmerhale.Com

Brian G Gilpin
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Godfrey and Kahn SC
780 North Water Street
Milwaukee , WI 53202
USA
414-273-3500
Fax: 414-273-5198
Email: Bgilpin@gklaw.Com

David M Stein
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Akin Gump Strauss Hauer and Feld LLP
633 West Fifth Street Suite 5000
Los Angeles , CA 90071
USA
213-254-1200
Fax: 213-229-1001
Email: Dstein@akingump.Com

James D Peterson
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Godfrey and Kahn SC
One East Main Street
Po Box 2719
Madison , WI 53701-2719
USA
608-257-3911
Fax: 608-257-0609
Email: Jpeterson@gklaw.Com

Marriott International Inc
[Term: 10/03/2013]
Defendant

Adam P Romero
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP

7 World Trade Center
New York , NY 10007
USA
212-295-6422
Fax: 212-230-8888
Email: Adam.Romero@wilmerhale.Com

Brian M Koide
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Crowell and Moring LLP
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue Nw
Washington , DC 20004
USA
202-624-2931
Fax: 949-263-8414
Email: Bkoide@crowell.Com

Craig P Lytle
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Crowell and Moring LLP
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue Nw
Washington , DC 20004
USA
202-624-2533
Fax: 202-628-5116
Email: Clytle@crowell.Com

Jeffrey Ahdoot
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
[Term: 05/13/2013]
Crowell and Moring LLP
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue Nw
Washington , DC 20004
USA
202-624-2500
Fax: 202-628-5116

John L Cuddihy
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Crowell and Moring LLP
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue Nw
Washington , DC 20004
USA
202-624-2500
Fax: 202-628-5116
Email: Cuddihyj@ballardspahr.Com

John S Gibson
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Crowell and Moring LLP
3 Park Plaza 20th Floor
Irvine , CA 92614-8414
USA
949-263-8400
Fax: 949-263-8414
Email: Jgibson@crowell.Com

Six Continents Hotels Inc
[Term: 09/16/2013]
Defendant

Adam P Romero
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP

7 World Trade Center
New York , NY 10007
USA
212-295-6422
Fax: 212-230-8888
Email: Adam.Romero@wilmerhale.Com

Erin Paige Gibson
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
DLA Piper LLP (US)
401 B Street, Ste 1700
San Diego , CA 92101
USA
619-699-2862
Email: Erin.Gibson@dlapiper.Com

John M Guaragna
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
DLA Piper LLP
401 Congress Avenue Suite 2500
Austin , TX 78701
USA
512-457-7000
Fax: 512-457-7001
Email: John.Guaragna@dlapiper.Com

Intercontinental Hotels Group Resources Inc
[Term: 09/16/2013]
Defendant

Adam P Romero
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
7 World Trade Center
New York , NY 10007
USA
212-295-6422
Fax: 212-230-8888
Email: Adam.Romero@wilmerhale.Com

Erin Paige Gibson
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
DLA Piper LLP (US)
401 B Street, Ste 1700
San Diego , CA 92101
USA
619-699-2862
Email: Erin.Gibson@dlapiper.Com

John M Guaragna
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
DLA Piper LLP
401 Congress Avenue Suite 2500
Austin , TX 78701
USA
512-457-7000
Fax: 512-457-7001
Email: John.Guaragna@dlapiper.Com

Choice Hotels International Inc
[Term: 09/16/2013]
Defendant

Adam P Romero
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
7 World Trade Center

New York , NY 10007
USA
212-295-6422
Fax: 212-230-8888
Email: Adam.Romero@wilmerhale.Com

George B Newhouse , Jr
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Brown White and Newhouse LLP
333 South Hope Street 40th Floor
Los Angeles , CA 90071-1406
USA
213-613-9474
Fax: 213-613-0550
Email: Gnewhouse@brownwhitelaw.Com

Gregory R Lyons
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wiley Rein LLP
1776 K Street Nw
Washington , DC 20006
USA
202-719-7000
Fax: 202-719-7049
Email: Glyons@wileyrein.Com

Kevin P Anderson
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wiley Rein LLP
1776 K Street Nw
Washington , DC 20006
USA
202-719-7000
Fax: 202-719-7049
Email: Kanderson@wileyrein.Com

Best Western International Inc
Defendant

Adam P Romero
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
7 World Trade Center
New York , NY 10007
USA
212-295-6422
Fax: 212-230-8888
Email: Adam.Romero@wilmerhale.Com

David E Rogers
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Snell and Wilmer LLP
400 East Van Buren
Phoenix , AZ 85004-2202
USA
602-382-6225
Fax: 602-382-6070
Email: Drogers@swlaw.Com

Elizabeth M Weldon
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Snell and Wilmer LLP
600 Anton Boulevard Suite 1400

Costa Mesa , CA 92626-7689
USA
714-427-7000
Fax: 714-427-7799
Email: Eweldon@swlaw.Com

Sid Leach
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Snell and Wilmer LLP
One Arizona Center
400 East Van Buren
Phoenix , AZ 85004-2202
USA
602-382-6372
Fax: 602-382-6070
Email: Sleach@swlaw.Com

Best Western International Inc
Counter Claimant

Adam P Romero
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
7 World Trade Center
New York , NY 10007
USA
212-295-6422
Fax: 212-230-8888
Email: Adam.Romero@wilmerhale.Com

David E Rogers
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Snell and Wilmer LLP
400 East Van Buren
Phoenix , AZ 85004-2202
USA
602-382-6225
Fax: 602-382-6070
Email: Drogers@swlaw.Com

Elizabeth M Weldon
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Snell and Wilmer LLP
600 Anton Boulevard Suite 1400
Costa Mesa , CA 92626-7689
USA
714-427-7000
Fax: 714-427-7799
Email: Eweldon@swlaw.Com

Sid Leach
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Snell and Wilmer LLP
One Arizona Center
400 East Van Buren
Phoenix , AZ 85004-2202
USA
602-382-6372
Fax: 602-382-6070
Email: Sleach@swlaw.Com

Linksmart Wireless Technology Llc

Andrew David Weiss

Counter Defendant

ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Russ August and Kabat
12424 Wilshire Boulevard 12th Floor
Los Angeles , CA 90025
USA
310-826-7474
Fax: 310-826-6991
Email: Aweiss@raklaw.Com

Irene Y Lee
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Russ August and Kabat
12424 Wilshire Boulevard 12th Floor
Los Angeles , CA 90025
USA
310-826-7474
Fax: 310-826-6991
Email: Ilee@raklaw.Com

Marc A Fenster
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Russ August and Kabat
12424 Wilshire Boulevard 12th Floor
Los Angeles , CA 90025
USA
310-826-7474
Fax: 310-826-6991
Email: Mafenster@raklaw.Com

Six Continents Hotels Inc
Counter Claimant

Adam P Romero
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
7 World Trade Center
New York , NY 10007
USA
212-295-6422
Fax: 212-230-8888
Email: Adam.Romero@wilmerhale.Com

Erin Paige Gibson
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
DLA Piper LLP (US)
401 B Street, Ste 1700
San Diego , CA 92101
USA
619-699-2862
Email: Erin.Gibson@dlapiper.Com

John M Guaragna
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
DLA Piper LLP
401 Congress Avenue Suite 2500
Austin , TX 78701
USA
512-457-7000
Fax: 512-457-7001
Email: John.Guaragna@dlapiper.Com

Intercontinental Hotels Group Resources Inc

Adam P Romero

Counter Claimant

ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
7 World Trade Center
New York , NY 10007
USA
212-295-6422
Fax: 212-230-8888
Email: Adam.Romero@wilmerhale.Com

Erin Paige Gibson
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
DLA Piper LLP (US)
401 B Street, Ste 1700
San Diego , CA 92101
USA
619-699-2862
Email: Erin.Gibson@dlapiper.Com

John M Guaragna
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
DLA Piper LLP
401 Congress Avenue Suite 2500
Austin , TX 78701
USA
512-457-7000
Fax: 512-457-7001
Email: John.Guaragna@dlapiper.Com

Linksmart Wireless Technology Llc
Counter Defendant

Andrew David Weiss
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Russ August and Kabat
12424 Wilshire Boulevard 12th Floor
Los Angeles , CA 90025
USA
310-826-7474
Fax: 310-826-6991
Email: Aweiss@raklaw.Com

Irene Y Lee
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Russ August and Kabat
12424 Wilshire Boulevard 12th Floor
Los Angeles , CA 90025
USA
310-826-7474
Fax: 310-826-6991
Email: Ilee@raklaw.Com

Marc A Fenster
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Russ August and Kabat
12424 Wilshire Boulevard 12th Floor
Los Angeles , CA 90025
USA
310-826-7474
Fax: 310-826-6991
Email: Mafenster@raklaw.Com

Ramada Worldwide Inc

Adam P Romero

Counter Claimant

ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
7 World Trade Center
New York , NY 10007
USA
212-295-6422
Fax: 212-230-8888
Email: Adam.Romero@wilmerhale.Com

Brian G Gilpin
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Godfrey and Kahn SC
780 North Water Street
Milwaukee , WI 53202
USA
414-273-3500
Fax: 414-273-5198
Email: Bgilpin@gklaw.Com

David M Stein
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Akin Gump Strauss Hauer and Feld LLP
633 West Fifth Street Suite 5000
Los Angeles , CA 90071
USA
213-254-1200
Fax: 213-229-1001
Email: Dstein@akingump.Com

James D Peterson
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Godfrey and Kahn SC
One East Main Street
Po Box 2719
Madison , WI 53701-2719
USA
608-257-3911
Fax: 608-257-0609
Email: Jpeterson@gklaw.Com

Linksmart Wireless Technology Llc
Counter Defendant

Andrew David Weiss
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Russ August and Kabat
12424 Wilshire Boulevard 12th Floor
Los Angeles , CA 90025
USA
310-826-7474
Fax: 310-826-6991
Email: Aweiss@raklaw.Com

Irene Y Lee
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Russ August and Kabat
12424 Wilshire Boulevard 12th Floor
Los Angeles , CA 90025
USA
310-826-7474
Fax: 310-826-6991
Email: Ilee@raklaw.Com

Marc A Fenster
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Russ August and Kabat
12424 Wilshire Boulevard 12th Floor
Los Angeles , CA 90025
USA
310-826-7474
Fax: 310-826-6991
Email: Mafenster@raklaw.Com

Ethostream Llc
Counter Claimant

Adam P Romero
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
7 World Trade Center
New York , NY 10007
USA
212-295-6422
Fax: 212-230-8888
Email: Adam.Romero@wilmerhale.Com

Brian G Gilpin
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Godfrey and Kahn SC
780 North Water Street
Milwaukee , WI 53202
USA
414-273-3500
Fax: 414-273-5198
Email: Bgilpin@gklaw.Com

David M Stein
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Akin Gump Strauss Hauer and Feld LLP
633 West Fifth Street Suite 5000
Los Angeles , CA 90071
USA
213-254-1200
Fax: 213-229-1001
Email: Dstein@akingump.Com

James D Peterson
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Godfrey and Kahn SC
One East Main Street
Po Box 2719
Madison , WI 53701-2719
USA
608-257-3911
Fax: 608-257-0609
Email: Jpeterson@gklaw.Com

Linksmart Wireless Technology Llc
Counter Defendant

Andrew David Weiss
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Russ August and Kabat
12424 Wilshire Boulevard 12th Floor
Los Angeles , CA 90025
USA
310-826-7474
Fax: 310-826-6991

Email: Aweiss@raklaw.Com

Irene Y Lee
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Russ August and Kabat
12424 Wilshire Boulevard 12th Floor
Los Angeles , CA 90025
USA
310-826-7474
Fax: 310-826-6991
Email: Ilee@raklaw.Com

Marc A Fenster
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Russ August and Kabat
12424 Wilshire Boulevard 12th Floor
Los Angeles , CA 90025
USA
310-826-7474
Fax: 310-826-6991
Email: Mafenster@raklaw.Com

T-Mobile USA Inc
[Term: 10/08/2013]
Counter Claimant

Adam P Romero
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
7 World Trade Center
New York , NY 10007
USA
212-295-6422
Fax: 212-230-8888
Email: Adam.Romero@wilmerhale.Com

Bethany M Stevens
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
350 South Grand Avenue Suite 2100
Los Angeles , CA 90071
USA
213-443-5300
Fax: 213-443-5400
Email: Bethany.Stevens@wilmerhale.Com

David Bassett
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
399 Park Avenue
New York , NY 10022
USA
212-230-8800
Fax: 212-230-8888
Email: David.Bassett@wilmerhale.Com

Erin Greenfield Mehta
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
399 Park Avenue
212-295-644
New York , NY 10022
USA
Fax: 213-230-8888

Email: Erin.Mehta@wilmerhale.Com

Kate Saxton
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
60 State Street
Boston , MA 02109
USA
617-526-6253
Fax: 617-526-5000
Email: Kate.Saxton@wilmerhale.Com

Kirk Ruthenberg
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Dentons US LLP
130 K Street Nw Suite 600 East Tower
Washington , DC 20005
USA
202-408-6410
Fax: 202-408-6399
Email: Kirk.Ruthenberg@dentons.Com

Michael D Jay
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
[Term: 10/04/2012]
Boies, Schiller & Flexner LLP
401 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 850
Santa Monica , CA 90401
USA
310-752-2400
Fax: 310-752-2490
Email: Mjay@bsflp.Com

Nandan R Padmanabhan
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
[Term: 05/08/2013]
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
350 South Grand Avenue Suite 2100
Los Angeles , CA 90071
USA
213-443-5300
Fax: 213-443-5400
Email: Nandan.Padmanabhan@wilmerhale.Com

Noah A Levine
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
7 World Trade Center
New York , NY 10007
USA
212-230-8875
Fax: 212-230-8888
Email: Noah.Levine@wilmerhale.Com

Sadaf R Abdullah
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
7 World Trade Center
New York , NY 10007
USA

212-937-7247
Fax: 212-230-8888
Email: Sadaf.Abdullah@wilmerhale.Com

Zachary Paul Piccolomini
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
60 State Street
Boston , MA 02109
USA
617-526-6027
Fax: 617-526-5000
Email: Zachary.Piccolomini@wilmerhale.Com

Linksmart Wireless Technology Llc
Counter Defendant

Andrew David Weiss
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Russ August and Kabat
12424 Wilshire Boulevard 12th Floor
Los Angeles , CA 90025
USA
310-826-7474
Fax: 310-826-6991
Email: Aweiss@raklaw.Com

Irene Y Lee
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Russ August and Kabat
12424 Wilshire Boulevard 12th Floor
Los Angeles , CA 90025
USA
310-826-7474
Fax: 310-826-6991
Email: Ilee@raklaw.Com

Marc A Fenster
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Russ August and Kabat
12424 Wilshire Boulevard 12th Floor
Los Angeles , CA 90025
USA
310-826-7474
Fax: 310-826-6991
Email: Mafenster@raklaw.Com

Marriott International Inc
Counter Claimant

Adam P Romero
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
7 World Trade Center
New York , NY 10007
USA
212-295-6422
Fax: 212-230-8888
Email: Adam.Romero@wilmerhale.Com

Brian M Koide
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Crowell and Moring LLP
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue Nw
Washington , DC 20004

USA
202-624-2931
Fax: 949-263-8414
Email: Bkoide@crowell.Com

Craig P Lytle
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Crowell and Moring LLP
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue Nw
Washington , DC 20004
USA
202-624-2533
Fax: 202-628-5116
Email: Clytle@crowell.Com

Jeffrey Ahdoot
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
[Term: 05/13/2013]
Crowell and Moring LLP
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue Nw
Washington , DC 20004
USA
202-624-2500
Fax: 202-628-5116

John L Cuddihy
PRO HAC VICE; ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Crowell and Moring LLP
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue Nw
Washington , DC 20004
USA
202-624-2500
Fax: 202-628-5116
Email: Cuddihyj@ballardspahr.Com

John S Gibson
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Crowell and Moring LLP
3 Park Plaza 20th Floor
Irvine , CA 92614-8414
USA
949-263-8400
Fax: 949-263-8414
Email: Jgibson@crowell.Com

Linksmart Wireless Technology Llc
Counter Defendant

Andrew David Weiss
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Russ August and Kabat
12424 Wilshire Boulevard 12th Floor
Los Angeles , CA 90025
USA
310-826-7474
Fax: 310-826-6991
Email: Aweiss@raklaw.Com

Irene Y Lee
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Russ August and Kabat
12424 Wilshire Boulevard 12th Floor
Los Angeles , CA 90025

USA
310-826-7474
Fax: 310-826-6991
Email: llee@raklaw.Com

Marc A Fenster
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Russ August and Kabat
12424 Wilshire Boulevard 12th Floor
Los Angeles , CA 90025
USA
310-826-7474
Fax: 310-826-6991
Email: Mafenster@raklaw.Com

Lodgenet Interactive Corp
Counter Claimant

Douglas J Beteta
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Morrison and Foerster LLP
555 West 5th Street Suite 3500
Los Angeles , CA 90013-1024
USA
213-892-5200
Fax: 213-892-5454
Email: Dbeteta@mofo.Com

Mark E Ungerman
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Ungerman IP
2305 Calvert St Nw
Washington , DC 20008
USA
202-461-3200
Fax: 202-461-3200
Email: Mungerman@ungermanip.Com

Linksmart Wireless Technology Llc
Counter Defendant

Andrew David Weiss
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Russ August and Kabat
12424 Wilshire Boulevard 12th Floor
Los Angeles , CA 90025
USA
310-826-7474
Fax: 310-826-6991
Email: Aweiss@raklaw.Com

Irene Y Lee
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Russ August and Kabat
12424 Wilshire Boulevard 12th Floor
Los Angeles , CA 90025
USA
310-826-7474
Fax: 310-826-6991
Email: llee@raklaw.Com

Marc A Fenster
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED
Russ August and Kabat
12424 Wilshire Boulevard 12th Floor

Los Angeles , CA 90025
 USA
 310-826-7474
 Fax: 310-826-6991
 Email: Mafenster@raklaw.Com

Date	#	Proceeding Text	Source
04/05/2012	1	COMPLAINT against Defendants Best Western International Inc, Choice Hotels International Inc, Ethostream LLC, Ibahn General Holdings Corp, Intercontinental Hotels Group Resources Inc, Lodgenet Interactive Corp, Marriott International Inc, Ramada Worldwide Inc, Six Continents Hotels Inc and T-Mobile USA Inc. Case assigned to Judge Josephine Staton Tucker for all further proceedings. Discovery referred to Magistrate Judge Arthur Nakazato.(Filing fee \$ 350 Paid). Jury Demanded. Filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC.(lwag) (lwag). (Entered: 04/06/2012)	
04/05/2012		21 DAY Summons Issued re Complaint - (Discovery), Complaint - (Discovery), Complaint - (Discovery) 1 as to Defendants Best Western International Inc, Choice Hotels International Inc, Ethostream LLC, Ibahn General Holdings Corp, Intercontinental Hotels Group Resources Inc, Lodgenet Interactive Corp, Marriott International Inc, Ramada Worldwide Inc, Six Continents Hotels Inc and T-Mobile USA Inc. (lwag) (Entered: 04/06/2012)	
04/05/2012	2	CERTIFICATION and Notice of Interested Parties filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC. (lwag) (lwag). (Entered: 04/06/2012)	
04/05/2012	3	NOTICE of Related Case(s) filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC. Related Case(s): 2:08-cv-00264-JRG-RSP; 2:09-cv-00026-DF-CE; 2:08-cv-00385-DF-CE and 2:08-cv-00304-DF-CE. (lwag) (lwag). (Entered: 04/06/2012)	
04/05/2012	4	REPORT ON THE FILING OF AN ACTION Regarding a Patent or a Trademark (Initial Notification) filed by Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC. (lwag) (Entered: 04/06/2012)	
04/05/2012	5	NOTICE TO PARTIES OF COURT-DIRECTED ADR PROGRAM filed.(lwag) (Entered: 04/06/2012)	
04/09/2012	6	INITIAL STANDING ORDER for cases assigned to Judge Josephine Staton Tucker. (Guerrero, Terry) (Entered: 04/09/2012)	
04/17/2012	7	PROOF OF SERVICE Executed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC, upon Defendant T-Mobile USA Inc served on 4/10/2012, answer due 5/1/2012. Service of the Summons and Complaint were executed upon Counsel Pursuant to Stipulation Dated 4/3/2012 attached to Complaint as Exhibit B in compliance with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure by service on a domestic corporation, unincorporated association, or public entity. Original Summons NOT returned. (Weiss, Andrew) (Entered: 04/17/2012)	
04/17/2012	8	PROOF OF SERVICE Executed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC, upon Defendant Lodgenet Interactive Corp served on 4/10/2012, answer due 5/1/2012. Service of the Summons and Complaint were executed upon Counsel Pursuant to Stipulation Dated 4/3/2012 attached to Complaint as Exhibit B in compliance with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure by service on a domestic corporation, unincorporated association, or public entity. Original Summons NOT returned. (Weiss, Andrew) (Entered: 04/17/2012)	
04/17/2012	9	PROOF OF SERVICE Executed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC, upon Defendant Ibahn General Holdings Corp served on 4/10/2012, answer due 5/1/2012. Service of the Summons and Complaint were executed upon Counsel Pursuant to Stipulation Dated 4/3/2012 attached	

- to Complaint as Exhibit B in compliance with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure by service on a domestic corporation, unincorporated association, or public entity. Original Summons NOT returned. (Weiss, Andrew) (Entered: 04/17/2012)
- 04/17/2012 10 PROOF OF SERVICE Executed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC, upon Defendant Ethostream LLC served on 4/10/2012, answer due 5/1/2012. Service of the Summons and Complaint were executed upon Counsel Pursuant to Stipulation Dated 4/3/2012 attached to Complaint as Exhibit B in compliance with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure by method of service not specified. Original Summons NOT returned. (Weiss, Andrew) (Entered: 04/17/2012)
- 04/17/2012 11 PROOF OF SERVICE Executed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC, upon Defendant Ramada Worldwide Inc served on 4/10/2012, answer due 5/1/2012. Service of the Summons and Complaint were executed upon Counsel Pursuant to Stipulation Dated 4/3/2012 attached to Complaint as Exhibit B in compliance with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure by service on a domestic corporation, unincorporated association, or public entity. Original Summons NOT returned. (Weiss, Andrew) (Entered: 04/17/2012)
- 04/17/2012 12 PROOF OF SERVICE Executed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC, upon Defendant Marriott International Inc served on 4/10/2012, answer due 5/1/2012. Service of the Summons and Complaint were executed upon Counsel Pursuant to Stipulation Dated 4/3/2012 attached to Complaint as Exhibit B in compliance with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure by service on a domestic corporation, unincorporated association, or public entity. Original Summons NOT returned. (Weiss, Andrew) (Entered: 04/17/2012)
- 04/17/2012 13 PROOF OF SERVICE Executed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC, upon Defendant Six Continents Hotels Inc served on 4/10/2012, answer due 5/1/2012. Service of the Summons and Complaint were executed upon Counsel Pursuant to Stipulation Dated 4/3/2012 attached to Complaint as Exhibit B in compliance with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure by service on a domestic corporation, unincorporated association, or public entity. Original Summons NOT returned. (Weiss, Andrew) (Entered: 04/17/2012)
- 04/17/2012 14 PROOF OF SERVICE Executed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC, upon Defendant Intercontinental Hotels Group Resources Inc served on 4/10/2012, answer due 5/1/2012. Service of the Summons and Complaint were executed upon Counsel Pursuant to Stipulation Dated 4/3/2012 attached to Complaint as Exhibit B in compliance with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure by service on a domestic corporation, unincorporated association, or public entity. Original Summons NOT returned. (Weiss, Andrew) (Entered: 04/17/2012)
- 04/17/2012 15 PROOF OF SERVICE Executed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC, upon Defendant Choice Hotels International Inc served on 4/10/2012, answer due 5/1/2012. Service of the Summons and Complaint were executed upon Counsel Pursuant to Stipulation Dated 4/3/2012 attached to Complaint as Exhibit B in compliance with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure by service on a domestic corporation, unincorporated association, or public entity. Original Summons NOT returned. (Weiss, Andrew) (Entered: 04/17/2012)
- 04/17/2012 16 PROOF OF SERVICE Executed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC, upon Defendant Best Western International Inc served on 4/10/2012, answer due 5/1/2012. Service of the Summons and Complaint were executed upon Counsel Pursuant to Stipulation Dated 4/3/2012 attached to Complaint as Exhibit B in compliance with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure by service on a domestic corporation, unincorporated association, or public entity. Original Summons NOT returned. (Weiss,

- Andrew) (Entered: 04/17/2012)
- 04/30/2012 17 NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION for Extend Time to File Answer to 6/11/2012 re Complaint - (Discovery), Complaint - (Discovery), Complaint - (Discovery) 1 filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC. Motion set for hearing on 6/4/2012 at 10:00 AM before Judge Josephine Staton Tucker. (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order)(Weiss, Andrew) (Entered: 04/30/2012)
- 05/01/2012 18 MINUTES (IN CHAMBERS): ORDER by Judge Josephine Staton Tucker: STRIKING NOTICE AND CONSENT TO EXTEND TIME 17 : (See document for details.) The Court orders the motion stricken, and orders Plaintiff's counsel to review carefully the local rules and this Court's ISO. (rla) (Entered: 05/02/2012)
- 05/08/2012 19 STIPULATION for Extension of Time to File Answer to 6/11/2012 re Complaint - (Discovery), Complaint - (Discovery), Complaint - (Discovery) 1 filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC. (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order EXHIBIT A)(Weiss, Andrew) (Entered: 05/08/2012)
- 05/08/2012 20 APPLICATION for attorney David E. Rogers to Appear Pro Hac Vice (PHV Fee of \$325 receipt number 0973-10343977 paid.) filed by Defendant Best Western International Inc. (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order)(Weldon, Elizabeth) (Entered: 05/08/2012)
- 05/09/2012 21 ORDER by Judge Josephine Staton Tucker: GRANTING Stipulation to Extend Time to Respond to Complaint 19 . The time for Defendants to answer to Plaintiff's Complaint for Patent Infringement Permanent Injunction and Damages shall be extended up to and including June 11, 2012. (rla) (Entered: 05/10/2012)
- 05/09/2012 23 ORDER by Judge Josephine Staton Tucker: granting 20 Application to Appear Pro Hac Vice by Attorney David E. Rogers on behalf of Defendant Best Western International, Inc., designating Elizabeth M. Weldon as local counsel. (lt) (Entered: 05/11/2012)
- 05/11/2012 22 APPLICATION for attorney Michael D. Broaddus to Appear Pro Hac Vice (PHV Fee of \$325 receipt number 0973-10359988 paid.) filed by defendant Ibahn General Holdings Corp. (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order)(Kinsel, Grant) (Entered: 05/11/2012)
- 05/11/2012 24 APPLICATION for attorney Sid Leach to Appear Pro Hac Vice (PHV Fee of \$325 receipt number 0973-10363942 paid.) filed by Defendant Best Western International Inc. (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order)(Weldon, Elizabeth) (Entered: 05/11/2012)
- 05/14/2012 25 APPLICATION for attorney Craig Lytle to Appear Pro Hac Vice. (PHV FEE PAID.) filed by defendant Marriott International Inc. Lodged order. (twdb) (Entered: 05/15/2012)
- 05/14/2012 26 APPLICATION for attorney Jeffrey Ahdoot to Appear Pro Hac Vice. (PHV FEE PAID.) filed by defendant Marriott International Inc. Lodged order. (twdb) (Entered: 05/15/2012)
- 05/14/2012 27 APPLICATION for attorney John Cuddihy to Appear Pro Hac Vice. (PHV FEE PAID.) filed by defendant Marriott International Inc. Lodged order. (twdb) (Entered: 05/15/2012)
- 05/17/2012 28 APPLICATION for attorney Kevin P. Anderson to Appear Pro Hac Vice. (PHV FEE PAID.) filed by defendant Choice Hotels International Inc. (nca) (Entered: 05/21/2012)
- 05/17/2012 29 APPLICATION for attorney Gregory R. Lyons to Appear Pro Hac Vice. (PHV FEE PAID.) filed by defendant Choice Hotels International Inc. (nca) (Entered: 05/21/2012)
- 05/24/2012 30 APPLICATION for attorney Brian M. Koide to Appear Pro Hac Vice. (PHV FEE PAID.) filed by defendant Marriott International Inc. Lodged order.

- (twdb) (Entered: 05/25/2012)
- 06/06/2012 31 ORDER by Judge Josephine Staton Tucker: granting 22 Application to Appear Pro Hac Vice by Attorney Michael D. Broaddus on behalf of iBAHN General Holding Corp, designating Grant E. Kinsel as local counsel. (It) (Entered: 06/07/2012)
- 06/06/2012 32 ORDER by Judge Josephine Staton Tucker: granting 24 Application to Appear Pro Hac Vice by Attorney Sid Leach on behalf of Defendant Best Western International, Inc., designating Elizabeth M. Weldon as local counsel. (It) (Entered: 06/07/2012)
- 06/06/2012 33 ORDER by Judge Josephine Staton Tucker: granting 25 Application to Appear Pro Hac Vice by Attorney Craig Lytle on behalf of Defendant Marriott International, Inc., designating John S. Gibson as local counsel. (It) (Entered: 06/07/2012)
- 06/06/2012 34 ORDER by Judge Josephine Staton Tucker: granting 27 Application to Appear Pro Hac Vice by Attorney John Cuddihay on behalf of Defendant Marriott International, Inc., designating John S. Gibson as local counsel. (It) (Entered: 06/07/2012)
- 06/06/2012 35 ORDER by Judge Josephine Staton Tucker: granting 29 Application to Appear Pro Hac Vice by Attorney Gregory R. Lyons on behalf of Defendant Choice Hotels International, Inc., designating George B. Newhouse, Jr. as local counsel. (It) (Entered: 06/07/2012)
- 06/06/2012 36 ORDER by Judge Josephine Staton Tucker: granting 26 Application to Appear Pro Hac Vice by Attorney Jeffrey Abbot on behalf of Defendant Marriott International, Inc., designating John S. Gibson as local counsel. (It) (Entered: 06/07/2012)
- 06/06/2012 37 ORDER by Judge Josephine Staton Tucker: granting 30 Application to Appear Pro Hac Vice by Attorney Brian Koide on behalf of Defendant Marriott International, Inc., designating John S. Gibson as local counsel. (It) (Entered: 06/07/2012)
- 06/06/2012 38 ORDER by Judge Josephine Staton Tucker: granting 28 Application to Appear Pro Hac Vice by Attorney Kevin P. Anderson on behalf of Defendant Choice Hotels International, Inc., designating George B. Newhouse, Jr. as local counsel. (It) (Entered: 06/07/2012)
- 06/11/2012 39 NOTICE of Manual Filing filed by Defendant Best Western International Inc of Answer, Defenses and Counterclaims. (Rogers, David) (Entered: 06/11/2012)
- 06/11/2012 40 NOTICE of Appearance filed by attorney David M Stein on behalf of Defendants Ethostream LLC, Ramada Worldwide Inc (Stein, David) (Entered: 06/11/2012)
- 06/11/2012 41 Certification and Notice of Interested Parties filed by Defendant Best Western International Inc, identifying Best Western International, Inc.. (Rogers, David) (Entered: 06/11/2012)
- 06/11/2012 42 ANSWER to Complaint - (Discovery), Complaint - (Discovery), Complaint - (Discovery) 1 filed by Defendant Ibahn General Holdings Corp.(Kinsel, Grant) (Entered: 06/11/2012)
- 06/11/2012 43 NOTICE of Manual Filing filed by Defendant T-Mobile USA Inc of Defendant T-Mobile USA, Inc.s Answer And Counterclaims; Defendant T-Mobile USA, Inc.s Corporate Disclosure Statement Pursuant To Federal Rules Of Civil Procedure 7.1 And Certification As To Interested Parties Pursuant To Local Rule 7.1-1; Proof Of Service. (Jay, Michael) (Entered: 06/11/2012)
- 06/11/2012 44 NOTICE of Manual Filing filed by Defendants Ethostream LLC, Ramada Worldwide Inc of Defendant Ramada Worldwide, Inc.'s Answer and Counterclaims; Defendant EthoStream, LLC's Answer and Counterclaims. (Stein, David) (Entered: 06/11/2012)

- 06/11/2012 45 ANSWER to Complaint - (Discovery), Complaint - (Discovery), Complaint - (Discovery) 1 with JURY DEMAND filed by Defendant Choice Hotels International Inc.(Newhouse, George) (Entered: 06/11/2012)
- 06/11/2012 46 CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT filed by Defendant Choice Hotels International Inc (Newhouse, George) (Entered: 06/11/2012)
- 06/11/2012 47 Certificate and Notice of Interested Parties filed by Defendant Choice Hotels International Inc, (Newhouse, George) (Entered: 06/11/2012)
- 06/11/2012 48 NOTICE of Manual Filing filed by Defendant Marriott International Inc of Marriott International, Inc.'s Answer and Counterclaims to Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC's Complaint. (Gibson, John) (Entered: 06/11/2012)
- 06/11/2012 49 NOTICE of Appearance filed by attorney John S Gibson on behalf of Defendant Marriott International Inc (Gibson, John) (Entered: 06/11/2012)
- 06/11/2012 50 Certification and Notice of Interested Parties filed by Defendant Marriott International Inc, identifying T.Rowe Price Associates, Inc.. (Gibson, John) (Entered: 06/11/2012)
- 06/11/2012 51 CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 7.1 filed by Defendant Marriott International Inc (Gibson, John) (Entered: 06/11/2012)
- 06/11/2012 52 Certificate of Interested Parties filed by Defendant Ibahn General Holdings Corp, (Kinsel, Grant) (Entered: 06/11/2012)
- 06/11/2012 53 STIPULATION Extending Time to Answer the complaint as to Lodgenet Interactive Corp answer now due 6/21/2012, filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC. (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order re Stipulation)(Weiss, Andrew) (Entered: 06/11/2012)
- 06/11/2012 54 CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT filed by Defendant Ethostream LLC (Stein, David) (Entered: 06/11/2012)
- 06/11/2012 55 CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT filed by Defendant Ramada Worldwide Inc (Stein, David) (Entered: 06/11/2012)
- 06/11/2012 56 Certification and Notice of Interested Parties filed by Defendant Ramada Worldwide Inc, (Stein, David) (Entered: 06/11/2012)
- 06/11/2012 57 Certification and Notice of Interested Parties filed by Defendant Ethostream LLC, (Stein, David) (Entered: 06/11/2012)
- 06/11/2012 58 ANSWER to Complaint - (Discovery) 1 and COUNTERCLAIM against Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC filed by defendant Best Western International Inc.(twdb) (Entered: 06/12/2012)
- 06/11/2012 59 PROOF OF SERVICE filed by defendants Intercontinental Hotels Group Resources Inc, Six Continents Hotels Inc, served on 06/11/2012. (db) (Entered: 06/13/2012)
- 06/11/2012 61 RULE 7.1 DISCLOSURE STATEMENT; filed by Defendants Intercontinental Hotels Group Resources Inc, Six Continents Hotels Inc (rla) (Entered: 06/13/2012)
- 06/11/2012 62 ANSWER to Complaint (Discovery) 1 , AND COUNTERCLAIM against Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC; filed by defendants Six Continents Hotels Inc, Intercontinental Hotels Group Resources Inc.(rla) (Entered: 06/13/2012)
- 06/11/2012 63 ANSWER to Complaint - (Discovery) 1 , and COUNTERCLAIM against Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC; filed by defendant Ramada Worldwide Inc.(rla) (Entered: 06/13/2012)
- 06/11/2012 64 ANSWER to Complaint - (Discovery) 1 , and COUNTERCLAIM against Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC; filed by defendant Ethostream LLC. (rla) Modified on 6/13/2012 (rla). (Entered: 06/13/2012)

- 06/11/2012 65 ANSWER to Complaint - (Discovery) 1 , and COUNTERCLAIM against Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC; filed by defendant T-Mobile USA Inc. (rla) (Entered: 06/13/2012)
- 06/11/2012 66 ANSWER to Complaint - (Discovery) 1 , and COUNTERCLAIM against Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC; filed by defendant Marriott International Inc.(rla) (Entered: 06/13/2012)
- 06/11/2012 67 DEMAND for Jury Trial; filed by defendant Ibahn General Holdings Corp. (rla) (Entered: 06/13/2012)
- 06/11/2012 68 CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATMENT AND CERTIFICATION of Interested Parties; filed by defendant T-Mobile USA Inc, identifying Corporate Parent Deutsche Telekom AG, Corporate Parent T-Mobile Global Zwischenholding GmbH, Corporate Parent T-Mobile Global Holding GmbH, a German entity for T-Mobile USA Inc. (rla) (Entered: 06/13/2012)
- 06/11/2012 69 PROOF OF SERVICE of MANUALLY FILED DOCUMENTS filed by defendant/counterclaimant Marriott International Inc, ANSWER AND COUNTERCLAIMS served on 06/11/12. (rla) (Entered: 06/13/2012)
- 06/11/2012 70 PROOF OF SERVICE filed by defendant T-Mobile USA Inc, ANSWER AND COUNTERCLAIMS, AND CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT AND CERTIFICATION AS TO INTERESTED PARTIES; served on 5/18/12. (rla) (Entered: 06/13/2012)
- 06/13/2012 60 ORDER granting Stipulation Extending Time to Respond to Complaint 53 by Judge Josephine Staton Tucker: The time for LodgeNet Interactive Corporation to answer Plaintiff's Complaint for Patent Infringement Permanent Injunction And Damages shall be extended up to and including June 21, 2012. (rla) (Entered: 06/13/2012)
- 06/14/2012 71 Defendant EthoStream, LLC's Demand For Trial by Jury re: Answer to Complaint (Discovery), Counterclaim 64 (Stein, David) (Entered: 06/14/2012)
- 06/14/2012 72 Defendant Ramada Worldwide, Inc.'s Demand For Trial by Jury re: Answer to Complaint (Discovery), Counterclaim 63 (Stein, David) (Entered: 06/14/2012)
- 06/21/2012 73 NOTICE of Manual Filing filed by Defendant Lodgenet Interactive Corp of Defendant Lodgenet Interactive Corp.'s Answer and Counterclaim to Complaint. (Beteta, Douglas) (Entered: 06/21/2012)
- 06/21/2012 74 CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT AND NOTICE OF INTERESTED PARTIES filed by Defendant Lodgenet Interactive Corp (Beteta, Douglas) (Entered: 06/21/2012)
- 06/21/2012 75 NOTICE of Appearance filed by attorney Douglas J Beteta on behalf of Defendant Lodgenet Interactive Corp (Beteta, Douglas) (Entered: 06/21/2012)
- 06/21/2012 76 ANSWER to Complaint - (Discovery) 1 , AND COUNTERCLAIM against Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC; filed by defendant Lodgenet Interactive Corp.(rla) (Entered: 06/25/2012)
- 06/26/2012 77 APPLICATION for attorney Brian G. Gilpin to Appear Pro Hac Vice(PHV Fee of \$325 receipt number 0973-10581942 paid.) filed by Defendants Ethostream LLC, Ramada Worldwide Inc. (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order On Application of Non-Resident Attorney To Appear in a Specific Case)(Stein, David) (Entered: 06/26/2012)
- 06/26/2012 78 APPLICATION for attorney James D. Peterson to Appear Pro Hac Vice(PHV Fee of \$325 receipt number 0973-10582093 paid.) filed by Defendants Ethostream LLC, Ramada Worldwide Inc. (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order on Application of Non-Resident Attorney to Appear in a Specific Case)(Stein, David) (Entered: 06/26/2012)
- 06/27/2012 79 NOTICE of Manual Filing filed by Counter Claimant Lodgenet Interactive

- Corp, Defendant Lodgenet Interactive Corp of Defendant Lodgenet Interactive Corp.'s First Amended Answer and Counterclaim to Complaint. (Beteta, Douglas) (Entered: 06/27/2012)
- 06/27/2012 80 NOTICE of Manual Filing filed by Counter Claimants Intercontinental Hotels Group Resources Inc, Six Continents Hotels Inc, Defendants Intercontinental Hotels Group Resources Inc, Six Continents Hotels Inc of Defendants Six Continents Hotels, Inc. and Intercontinental Hotels Group Resources, Inc.'s First Amended Answer and Counterclaims to Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC's Complaint. (Gibson, Erin) (Entered: 06/27/2012)
- 06/27/2012 81 AMENDED ANSWER to Answer to Complaint (Discovery), and Counterclaim re 62 filed by defendants Six Continents Hotels Inc, Intercontinental Hotels Group Resources Inc. (twdb) (Entered: 06/28/2012)
- 06/27/2012 82 AMENDED ANSWER to Answer to Complaint (Discovery), and Counterclaim re 76 filed by defendant Lodgenet Interactive Corp. (twdb) (Entered: 06/28/2012)
- 06/28/2012 83 ORDER by Judge Josephine Staton Tucker: granting 77 Application to Appear Pro Hac Vice by Attorney Brian G. Gilpin on behalf of Defendants EthoStream and Ramada Worldwide, Inc., designating David Stein as local counsel. (lt) (Entered: 06/29/2012)
- 06/28/2012 84 ORDER by Judge Josephine Staton Tucker: granting 78 Application to Appear Pro Hac Vice by Attorney James D. Peterson on behalf of Defendants EthoStream and Ramada Worldwide, Inc., designating David Stein as local counsel. (lt) (Entered: 06/29/2012)
- 06/28/2012 85 ORDER by Judge Josephine Staton Tucker SETTING SCHEDULING CONFERENCE FOR OCTOBER 19, 2012 at 1:30 P.M., COURTROOM 10-A before Judge Josephine Staton Tucker. (rrp) (Entered: 06/29/2012)
- 07/02/2012 86 APPLICATION for attorney ERIN GREENFIELD MEHTA to Appear Pro Hac Vice(PHV Fee of \$325 receipt number 0973-10608353 paid.) filed by DEFENDANT T-Mobile USA Inc. (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order ORDER ON APPLICATION OF NON-RESIDENT ATTORNEY TO APPEAR IN A SPECIFIC CASE)(Jay, Michael) (Entered: 07/02/2012)
- 07/02/2012 87 APPLICATION for attorney SADAF R ABDULLAH to Appear Pro Hac Vice (PHV Fee of \$325 receipt number 0973-10608562 paid.) filed by DEFENDANT T-Mobile USA Inc. (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order ORDER ON APPLICATION OF NON-RESIDENT ATTORNEY TO APPEAR IN A SPECIFIC CASE)(Jay, Michael) (Entered: 07/02/2012)
- 07/02/2012 88 APPLICATION for attorney DAVID B. BASSETT to Appear Pro Hac Vice(PHV Fee of \$325 receipt number 0973-10608630 paid.) filed by DEFENDANT T-Mobile USA Inc. (Attachments: # 1 Supplement ORDER ON APPLICATION OF NON-RESIDENT ATTORNEY TO APPEAR IN A SPECIFIC CASE)(Jay, Michael) (Entered: 07/02/2012)
- 07/02/2012 89 APPLICATION for attorney ADAM ROMERO to Appear Pro Hac Vice(PHV Fee of \$325 receipt number 0973-10608826 paid.) filed by DEFENDANT T-Mobile USA Inc. (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order ORDER ON APPLICATION OF NON-RESIDENT ATTORNEY TO APPEAR IN A SPECIFIC CASE)(Jay, Michael) (Entered: 07/02/2012)
- 07/02/2012 90 APPLICATION for attorney NOAH A. LEVINE to Appear Pro Hac Vice(PHV Fee of \$325 receipt number 0973-10608879 paid.) filed by DEFENDANT T-Mobile USA Inc. (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order ORDER ON APPLICATION OF NON-RESIDENT ATTORNEY TO APPEAR IN A SPECIFIC CASE)(Jay, Michael) (Entered: 07/02/2012)
- 07/02/2012 91 APPLICATION for attorney KATE SAXTON to Appear Pro Hac Vice(PHV Fee of \$325 receipt number 0973-10608931 paid.) filed by DEFENDANT T-Mobile USA Inc. (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order ORDER ON

- APPLICATION OF NON-RESIDENT ATTORNEY TO APPEAR IN A SPECIFIC CASE)(Jay, Michael) (Entered: 07/02/2012)
- 07/05/2012 92 Linksmart's ANSWER to Answer to Complaint (Discovery), Counterclaim 64 filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC.(Fenster, Marc) (Entered: 07/05/2012)
- 07/05/2012 93 Linksmart's ANSWER to Answer to Complaint (Discovery), Counterclaim 63 filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC.(Fenster, Marc) (Entered: 07/05/2012)
- 07/05/2012 94 Linksmart's ANSWER to Answer to Complaint (Discovery), Counterclaim 58 filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC.(Fenster, Marc) (Entered: 07/05/2012)
- 07/05/2012 95 Linksmart's ANSWER to Answer to Complaint (Discovery), Counterclaim 66 filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC.(Fenster, Marc) (Entered: 07/05/2012)
- 07/05/2012 96 Linksmart's ANSWER to Answer to Complaint (Discovery), Counterclaim 65 filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC.(Fenster, Marc) (Entered: 07/05/2012)
- 07/05/2012 97 ANSWER Linksmart filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC. (Fenster, Marc) (Entered: 07/05/2012)
- 07/05/2012 98 ORDER by Judge Josephine Staton Tucker: granting 86 Application to Appear Pro Hac Vice by Attorney Erin Greenfield Mehta on behalf of Defendant T-Mobile, designating Michael D. Jay as local counsel. (It) (Entered: 07/06/2012)
- 07/05/2012 99 ORDER by Judge Josephine Staton Tucker: granting 87 Application to Appear Pro Hac Vice by Attorney Sadaf R. Abdullah on behalf of Defendant T-Mobile, designating Michael D. Jay as local counsel. (It) (Entered: 07/06/2012)
- 07/05/2012 100 ORDER by Judge Josephine Staton Tucker: granting 88 Application to Appear Pro Hac Vice by Attorney David B. Bassett on behalf of Defendant T-Mobile, designating Michael D. Jay as local counsel. (It) (Entered: 07/06/2012)
- 07/05/2012 101 ORDER by Judge Josephine Staton Tucker: granting 89 Application to Appear Pro Hac Vice by Attorney Adam Romero on behalf of Defendant T-Mobile, designating Michael D. Jay as local counsel. (It) (Entered: 07/06/2012)
- 07/05/2012 102 ORDER by Judge Josephine Staton Tucker: granting 90 Application to Appear Pro Hac Vice by Attorney Noah A. Levine on behalf of Defendant T-Mobile, designating Michael D. Jay as local counsel. (It) (Entered: 07/06/2012)
- 07/05/2012 103 ORDER by Judge Josephine Staton Tucker: granting 91 Application to Appear Pro Hac Vice by Attorney Kate Saxton on behalf of Defendant T-Mobile, designating Michael D. Jay as local counsel. (It) (Entered: 07/06/2012)
- 07/10/2012 104 NOTICE of Change of address by Noah A Levine attorney for Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC. Changing attorneys address to 7 World Trade Center, New York, NY 10007. Filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC. (Levine, Noah) (Entered: 07/10/2012)
- 07/16/2012 105 ANSWER to LodgeNet Interactive Corp.'s First Amended Counterclaims filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC.(Fenster, Marc) (Entered: 07/16/2012)
- 07/16/2012 106 ANSWER to Six Continents Hotels, Inc. and Intercontinental Hotels Group Resources, Inc.'s First Amended Counterclaims filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC.(Fenster, Marc) (Entered: 07/16/2012)

- 07/26/2012 107 NOTICE of Manual Filing filed by Counter Claimant Marriott International Inc, Defendant Marriott International Inc of Marriott International, Inc.'s First Amended Answer and Counterclaims to Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC's Complaint. (Gibson, John) (Entered: 07/26/2012)
- 07/26/2012 108 FIRST AMENDED ANSWER AND COUNTERCLAIMS to Answer to Complaint (Discovery), Counterclaim 66 ; filed by defendant Marriott International Inc. (rla) (Entered: 07/27/2012)
- 07/26/2012 109 PROOF OF SERVICE filed by defendant/counterclaimant Marriott International Inc, re First Amended Answer to Complaint 108 ; served on 7/26/2012. (rla) (Entered: 07/27/2012)
- 08/01/2012 110 NOTICE of Change of address by Adam P Romero attorney for Defendant T-Mobile USA Inc. Changing attorneys address to 7 World Trade Center, New York, NY 10007. Filed by Defendant T-Mobile USA Inc. (Romero, Adam) (Entered: 08/01/2012)
- 08/16/2012 111 ANSWER to Defendant Marriott International filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC.(Fenster, Marc) (Entered: 08/16/2012)
- 08/17/2012 112 NOTICE of Appearance filed by attorney Michael Terrence Boardman on behalf of Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC (Boardman, Michael) (Entered: 08/17/2012)
- 09/12/2012 113 NOTICE of Appearance filed by attorney Larry C Russ on behalf of Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC (Russ, Larry) (Entered: 09/12/2012)
- 10/04/2012 114 NOTICE of Appearance filed by attorney Nandan R Padmanabhan on behalf of Counter Claimant T-Mobile USA Inc, Defendant T-Mobile USA Inc (Padmanabhan, Nandan) (Entered: 10/04/2012)
- 10/04/2012 115 NOTICE of Change of Attorney Information for attorney Nandan R Padmanabhan counsel for Counter Claimant T-Mobile USA Inc, Defendant T-Mobile USA Inc. Michael D. Jay is no longer attorney of record for the aforementioned party in this case for the reason indicated in the G-06 Notice. Filed by defendant T-Mobile USA, Inc. (Padmanabhan, Nandan) (Entered: 10/04/2012)
- 10/05/2012 116 JOINT REPORT Rule 26(f) Discovery Plan ; estimated length of trial 10 days, filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC.. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit A - Joint Schedule)(Weiss, Andrew) (Entered: 10/05/2012)
- 10/17/2012 117 MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS by Judge Josephine Staton Tucker, VACATING SCHEDULING CONFERENCE AND SETTING CASE MANAGEMENT DATES: Scheduling Conference set for hearing on October 19, 2012, is VACATED and taken off calendar, and the following dates are set. Counsel's attention is directed to the Court's Order on Jury Trial filed concurrently with this minute order. Amended Pleadings due by 1/18/2013. Last date to conduct settlement conference is 4/7/2014. Final Pretrial Conference set for 5/30/2014 01:30 PM. Jury Trial set for 6/17/2014 09:00 AM. (See document for further details.) (rla) (Entered: 10/17/2012)
- 10/17/2012 118 ORDER by Judge Josephine Staton Tucker, ON JURY TRIAL: Final Pretrial Conference: May 30, 2014 at 1:30 p.m.; Exhibit Conference June 13, 2014 at 3:30 p.m.; Trial: June 17, 2014 at 9:00 a.m. (See document for further details.) (rla) (Entered: 10/17/2012)
- 10/17/2012 119 ORDER/REFERRAL to ADR Procedure No 3 by Judge Josephine Staton Tucker. Case ordered to a private mediator based upon a stipulation of the parties or by the court order. ADR Proceeding to be held no later than 4/7/14. (twdb) (Entered: 10/17/2012)
- 01/25/2013 120 NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION to Stay Case pending Outcome Of Inter Partes Reexamination and Ex Parte Reexamination filed by Defendant Best Western International Inc. Motion set for hearing on 3/15/2013 at 02:30 PM before Judge Josephine Staton Tucker. (Attachments: # 1 Declaration

- David E. Rogers, # 2 Proposed Order)(Rogers, David) (Entered: 01/25/2013)
- 01/28/2013 121 STIPULATION for Order to Set Briefing Dates re Motion to Stay Litigation Pending Outcome of Inter Partes Reexamination and Ex Parte Reexamination filed by Defendant Best Western International Inc. (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order)(Rogers, David) (Entered: 01/28/2013)
- 02/05/2013 122 ORDER TO REASSIGN CASE due to self-recusal pursuant to General Order 08-05 by Judge Josephine Staton Tucker. Case transferred from Judge Josephine Staton Tucker to the calendar of Judge Andrew J. Guilford for all further proceedings. Case number now reads as SACV12-522 AG(ANx). (twdb) (Entered: 02/05/2013)
- 02/11/2013 123 NOTICE OF MOTION re MOTION to Stay Case pending Outcome Of Inter Partes Reexamination and Ex Parte Reexamination 120 [Amended Notice of Hearing] filed by Defendant Best Western International Inc. Motion set for hearing on 3/11/2013 at 10:00 AM before Judge Andrew J. Guilford. (Weldon, Elizabeth) (Entered: 02/11/2013)
- 02/11/2013 124 Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC's Opposition re: MOTION to Stay Case pending Outcome Of Inter Partes Reexamination and Ex Parte Reexamination 120 filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC. (Attachments: # 1 Declaration of Andrew D. Weiss in support of Opposition to Motion to Stay Case Litigation, # 2 Exhibit A, # 3 Exhibit B, # 4 Exhibit C, # 5 Exhibit D, # 6 Exhibit E, # 7 Exhibit F, # 8 Exhibit G, # 9 Exhibit H, # 10 Exhibit I, # 11 Proposed Order Denying Motion to Stay Case Litigation)(Weiss, Andrew) (Entered: 02/11/2013)
- 02/12/2013 125 ORDER by Judge Andrew J. Guilford, re Stipulation for Order 121 . ORDERS as follows: 1. Plaintiff shall file and serve any opposition to the Motion on or before February 11, 2013. 2. Defendants shall file and serve any reply relating to the Motion on or before February 22, 2013. (twdb) (Entered: 02/12/2013)
- 02/15/2013 126 NOTICE filed by Defendant-Counterclaimant Lodgenet Interactive Corp. of Stay Under 11 U.S.C. Section 362 (Beteta, Douglas) (Entered: 02/15/2013)
- 02/15/2013 127 STATEMENT Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing filed by Defendant T-Mobile USA Inc (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit Ex. A to Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement)(Padmanabhan, Nandan) (Entered: 02/15/2013)
- 02/22/2013 128 REPLY in support of MOTION to Stay Case pending Outcome Of Inter Partes Reexamination and Ex Parte Reexamination 120 filed by Defendant Best Western International Inc. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit 2 - Declaration of David E. Rogers [Exs. 2A-2F])(Rogers, David) (Entered: 02/22/2013)
- 03/11/2013 129 MINUTES OF Motion Hearing held before Judge Andrew J. Guilford: DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO STAY LITIGATION PENDING OUTCOME OF INTER PARTES REEXAMINATION AND EX PARTE REEXAMINATION [DKT # 120, 123]: Cause is called for hearing and counsel make their appearances. Matter is argued and taken under submission. Court Reporter: Denise Paddock. (rla) (Entered: 03/11/2013)
- 03/14/2013 130 MINUTES (IN CHAMBERS): ORDER by Judge Andrew J. Guilford: DENYING MOTION TO STAY LITIGATION PENDING OUTCOME OF EX PARTE AND INTER PARTES REEXAMINATIONS: (See document for details.) (rla) (Entered: 03/15/2013)
- 03/18/2013 131 TRANSCRIPT ORDER as to Defendant and Counterclaimant T-Mobile USA Inc Court Reporter. Court will contact Adam Romero at adam.romero@wilmerhale.com with any questions regarding this order. Transcript portion requested: Other: 3/11/2013 Hearing on Motion to Stay Litigation. Transcript preparation will not begin until payment has been

- satisfied with the court reporter/recorder. (Romero, Adam) (Entered: 03/18/2013)
- 04/01/2013 132 STIPULATION for Extension of Time to File Responsive Claim Construction Brief and Plaintiff's Reply Claim Construction Brief and to Conduct the Depositions of Dr. Kevin Jeffay and Dr. Tal Lavian filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC. (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order) (Weiss, Andrew) (Entered: 04/01/2013)
- 04/01/2013 133 Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC's Opening Claim Construction Brief BRIEF filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC. (Weiss, Andrew) (Entered: 04/01/2013)
- 04/01/2013 134 DECLARATION of Andrew D. Weiss re Brief (non-motion non-appeal) 133 filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit A, # 2 Exhibit B, # 3 Exhibit C, # 4 Exhibit D, # 5 Exhibit E, # 6 Exhibit F, # 7 Exhibit G)(Weiss, Andrew) (Entered: 04/01/2013)
- 04/05/2013 135 ORDER by Judge Andrew J. Guilford, granting Stipulation for Extension of Time to File Response/Reply 132 . (Claim Construction Hearing set for 6/4/2013 09:00 AM before Judge Andrew J. Guilford.) (twdb) (Entered: 04/05/2013)
- 04/12/2013 136 Joint STIPULATION to Exceed Page Limitation as to Responsive and Reply Claim Construction Briefs filed by defendant T-Mobile USA Inc. (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order RE: stipulation for the parties to exceed the default page limits for their responsive and reply claim construction briefs by ten pages)(Padmanabhan, Nandan) (Entered: 04/12/2013)
- 04/16/2013 137 ORDER by Judge Andrew J. Guilford re Stipulation for the Parties to Exceed the Default Page Limits for Their Responsive and Reply Claim Construciton Briefs by Ten Pages. it is ordered that the Defendants Joint Responsive Claim Construction Brief, due on April 22, 2013, will be limited to no more than thirty-five (35) pages in length and Linksmarts Reply Claim Construction Brief, due on May 6, 2013, will be limited to no more than thirty-five (35) pages in length. (db) (Entered: 04/16/2013)
- 04/19/2013 138 NOTICE of Appearance filed by attorney Robert F Gookin on behalf of Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC (Gookin, Robert) (Entered: 04/19/2013)
- 04/22/2013 139 BRIEF filed by Defendant-Counterclaimant Best Western International Inc, Choice Hotels International Inc, Ethostream LLC, Ibahn General Holdings Corp, Intercontinental Hotels Group Resources Inc, Marriott International Inc, Ramada Worldwide Inc, Six Continents Hotels Inc, T-Mobile USA Inc. re CLAIM CONSTRUCTION (Romero, Adam) (Entered: 04/22/2013)
- 04/22/2013 140 DECLARATION of Adam P. Romero re Brief (non-motion non-appeal), 139 filed by Counter Claimant T-Mobile USA Inc, Defendant T-Mobile USA Inc. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit A, # 2 Exhibit B, # 3 Exhibit C, # 4 Exhibit D, # 5 Exhibit E, # 6 Exhibit F, # 7 Exhibit G, # 8 Exhibit H, # 9 Exhibit I, # 10 Exhibit J, # 11 Exhibit K)(Romero, Adam) (Entered: 04/22/2013)
- 04/22/2013 141 DECLARATION of David E. Rogers re Brief (non-motion non-appeal), 139 filed by Counter Claimant Best Western International Inc, Defendant Best Western International Inc. (Romero, Adam) (Entered: 04/22/2013)
- 05/06/2013 142 REPLY Claim Construction Brief filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC. (Attachments: # 1 Declaration of Andrew D. Weiss, # 2 Exhibit A, # 3 Exhibit B, # 4 Exhibit C, # 5 Exhibit D, # 6 Exhibit E, # 7 Exhibit F)(Weiss, Andrew) (Entered: 05/06/2013)
- 05/08/2013 143 NOTICE of Appearance filed by attorney Bethany M Stevens on behalf of Counter Claimant T-Mobile USA Inc, Defendant T-Mobile USA Inc (Stevens, Bethany) (Entered: 05/08/2013)
- 05/08/2013 144 NOTICE of Change of Attorney Information for attorney Bethany M

- Stevens counsel for Counter Claimant T-Mobile USA Inc, Defendant T-Mobile USA Inc.Nandan R. Padmanabhan is no longer attorney of record for the aforementioned party in this case for the reason indicated in the G-06 Notice. Filed by defendant T-Mobile USA, Inc. (Stevens, Bethany) (Entered: 05/08/2013)
- 05/08/2013 145 NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION for attorney Zachary Paul Piccolomini to Appear Pro Hac Vice(PHV Fee of \$325 receipt number 0973-12081997 paid.) filed by defendant T-Mobile USA Inc. (Attachments: # 1 Certificate of Good Standing, # 2 Proposed Order)(Stevens, Bethany) (Entered: 05/08/2013)
- 05/09/2013 146 ORDER by Judge Andrew J. Guilford: granting 145 Motion to Appear Pro Hac Vice by Attorney Zachary Paul Piccolomini on behalf of Defendant T-Mobil USA, Inc., designating Bethany Stevens as local counsel. (lt) (Entered: 05/10/2013)
- 05/13/2013 147 NOTICE of Change of Attorney Information for attorney John S Gibson counsel for Defendant Marriott International Inc. Jeffrey D. Adhoot will no longer receive service of documents from the Clerks Office for the reason indicated in the G-06 Notice.Jeffrey D. Adhoot is no longer attorney of record for the aforementioned party in this case for the reason indicated in the G-06 Notice. Filed by Defendant Marriott International, Inc. (Gibson, John) (Entered: 05/13/2013)
- 05/13/2013 148 CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT (AMENDED) filed by Counter Claimant T-Mobile USA Inc, Defendant T-Mobile USA Inc identifying T-Mobile US, Inc. as Corporate Parent. (Romero, Adam) (Entered: 05/13/2013)
- 05/14/2013 149 SCHEDULING NOTICE: On the Court's own motion, the Claim Construction Hearing previously scheduled for 6/4/2013 at 9:00 am is continued to 6/6/2013 at 9:00 am.THERE IS NO PDF DOCUMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THIS ENTRY.(lb) TEXT ONLY ENTRY (Entered: 05/14/2013)
- 05/22/2013 150 Joint STIPULATION to Continue Claim Construction Hearing from June 6, 2013 to July 16, 2013 filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC. (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order)(Weiss, Andrew) (Entered: 05/22/2013)
- 05/23/2013 151 ORDER by Judge Andrew J. Guilford, granting Stipulation to Continue 150 . (Claim Construction Hearing continued to 7/17/2013 09:00 AM before Judge Andrew J. Guilford.) (twdb) (Entered: 05/23/2013)
- 06/07/2013 152 APPLICATION for attorney Kirk R. Ruthenberg to Appear Pro Hac Vice(PHV Fee of \$325 receipt number 0973-12231501 paid.) filed by defendant T-Mobile USA Inc. (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order)(Stevens, Bethany) (Entered: 06/07/2013)
- 06/10/2013 153 NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION for Reconsideration re Order on Motion to Stay Case 130 filed by Defendants Best Western International Inc, Choice Hotels International Inc, Ethostream LLC, Ibahn General Holdings Corp, Intercontinental Hotels Group Resources Inc, Marriott International Inc, Ramada Worldwide Inc, Six Continents Hotels Inc, T-Mobile USA Inc. Motion set for hearing on 7/8/2013 at 10:00 AM before Judge Andrew J. Guilford. (Romero, Adam) (Entered: 06/10/2013)
- 06/10/2013 154 DECLARATION of Adam P. Romero in support of MOTION for Reconsideration re Order on Motion to Stay Case 130 153 filed by Counter Claimant T-Mobile USA Inc, Defendant T-Mobile USA Inc. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit A, # 2 Exhibit B, # 3 Exhibit C)(Romero, Adam) (Entered: 06/10/2013)
- 06/10/2013 155 NOTICE OF LODGING OF PROPOSED ORDER re MOTION for Reconsideration re Order on Motion to Stay Case 130 153 filed by Counter Claimants Best Western International Inc, Ethostream LLC, Intercontinental Hotels Group Resources Inc, Marriott International Inc,

- Ramada Worldwide Inc, Six Continents Hotels Inc, T-Mobile USA Inc, Defendants Best Western International Inc, Choice Hotels International Inc, Ethostream LLC, Ibahn General Holdings Corp, Intercontinental Hotels Group Resources Inc, Marriott International Inc, Ramada Worldwide Inc, Six Continents Hotels Inc, T-Mobile USA Inc. (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order)(Romero, Adam) (Entered: 06/10/2013)
- 06/11/2013 156 ORDER by Judge Andrew J. Guilford: granting 152 Application to Appear Pro Hac Vice by Attorney Kirk R. Ruthenberg on behalf of Defendant, designating Bethany M. Stevens as local counsel. (lt) (Entered: 06/11/2013)
- 06/11/2013 157 Notice of Electronic Filing re Order on Application to Appear Pro Hac Vice 156 e-mailed to kirk.ruithenberg@dentons.com bounced due to 5.1.0 - Unknown address error 550-'Invalid Recipient. Primary e-mail address corrected. Notice of Electronic Filing resent addressed to kirk.ruthenberg@dentons.com. Pursuant to Local Rules it is the attorneys obligation to maintain all personal contact information including e-mail address in the CM/ECF system. THERE IS NO PDF DOCUMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THIS ENTRY.(tyw) TEXT ONLY ENTRY (Entered: 06/11/2013)
- 06/17/2013 158 STIPULATION for Extension of Time to File to Defendants' Motion for Reconsideration of Motion to Stay Litigation filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC. (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order)(Weiss, Andrew) (Entered: 06/17/2013)
- 06/17/2013 159 ORDER by Judge Andrew J. Guilford, Granting Stipulation for Extension of Time to Respond to Motion for Reconsideration of Motion to Stay Litigation 158 : The time for Linksmart to respond to Defendants' Motion for Reconsideration of Motion to Stay Litigation shall be extended up to and including June 19, 2013. (rla) (Entered: 06/17/2013)
- 06/19/2013 160 Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Reconsideration of Motion to Stay Litigation re: MOTION for Reconsideration re Order on Motion to Stay Case 130 153 filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC. (Weiss, Andrew) (Entered: 06/19/2013)
- 06/21/2013 161 STIPULATION to Stay Case pending Preparation of Settlement Agreement filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC. (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order)(Weiss, Andrew) (Entered: 06/21/2013)
- 06/26/2013 162 ORDER by Judge Andrew J. Guilford, granting Stipulation to Stay Case pending Preparation of Settlement Agreement 161 . (Made JS-6. Case Terminated.) (twdb) (Entered: 07/01/2013)
- 07/24/2013 163 Joint STIPULATION to Stay Case pending Preparation of Settlement Agreements filed by Defendant T-Mobile USA Inc. (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order)(Romero, Adam) (Entered: 07/24/2013)
- 07/26/2013 164 REPORT ON THE DETERMINATION OF AN ACTION Regarding a Patent or Trademark. (Closing) (Attachments: # 1 order) (twdb) (Entered: 07/26/2013)
- 07/26/2013 165 MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS by Judge Andrew J. Guilford: ORDER DENYING REQUEST TOCONTINUE HEARING. The Court DENIES the request to continue the statusconference. (twdb) (Entered: 07/26/2013)
- 07/26/2013 166 NOTICE of Appearance filed by attorney Michael J Song on behalf of Defendant Ibahn General Holdings Corp (Song, Michael) (Entered: 07/26/2013)
- 07/29/2013 167 MINUTES OF Status Conference RE Settlement held before Judge Andrew J. Guilford: Cause is called for hearing and counsel make their appearances. Court and counsel confer. Court finds cause for granting additional time to finalize settlement. The Status Conference Re Settlement is continued to September 9, 2013, at 9:00 a.m.Court

- Reporter: Denise Paddock. (twdb) (Entered: 07/29/2013)
- 08/26/2013 168 NOTICE OF MOTION AND Joint MOTION to Dismiss Defendant Best Western International Inc filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC. (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order)(Weiss, Andrew) (Entered: 08/26/2013)
- 08/28/2013 169 ORDER by Judge Andrew J. Guilford: granting 168 Joint Motion to Dismiss Defendant Best Western International Inc., with prejudice. (twdb) (Entered: 08/28/2013)
- 09/06/2013 170 NOTICE of Bankruptcy Stay Under 11 U.S.C. § 362 filed by defendant Ibahn General Holdings Corp. (Song, Michael) (Entered: 09/06/2013)
- 09/06/2013 171 NOTICE of Settlement Agreement Between Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC and Ramada Worldwide, Inc. filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC. (Weiss, Andrew) (Entered: 09/06/2013)
- 09/08/2013 172 NOTICE of Settlement Agreement Between Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC and T-Mobile USA, Inc. filed by Defendant T-Mobile USA Inc. (Romero, Adam) (Entered: 09/08/2013)
- 09/09/2013 173 MINUTES OF Status Conference RE Settlement held before Judge Andrew J. Guilford: Cause is called for hearing and counsel make their appearances. Court and counsel confer. Court finds cause for granting additional time to finalize settlement. Status Conference continued to 9/23/2013 09:00 AM before Judge Andrew J. Guilford.Court Reporter: Denise Paddock. (twdb) (Entered: 09/10/2013)
- 09/10/2013 174 APPLICATION to Dismiss Defendant InterContinental Hotels Group Resources, Inc., and Six Continents Hotels, Inc. with Prejudice Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC. (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order)(Weiss, Andrew) (Entered: 09/10/2013)
- 09/13/2013 175 NOTICE OF MOTION AND Joint MOTION to Dismiss Choice Hotels International, Inc., with Prejudice Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC. (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order)(Weiss, Andrew) (Entered: 09/13/2013)
- 09/13/2013 176 NOTICE OF MOTION AND Joint MOTION to Dismiss Defendant Ramada Worldwide Inc with Prejudice filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC. (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order)(Weiss, Andrew) (Entered: 09/13/2013)
- 09/16/2013 177 ORDER by Judge Andrew J. Guilford: granting 176 Motion to Dismiss Defendant Ramada Worldwide Inc. Terminating Ramada Worldwide Inc. (twdb) (Entered: 09/16/2013)
- 09/16/2013 178 ORDER by Judge Andrew J. Guilford: granting 175 Motion to Dismiss Defendant Choice Hotels International Inc. Terminating Choice Hotels International Inc. (twdb) (Entered: 09/16/2013)
- 09/16/2013 179 ORDER by Judge Andrew J. Guilford, granting APPLICATION to Dismiss Defendant InterContinental Hotels Group Resources, Inc., and Six Continents Hotels, Inc. with Prejudice Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC 174 . Intercontinental Hotels Group Resources Inc and Six Continents Hotels Inc terminated. (twdb) (Entered: 09/17/2013)
- 09/20/2013 180 NOTICE of Settlement Agreement Between Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC and EthoStream LLC filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC. (Weiss, Andrew) (Entered: 09/20/2013)
- 09/23/2013 181 MINUTES OF Status Conference RE Settlement held before Judge Andrew J. Guilford:Status Conference set for 10/28/2013 09:00 AM before Judge Andrew J. Guilford.Court Reporter: Denise Paddock. (twdb) (Entered: 09/24/2013)
- 09/27/2013 182 NOTICE OF MOTION AND Joint MOTION to Dismiss Defendant T-Mobile

- USA Inc filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC.
(Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order)(Weiss, Andrew) (Entered:
09/27/2013)
- 10/02/2013 183 NOTICE OF MOTION AND Joint MOTION to Dismiss Defendant Ethostream
LLC with Predjuice filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC.
(Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order)(Weiss, Andrew) (Entered:
10/02/2013)
- 10/03/2013 184 NOTICE OF MOTION AND Joint MOTION to Dismiss Defendant Marriott
International Inc with Prejudice filed by Plaintiff Linksmart Wireless
Technology LLC. (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order)(Weiss, Andrew)
(Entered: 10/03/2013)
- 10/03/2013 185 ORDER by Judge Andrew J. Guilford: granting 184 Motion to Dismiss
Defendant Marriott International Inc. Terminating Marriott International
Inc. (twdb) (Entered: 10/03/2013)
- 10/07/2013 186 ORDER Granting Joint Motion to Dismiss T-Mobile USA, Inc 182 , by Judge
Andrew J. Guilford. On this day, Plaintiff and Counterclaim Defendant
Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC ("Linksmart") and Defendant and
Counterclaimant T-Mobile USA, Inc. ("T-Mobile"), announced to the Court
that they have settled their respective claims for relief asserted in this
case. The Court, having considered this request, is of the opinion that
their request of dismissal should be GRANTED. IT IS THEREFORE
ORDERED that the above-entitled cause and all claims against T-Mobile by
Linksmart herein are dismissed, with prejudice as to the refiling of same
and all claims against Linksmart by T-Mobile are dismissed without
prejudice to the re-filing of same. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all
attorneys' fees, costs of court and expenses shall be borne by the party
that incurred them. This is a final judgment. IT IS SO ORDERED. (dro)
(Entered: 10/08/2013)
- 10/10/2013 187 ORDER by Judge Andrew J. Guilford: granting 182 Joint Motion to Dismiss
Defendant T-Mobile USA Inc. (twdb) (Entered: 10/11/2013)
- 10/10/2013 188 ORDER by Judge Andrew J. Guilford: granting 183 Joint Motion to Dismiss
Defendant Ethostream LLC. Terminating Ethostream LLC. (twdb) (Entered:
10/11/2013)
- 10/28/2013 189 MINUTES OF Status Conference RE Settlement held before Judge Andrew
J. Guilford: Cause is called for hearing and counsel make their
appearances. Court and counsel confer. Counsel for plaintiff and
defendants lbahn and Lodgenet shall file a joint status report every three
months on the first of the month with the first report due on December 1,
2013. Court Reporter: Denise Paddock. (twdb) (Entered: 10/29/2013)
- 11/06/2013 190 REQUEST to Substitute attorney Mark E. Ungerman in place of attorney
Douglas J. Beteta filed by Defendant Lodgenet Interactive Corp.
(Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order)(Beteta, Douglas) (Entered:
11/06/2013)
- 12/02/2013 191 STATUS REPORT JOINT STATUS REPORT filed by Plaintiff Linksmart
Wireless Technology LLC. (Weiss, Andrew) (Entered: 12/02/2013)

Copyright © 2014 LexisNexis CourtLink, Inc. All rights reserved.
*** THIS DATA IS FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY ***

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application of: Koichiro Ikudome, et al. <i>Inter Partes</i> Reexamination	§	Docket No. 43614.61
	§	
Patent No. 6,779,118	§	Examiner: WORJLOH, Jalatee
	§	
Proceeding Nos.: 95/002,035 and	§	Art Unit: 3992
90/012,342 (merged)	§	Conf. No. 1745
	§	
For: User specific automatic data redirection system		

Mail Stop: *Inter Partes* Reexamination
Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**THIRD PARTY REQUESTER'S
RESPONDENT BRIEF**

Table of Contents

I.	Real Party in Interest	1
II.	Related Appeals and Interferences	1
III.	Status of Claims	1
IV.	Status of Amendments	1
V.	Summary of Claimed Subject Matter	1
VI.	Issues to be Reviewed on Appeal.....	2
VII.	Argument.....	2
A.	The Examiner Correctly Rejected Claims 16-18, 23, 24, 26, 36-43, 68-71, 76-84, and 86-90 as Obvious over Willens in view of RFC 2138 and Stockwell Because Willens Teaches Automated Modification of at Least a Portion of the Rule Set.....	2
1.	The Examiner Correctly Determined That Modifying a List of Permitted Websites Is a “Modification of at Least a Portion of the Rule Set”.....	4
2.	The Examiner Correctly Applied the Test for Obviousness	4
B.	The Examiner Correctly Rejected Claims 16-18, 23, 24, 26, 36-43, 68-71, 76-84, and 86-90 as Obvious over Willens in view of RFC 2138 and the Admitted Prior Art.....	5
C.	The Examiner Correctly Rejected Claims 16-24, 26-27, 36-43, 68-90 as Obvious Based in Part on Radia.....	5
1.	Radia Teaches a Redirection Server “Configured to Allow Modification”.....	6
2.	The Examiner Correctly Determined that Radia Teaches a “Redirection Server”.....	8
3.	The Examiner Correctly Applied the Test for Obviousness in Rejecting Claims Based in Part on Radia.....	9
D.	The Examiner Correctly Rejected Claims 40-43 as Obvious Over He, Zenchelsky, Fortinsky, and Admitted Prior Art	10
E.	The Examiner Correctly Rejected Claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-43, and 68-90 as Obvious over Coss in View of the Admitted Prior Art	11
1.	The Examiner Correctly Relied on Coss as a Prior Art Reference	11

2. The Examiner Correctly Determined That Coss Teaches an Individualized Rule Set	13
VIII. Evidence Appendix	15
IX. Related Proceedings Appendix	15
X. Conclusion.....	15
XI. Certificate of Word Count.....	16
XII. Certificate of Service.....	16

This is the Respondent Brief of the Third Party Requester in the *inter partes* reexamination of US 6,779,118 (“the ’118 Patent”).

I. Real Party in Interest

The real party in interest is Cisco Systems, Inc. (“Cisco”).

II. Related Appeals and Interferences

There is a pending petition in this reexamination proceeding for supervisory review of the examiner’s decision to enter the Patent Owner’s declaration evidence submitted after the Action Closing Prosecution. *See* Petition Under 37 CFR §1.181 to Strike Patent Owner’s Untimely Declarations from the Record (Oct. 4, 2013).

The ’118 Patent is the subject of pending litigation styled as *Linksmart Wireless Technology LLC v. T-Mobile USA Inc., et al.*, Case No. 8-12-cv-00522 (C.D. Cal.). The ’118 Patent is also the subject of these prior litigations: *Linksmart v. TJ Hospitality*, No. 2-10-cv-00277 (E.D. Tex.); *Linksmart v. Six Continents Hotels*, No. 2-09-cv-00026 (E.D. Tex.); *LinkSmart v. SBC Internet Servs.*, No. 2-08-cv-00385 (E.D. Tex.); *Linksmart v. Cisco Systems*, No. 2-08-cv-00304(E.D. Tex.); *Linksmart v. T-Mobile USA*, No. 2-08-cv-00264 (E.D. Tex.).

The ’118 Patent was the subject of the Board’s Decision on Appeal, Reexamination Control No. 90/009301 (Aug. 23, 2011).

III. Status of Claims

Requester accepts the Patent Owner’s statement of the status of claims. Requester understands that the Patent Owner concedes the invalidity of claims 2-7, 9-14, 28-35, and 44-67, which were rejected as obvious over US 5,848,233 to Radia in view of the Admitted Prior Art and further in view of US 6,154,775 to Coss.

IV. Status of Amendments

Requester accepts the Patent Owner’s statement of the status of amendments.

V. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

Requester disputes the Patent Owner’s summary of the claimed subject matter because it refers to a variety of features that are neither described nor claimed in the ’118 patent. For example, the Patent Owner asserts that the ’118 patent “enables a provider, such as a hotel or a Wi-Fi hotspot operator, to allow access to a network such as the Internet, conditioned on the payment of a fee.” (Patent Owner Appeal Brief [*hereinafter* “PO Br.”] at 6.) The ’118 patent does not disclose a hotel, Wi-Fi hotspot operator, or wireless networking. Nor does the patent

describe allowing access to the Internet after the payment of a fee. Similarly, the patent does not describe “redirect[ing] the user to a billing webpage where the user can pay for the desired access.” PO Br. at 7. Such concepts are neither described nor claimed in the ’118 patent.

Requester generally accepts the remainder of the Patent Owner’s summary of the claimed subject matter.

VI. Issues to be Reviewed on Appeal

Requester accepts the Patent Owner’s statement of issues.

VII. Argument

The Examiner correctly rejected all of the remaining claims of the ’118 Patent, and the Patent Owner fails to present any persuasive argument or show any error in the Examiner’s analysis. The Board should affirm the Examiner’s rejections.

Numerous claims are subject to this appeal. The Patent Owner’s arguments, however, focus on the “automated modification” limitation in system claim 16, and indicate that the same arguments apply with respect to the other claims, such as method claim 26. *See* PO Br. at 9. Accordingly, claim 16 is a suitable exemplary claim. *See* 37 CFR 41.67 (c)(1)(vii).

“During patent examination, the pending claims must be ‘given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.’” (MPEP 2111.) This standard is different from that applied in patent litigation. Accordingly, the claim interpretations in this Respondent Brief are not binding upon the real party in interest in any litigation related to the ’118 Patent.

A. The Examiner Correctly Rejected Claims 16-18, 23, 24, 26, 36-43, 68-71, 76-84, and 86-90 as Obvious over Willens in view of RFC 2138 and Stockwell Because Willens Teaches Automated Modification of at Least a Portion of the Rule Set

The Examiner correctly rejected claims 16-18, 23, 24, 26, 36-43, 68-71, 76-84, and 86-90 as being obvious over to Willens (US 5889958) in view of RFC 2138 and Stockwell (US 5950195).¹ The Examiner also correctly rejected these claims as being obvious over Willens in view of RFC 2138 and the Admitted Prior Art.

The Patent Owner’s arguments focus on claim 16’s recitation of a redirection server “configured to allow modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily

¹ While the Examiner has rejected claims 2-7, 9-14, 28-35, and 44-67 on these grounds, the Patent Owner did not contest the rejection of those claims.

assigned network address.”

As the Examiner noted in the Right of Appeal Notice, Willens teaches controlling a user’s access to websites on the Internet by consulting a filter rule specific to each user. When a user attempts to access a website, Willens’ communications server 14 (a “redirection server”) determines whether to allow the access and stores the result in a local cache:

The server 14 looks at each filter rule found in “F(Timmy)” starting from the top. When it reaches the rule permit “PTA List”, the server 14 looks into its local cache 50 to see if www.playboy.com is on the PTA List. If not, the server 14 sends a filter look-up request to the server 18. This look-up contains the list name “PTA List” and the site Timmy is trying to access (www.playboy.com). The server 18 searches list 52 and sends back the result. Based on the result, the server 14 either permits or denies access and updates it’s local cache 50.

Willens, 5:64-6:7; *see also* Right of Appeal Notice [*hereinafter* RAN] at 9-10.

The local cache of allowed websites stored on communications server 14 is modified every time the user accesses a new allowable website. The cached list of allowed websites is “at least a portion of the rule set.” The updates to the local cache occur while the user is logged into the communication server 14 with a temporary network address. Thus, Willens teaches that the communication server 14 is “configured to allow modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address” as recited in the claim.

Furthermore, Willens’ ChoiceNet server 18 “automatically maintains the permit list by *downloading updated versions* of the list over the Internet and compiling the list *for use by the client software 42,*” perhaps “on a daily or hourly basis.” Willens, 5:41-44, 4:43-44. The “client software 42” is the packet filter on communications server 14 (the “redirection server”). Thus, the rules applied by communications server 14—such as the F(Timmy) rule set, which incorporates the “PTA List” of updateable websites—may be automatically modified every hour. For example, during the course of a student’s day at school, additional websites may be discovered that should be allowed or blocked, so they could be added to or removed from the PTA List. Within an hour, the update would reach the ChoiceNet server 18 and, as needed in response to a student’s queries, be obtained and applied by the communication server 14 to the student’s website requests. Thus, Willens renders obvious modifying a portion of the rule set on communication server 14 while the rule set remains correlated with a user’s temporary network address.

1. The Examiner Correctly Determined That Modifying a List of Permitted Websites Is a “Modification of at Least a Portion of the Rule Set”

The Patent Owner argues that Willens' teaching of updating the list of permitted websites does not teach “modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated with a temporarily assigned network address.” See PO Br. at 11. Specifically, the Patent Owner argues that Willens teaches “the modification of the *site list*, not the rule set.” PO Br. at 11.

The Patent Owner is incorrect. Willens teaches that one example rule is “the rule permit ‘PTA List.’” Willens, 5:66. The list of websites included on the “PTA List” is an integral part of this rule, and changing the list of websites on the “PTA List” unambiguously changes the meaning of the rule “permit ‘PTA List.’” Thus, modifying the list of websites incorporated into a rule is a “modification of at least a portion of the rule set.”

The Patent Owner also argues that only the ChoiceNet server 18 is updated, and that these updates do not reach the communication server 14. Willens teaches, however, “downloading updated versions of the list over the Internet and compiling the list *for use by the client software*,” i.e., the filter programmed in the communication server 14. Willens, 5:42-44. Since Willens teaches that the updates are intended for use by the client software on communication server 14, one of skill in the art would have been motivated to provide the updates from the ChoiceNet server 18 to the communication server 14. One mechanism to ensure that this would happen would be to mark cache entries with an expiration time after which they are discarded. For example, Stockwell teaches that cache entries should only be relied on before their expiration, thus avoiding the use of stale data:

The reply can *include an expiration date* for the result of this query. This is *used internally for caching*. If a duplicate query is made by the same agent before the time expires, the cached reply is returned.

Stockwell, 8:30-33 (emph. added). It would have been obvious to apply a similar expiration timer to the cache entries in Willens' communications server 14, thus ensuring that communications server 14 obtains the automatic updates received by ChoiceNet server 18 in a timely fashion.

2. The Examiner Correctly Applied the Test for Obviousness

The Patent Owner also argues that the examiner failed to “apply the non-obviousness analysis required by *Graham v. John Deere*.” PO Br. at 12.

To the contrary, the examiner assessed the scope of the admitted and applied prior art by

adopting the detailed reasoning and analysis included with the request for reexamination. *See* RAN at 20-21 (incorporating by reference the analysis from the Request (Control No. 95/002035) Ex. AA, pp. 2-112). The adopted analysis includes detailed findings regarding the disclosure of each prior art reference, the differences between the prior art and the claims (e.g., Willens does not teach redirection *per se*), and the level of ordinary skill in the art as reflected in the admitted and applied prior art. Furthermore, the examiner's adopted analysis includes a detailed explanation of why a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the references as used in the rejections.

Accordingly, the Patent Owner's argument that the Examiner failed to properly evaluate the obviousness of the claims is without foundation. The Board should affirm the rejection of claims 16-18, 23, 24, 26, 36-43, 68-71, 76-84, and 86-90 as obvious over Willens in view of RFC 2138 and Stockwell.

B. The Examiner Correctly Rejected Claims 16-18, 23, 24, 26, 36-43, 68-71, 76-84, and 86-90 as Obvious over Willens in view of RFC 2138 and the Admitted Prior Art

The claims 16-18, 23, 24, 26, 36-43, 68-71, 76-84 and 86-90 stand rejected as obvious over Willens in view of RFC 2138 and the Admitted Prior Art. The Patent Owner grouped these rejections together with the rejections based on Willens, RFC 2138, and Stockwell. For reasons analogous to those discussed immediately above, affirmance of these rejections is appropriate.

C. The Examiner Correctly Rejected Claims 16-24, 26-27, 36-43, 68-90 as Obvious Based in Part on Radia

The Examiner properly rejected various claims based in part on Radia (US5848233) under two separate grounds, which the Patent Owner argues together:

- claims 16-24, 26-27, 36-43, and 68-90 are obvious over Radia in view of Wong'727 (US5835727) and Stockwell (US5950195); and
- claims 16-24 and 68-90 are obvious over Radia in view of Wong'727 (US5835727) and the Admitted Prior Art.²

² Requester also proposed rejecting claims 26-27 and 36-43 as obvious over Radia in view of Wong'727 and the Admitted Prior Art in the detailed analysis adopted by the Examiner. *See* RAN at 21; Request Ex. BB at 55-102. Their omission from the rejection appears to be a clerical oversight, not the result of a determination on the merits.

1. Radia Teaches a Redirection Server “Configured to Allow Modification”

As analyzed more fully in the Request for Reexamination, Radia teaches a system in which each user's access to a network is controlled by an individualized set of rules programmed into a router, which then blocks or allows data packets sent between the user's computer and the network. *See, e.g.*, Radia, 6:66-7:2 & 3:18-20. Thus, Radia's router corresponds to the claimed “redirection server” that processes users' data “according to the individualized rule set.”

Radia further teaches modifying a user's rule set. For example, Radia teaches that the router initially associates each newly assigned temporary network address with a login profile permitting communication with a limited number of destinations. Radia, 7:22-42. These destinations are essentially those “required for a user to login to network 100,” such as the login server. Radia, 7:42-45. After the user successfully logs in, the router is updated with user's packet filter, thus allowing the user access to network resources according to the user's individualized rule set. *See, e.g.*, Radia, 10:6-14. Thus, the user's packet filter is modified *after* the user has obtained a temporary network address and communicated with the login server.

The Patent Owner argues that the redirection server *itself* must make the modification. PO Br. at 14. As the Examiner correctly noted, however, the claim language simply recites that the redirection server is configured to *allow* automated modification of the rule set, “which does not limit the modification to the redirection server.” *See* RAN at 12. Furthermore, the '118 Patent includes examples where the redirection server allows signals from the Internet or an outside server to modify the rule set:

In yet another embodiment, *signals from the Internet* 110 side of redirection server 208 *can be used to modify rule sets* being used by the redirection server. ... Of course, the type of *modification an outside server can make to a rule set* on the redirection server is not limited to deleting a redirection rule, but can include any other type of modification to the rule set that is supported by the redirection server as discussed above.

'118 Patent, 7:58-8:11 (emph. added).

As the Examiner correctly concluded, “Patent Owner's argued claim interpretation is inconsistent with the broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification, as it would exclude embodiments where the rule set is modified by an outside server.” RAN at 12.

Patent Owner also argues that claims 24, 26, 40-43 and 83-90 are distinguishable because they recite “instructions to the redirection server to modify the rule set.” PO Br. at 14. Claims 26

and 40-43, however, contain *no such claim language*. The Patent Owner provides no argument for why claims 26 and 40-43 should be interpreted as including an “instructions” limitation. It would be improper and contrary to the broadest reasonable interpretation to treat claims 26 and 40-43 as if they recited such a limitation. Thus, the Patent Owner’s arguments relating to “instructions” are not applicable to claims 26 and 40-43.

While claims 24 and 83-90 do recite limitations relating to “instructions” to modify the rule set, Radia unambiguously teaches this concept. With respect to claim 24, for example, the detailed analysis adopted by the Examiner shows that the router 106 (the redirection server) receives instructions to modify its filtering rules from the ANCS server 112:

In step 602 of method 600, the filtering profile 400 is downloaded by the SMS 114 to the ANCS 112. At the same time, the SMS 114 also passes the IP address of client system 102b to the ANCS 112. In step 604, *the ANCS 112 uses the single filtering rule 404 included in the filtering profile 400 to establish a packet filter for IP packets originating from the client system 102b*. The packet filter is established by reconfiguring one or more of the components of the network 100 that forward packets originating at the client system 102b. For example, in some cases the packet filter may be established by reconfiguring the modem 104b connected to client system 102. Alternatively, *the packet filter may be established by reconfiguring router 106*.

Radia, 6:64–7:8 (emph. added); *see also* Request Exhibit BB at 25 (incorporated by reference in the Right of Appeal Notice at 21). The router 106 receives instructions including, for example, the detailed filtering rules included in the user’s filtering profile 400. Thus, the Examiner’s analysis shows (and Radia teaches) “instructions to the redirection server to modify the rule set.”

The Examiner’s analysis is further supported by Radia’s disclosure that “ANCS 112 reconfigures the network components using a protocol that is generally applicable to components of network 100, such as the simple network management protocol (SNMP).” Radia, 10:8-11. Thus, Radia does not contemplate that the ANCS 112 directly manipulates the rule set stored in the router 106 without any cooperation from the router 106 (as the Patent Owner seems to suggest). Rather, ANCS 112 sends management protocol messages to the router 106 to establish or update the packet filter (i.e., “modify the rule set”). The simple network management protocol (SNMP) messages sent from the ANCS 112 to reconfigure the router 106 are “instructions to the redirection server to modify the rule set.”

Finally, the Patent Owner argues that the Examiner has misread the ’118 Patent’s description of allowing an outside server to make rule set modifications. *See* PO Br. at 15. The Patent Owner’s argument focuses on the description in the specification of sending an *authorization* to the redirection server. The argument fails for several reasons. First, the specification states that the use of authorization is merely preferred, not required. ’118 Patent, 7:60-64. Second, none of claims 24 and 83-90 recite any limitation relating to authorization. Finally, the Patent Owner ignores other pertinent description in the ’118 Patent. For example, the specification states that “signals from the Internet 110 side of redirection server 208 can be used to modify rule sets.” ’118 Patent, 7:58-59. Thus, applying the Patent Owner’s literal approach to reading the disclosure, the ’118 Patent contemplates that the rule set may be modified by “signals from the Internet” (not by the redirection server *itself*).

In summary, the Patent Owner’s arguments do not distinguished the claims over Radia. The Board should affirm the Examiner’s rejections.

2. The Examiner Correctly Determined that Radia Teaches a “Redirection Server”

The Patent Owner argues that the Examiner erred by looking to the combined functionality of Radia’s ANCS 112 and router 106 to teach the “redirection server.” PO Br. at 15-16. This argument fails because the Patent Owner has not addressed the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims, which is that the “redirection server” may be composed of a combination of components. For example, the Patent Owner has admitted in related litigation that the redirection server may be composed of multiple components:

In the alternative, *the redirection server can be a combination* of the SSG and SESM. The redirection server may also be embodied by a different *combination of hardware and software*. ... In the alternative, the ISG and components of the AAA server, Policy server, Web portal and DHCP server (some of which may be components of SESM) also act as the redirection server.”

Linksmart’s Infringement Contentions, Request Ex. D2 at 18 (emph. added). The Patent Office may rely on the Patent Owner’s claim interpretation in litigation as an admission regarding the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim. *See* MPEP 2658, 2258 (“The admission can reside ... in litigation. Admissions by the patent owner as to any matter affecting patentability may be utilized...”). Therefore, the Examiner was correct to find that Radia’s ANCS 112 and router 106 teach the “redirection server.” The Board should be affirm the Examiner’s rejections.

Furthermore, Radia teaches flexibility in determining which components in its system perform which functions. For example, Radia teaches that the ANCS may be consolidated with SMS 114 (“authentication accounting server”). *See* Radia, 5:65-6:4. It would have been obvious to try other arrangements, such as consolidating the ANCS with the router 106.

The Patent Owner also argues that “Radia only teaches creation and configuration (but not modification) of filters in the router/modem by the ANCS.” PO Br. at 16. The Patent Owner is incorrect. Radia teaches not just configuring the router, but “reconfiguring the router.” Radia, 7:8 (emph. added). Furthermore, the Examiner’s rejection provided substantial analysis of Radia’s teachings with respect to modifying a user’s rule set. *See* Request Exhibit BB at 15-17. For example, Radia teaches that a user’s computer is assigned a temporary network address and associated with a packet filter that allows communications with a limited number of destinations, such as those required to login to the network. *See* Radia, 7:38-45. After the user successfully logs in, the user’s packet filter on the router is updated appropriately. Radia, 10:6-14. Thus, the user’s initial packet filter is modified while the temporary network address remains the same. The Patent Owner’s argument, which ignores these teachings, is without merit.

3. The Examiner Correctly Applied the Test for Obviousness in Rejecting Claims Based in Part on Radia

The Patent Owner argues that the Examiner applied the wrong test for obviousness, stating that “the Examiner’s disregard of the differences between the claimed invention and Radia, and the claimed invention and Stockwell, in reliance on *In re Keller*, is an error.” PO Br. at 18. The Patent Owner is incorrect to argue that the claims are nonobvious merely because neither Radia nor Stockwell are anticipation references, and the error in the argument explains the Examiner’s basis for citing *In re Keller*. “One cannot show non-obviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on a combination of references.” *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413 (CCPA 1981). The Patent Owner cannot overcome the Examiner’s obviousness rejection merely by showing a difference between the claims and Radia, or between the claims and Stockwell. Instead, the Patent Owner would need to show — but has not shown — a difference between the claim language and the *combination of references*.

Furthermore, Examiner correctly applied the *Graham* test for obviousness. The Examiner assessed the scope of the admitted and applied prior art by adopting the detailed reasoning and analysis included with the request for reexamination. *See* Right of Appeal Notice at 21-22

(incorporating by reference the analysis from Exhibit BB, pp. 2-109). The adopted analysis includes detailed findings regarding the disclosure of each prior art reference, the differences between the prior art and the claims (e.g., Radia does not teach redirection *per se*), and the level of ordinary skill in the art as reflected in the admitted and applied prior art. Furthermore, the Examiner’s adopted analysis includes a detailed explanation of why a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the references as applied in the rejections.

Accordingly, the rejections are supported by the references and should be affirmed.

D. The Examiner Correctly Rejected Claims 40-43 as Obvious Over He, Zenchelsky, Fortinsky, and Admitted Prior Art

The Patent Owner argues that the Examiner should have withdrawn the rejection of claims 40-43 as being obvious over He, Zenchelsky, Fortinsky, and Admitted Prior Art for the same reason that the Examiner withdrew other rejections. Specifically, the Patent Owner states that the “basis for the Examiner’s withdrawal of the rejection regarding claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-39, 68-82 and 84-85 was that none of the cited references teach automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set.” PO Br. at 18.

The Patent Owner’s restatement of the Examiner’s reasoning is incorrect, however. The Examiner noted that claim 16 recites “automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user access.” *See* Action Closing Prosecution at 34 (Apr. 29, 2013). “Upon further review, the examiner note[d] that He’s authentication lifetime *does not teach the time condition.*” *Id.* (emph. added). Claims 40-43 do not recite a “time” condition, and therefore the Examiner’s reason for withdrawing the rejection of claim 16 has no bearing on claims 40-43.

The Patent Owner also argues that claims 40-43 are allowable because they depend from claim 25. PO Br. at 18. Claim 25 was canceled in a previous reexamination, however, after the Board finally determined that the claim was obvious over He in view of Zenchelsky and the Admitted Prior Art. *See* Decision at 10, Control No. 90/009301 (August 23, 2011); ’118 Patent Ex Parte Reexamination Certificate No. 8926 (Mar. 27, 2012). Thus, claim 40-43 do not depend from a patentable claim, and their dependence from claim 25 is not relevant.

Because the Patent Owner does not present any argument on the merits with respect to claims 40-43, the Board should affirm the obviousness of these claims.

E. The Examiner Correctly Rejected Claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-43, and 68-90 as Obvious over Coss in View of the Admitted Prior Art

The Patent Owner argues that the Examiner failed to properly consider the declarations submitted by named inventors Yeung and Ikudome. PO Br. at 18-19. In fact, it was improper for the Examiner to consider these declarations at all, because the Patent Owner *intentionally* delayed in providing the declaration evidence, and therefore *cannot* show “good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not presented earlier.” 37 CFR 1.116 (e); *see also* Patent Owner Response at 10 n. 14 (Feb. 7, 2013) (“Patent Owner *is prepared to file Affidavits* under 37 CFR § 131 in support of prior conception and reduction to practice before the filing date of Coss.” (emph. added)). Accordingly, the Board should not consider the Patent Owner’s arguments that rely on its untimely declarations.³

1. The Examiner Correctly Relied on Coss as a Prior Art Reference

Even if the Patent Owner’s improper evidence is considered, the declarations are insufficient to establish conception and reduction to practice prior to Coss’ priority date. Establishing an actual reduction to practice “requires a showing of the invention in a physical or tangible form *that shows every element* of the [claim]” and that “*will work* for its intended purpose.” MPEP 2138.05 (emph. added). Patent Owner fails to make such a showing.

First, the collection of receipts for various hardware and software purchases is not correlated with any of the claim limitations. The receipts merely provided a list of general purpose computer parts — such as Linux software, modems and hard drives—that might have been used for a variety of purposes. Neither the declarants nor the Patent Owner explain how any of the purchased components relate to the claims.

Second, the submitted documents appear to be unrelated to the alleged reduction to practice. The the “Miscellaneous Expenses Claim” worksheet submitted by Moon-Tai Yeung has a “Project” field that is blank. Additionally, the expense claim form has the corporate logo and heading of Infogy, Inc., for whom Mr. Yeung states that he performed “consulting for NASA-JPL and KPMG.” Yeung Decl. at 1. The claim form does not have any markings to indicate that it is associated with AuriQ Systems, for whom he allegedly worked to develop the

³ Cisco has filed a petition for supervisory review of the Examiner’s decision to allow the untimely declarations to be admitted to the record.

claimed technology. *See id.* Thus, the receipts do not corroborate the statements in the declarations.

Third, the declarants’ naked statement that they demonstrated a device prior to mid-August 1997 is insufficient to prove an actual reduction to practice. The Patent Owner does not provide a declaration from anyone to whom the device was allegedly demonstrated. The Patent Owner does not even identify any such individuals. The Patent Owner does not explain when the device was allegedly demonstrated, how the device was allegedly demonstrated, or which of the many features now claimed was allegedly demonstrated.

Fourth, the Technical Innovation Report is not shown to support every element of the rejected claims. The Patent Owner bears the burden of proving that it is entitled to an earlier priority date, but Patent Owner does not provide any analysis whatsoever of *any language* of *any claim* relative to the Technical Innovation Report. “Vague and general statements in broad terms about what the exhibits describe along with a general assertion that the exhibits describe a reduction to practice ‘amounts essentially to mere pleading, unsupported by proof or a showing of facts’ and, thus, does not satisfy the requirements of 37 CFR 1.131(b).” MPEP 715.07 (I). Instead of presenting analysis, the Patent Owner argues that the Technical Innovation Report is relevant because of comments in an Order for an earlier *ex parte* reexamination. PO Br. at 19-20. But the Patent Owner does not provide the comments or explain their relevance. Additionally, the claims have changed since that Order, in particular, that reexamination proceeding resulted in the cancellation of all of the original independent claims and amendments to numerous others. In this reexamination, the Patent Owner has presented new claims. Thus, the Patent Owner has not shown that the Technical Innovation Report supports the claims as they stand now.

A review of the Technical Innovation Report shows that it does not support the claims under reexamination. For example, claim 16 recites “a redirection server programmed with a user’s rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address.” The Technical Innovation Report does not describe assigning temporary network addresses or correlating them with a user’s rule set. Instead, a user is redirected “based on his login ID.” Ikudome Decl., Appendix B at 6. Thus, the Technical Innovation Report does not provide §112 support for “a user’s rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address” as recited in claim 16.

Claim 16 also recites modifying the rule set “as a function of... location the user accesses.” The Technical Innovation Report also states that after a user “attempts to connect to a

Web site” and is redirected, “the server removes the information associated with his session from its registry.” *Id.* at 6. The Report clarifies that “(any valid) Web site” will trigger redirection and the session’s removal. *Id.* at 5. Thus, the Technical Innovation Report describes removing the rule set *regardless* of the website the user attempted to connect to. Thus, the Technical Innovation Report not provide §112 support for modification “as a function of... location the user accesses” as recited in claim 16.

Claim 16 further recites “wherein the redirection server is configured to allow modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of time.” The Technical Innovation Report does not describe modifying a rule set as a function of time; it merely states that “filters installed by the server have a preconfigured maximum lifetime.” *Id.* at 7. When the lifetime expires, the filter is removed. *Id.* The Examiner has distinguished, however, *removing* a rule set at the end of a preconfigured lifetime and *modifying* a rule set. *See, e.g.*, RAN at 3 (“Willens teaches updating the permit list, but does not expressly disclose removal or reinstatement....”); Action Closing Prosecution at 34 (“He’s authentication lifetime does not teach the time condition” of claim 16). Thus, the Technical Innovation Report’s disclosure of removing an expired filter does not provide §112 support under the Examiner’s interpretation of “modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of time” as recited in claim 16.

In summary, the Patent Owner’s evidence in support of the alleged prior reduction to practice is entirely insufficient. Although an exhibit need not support all claimed limitations, the missing limitation must be supported by the declaration itself. MPEP 715.07 (I). Neither of the Patent Owner’s declarants addresses the significant gaps noted above. Thus, the Patent Owner fails to remove Coss as a prior art reference.

2. The Examiner Correctly Determined That Coss Teaches an Individualized Rule Set

The Patent Owner argues that Coss is deficient as a reference because it describes a rule set shared across multiple users, and therefore does not teach modifying a “rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address.” PO Br. at 20.

However, the detailed analysis of Coss in view of the Admitted Prior Art adopted by the Examiner (RAN at 72) shows these features. For example, Coss teaches “a single firewall can support *multiple users, each with a separate security policy.*” Coss, 3:31-33 (emph. added). Coss also teaches that rules are associated with an IP address, such as a source or destination IP

address. *See* Coss, 4:4-11 and FIG. 3. The Admitted Prior Art teaches that it was known to provide temporary IP network addresses to users, and the Examiner determined that it would have been obvious to associate Coss' security rules with a temporarily assigned IP address. *See* Request (Control No. 90/012342) at 340-42.

Coss further teaches using “*dynamic rules* [to] allow a given rule set to be modified based on events happening in the network without requiring that the entire rule set be reloaded.” Coss, 8:34-36. The Examiner determined that it would have been obvious to apply Coss' dynamic rules to users associated with the temporarily assigned IP address. *See* Request (Control No. 90/012342) at 343. Thus, the Examiner was correct in finding that Coss and the Admitted Prior Art together teach “automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address.”

The Patent Owner does not address these teachings of Coss relied upon by the Examiner. Instead, the Patent Owner discusses Coss' teaching to cache packet filtering results using a session key and the sharing of rules across multiple users. PO Br. at 20; Coss, 5:42-52. But the Patent Owner does not explain how Coss' caching and session keys undermine the Examiner's adopted analysis. The Patent Owner also does not address Coss' teaching that “Exemplary dynamic rules include a ‘one-time’ rule which is only used *for a single session*,” that is, a dynamic rule applied to a single user. Coss, 8:41-42. Thus, the Patent Owner fails to show any error in the Examiner's rejection.

The Patent Owner also argues that Coss' “dynamic rules” do not correspond to the claim limitation of an “automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set.” PO Br. at 20-21. As noted above, Coss teaches that “dynamic rules *allow a given rule to be modified* based on events happening in the network.” Coss, 8:34-36 (emph. added). The Patent Owner does not explain why it believes the claim language is distinguishable from the dynamic rule modifications taught by Coss. The Patent Owner emphasizes that Coss does not teach modifying a rule set correlated to a *temporarily* assigned network address (PO Br. at 21), but this is simply because the Admitted Prior Art, not Coss, is relied on to teach *temporarily* assigned network addresses. As the Examiner previously stated, “One cannot show non-obviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on a combination of references.” *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413 (CCPA 1981). The argument is without merit.

In summary, the Patent Owner has not shown any error in the Examiner's analysis. The

Examiner's obviousness rejections based on Coss and the Admitted Prior Art should be affirmed.

VIII. Evidence Appendix

Requester does not rely on any declarations submitted under 37 CFR 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132.

IX. Related Proceedings Appendix

Filed concurrently with this respondent brief is an appendix containing a copy of the Board's Decision on Appeal in Reexamination Control No. 90/009301 (Aug. 23, 2011).

X. Conclusion

For the reasons provided above, Third Party Requester respectfully asks the Board to affirm all of the Examiner's claim rejections. As identified in the attached Certificate of Service, a copy of the present Respondent Brief, in its entirety, is being served to the address of the attorney or agent of record.


The estimated fees of \$2,000.00 for the fee set forth in 37 CFR 41.20(b)(2) have been provided for by credit card separately but concurrently herewith. However, should any additional fees be required, please charge any such fees to Haynes & Boone LLP Deposit Account No. 08-1394.

Respectfully submitted,

/David L. McCombs/

David L. McCombs
Registration No. 32,271

Dated: January 8, 2013
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
IP Section, 2323 Victory Avenue,
Suite 700
Dallas, Texas 75219
Telephone: 214/651-5533
Facsimile: 214/200-0853
R-353046_1.docx



XI. Certificate of Word Count

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.943(c), the undersigned certifies that this Respondent Brief contains 6671 words. The undersigned has relied upon the word count feature in Microsoft Word to provide this count.

/David L. McCombs /

David L. McCombs,
Registration No. 32,271

XII. Certificate of Service

The undersigned certifies that a copy of the THIRD PARTY REQUESTER'S RESPONDENT BRIEF was served on:

HERSHKOVITZ & ASSOCIATES, PLLC
2845 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

the attorneys of record for the assignee of USP 6,779,118 and

JAMES J. WONG
2108 GOSSAMER AVE.
REDWOOD CITY, CA 94065

the attorney of record for the requester in Control No. 90/012342, in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.903, on January 8, 2014.

/David L. McCombs /

David L. McCombs,
Registration No. 32,271

Related Proceeding Appendix

Board's Decision on Appeal in Reexamination Control No. 90/009,301 (August 23, 2011).



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
90/009,301	12/17/2008	6,779,118 B1	R1341006	6609
40401	7590	08/23/2011	EXAMINER	
Hershkovitz & Associates, LLC 2845 Duke Street Alexandria, VA 22314			RIMELL, SAMUEL G	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3992	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/23/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC
(U.S. Patent 6,779,118)

Appeal 2011-009566
Reexamination 90/009,301
Technology Center 3900

Before RICHARD TORCZON, SCOTT R. BOALICK and KARL
EASTHOM, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

TORCZON, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL
37 C.F.R. § 41.50(a) and (b)

The appellant (LWT) seeks review under 35 U.S.C. 134(b) of the final rejection of claims 1-47 in its Ikudome patent.¹ The rejection is AFFIRMED in part and REVERSED in part with a new ground of rejection.

¹ K. Ikudome & M.T. Yeung, *User specific automatic data redirection system*, US 6,779,118 B1 (granted 17 August 2004).

OPINION

INTRODUCTION

Rejections

LWT's patent issued with twenty-seven claims. During reexamination, LWT added claims 28-47. On appeal, the examiner maintains a rejection of all claims² under 35 U.S.C. 103 over the He³ and Zenchelsky⁴ patents, with additional reliance on an admission in the Ikudome patent about the prior art⁵ for claims 32, 37, 42 and 47.⁶

Representative claim

For purposes of this appeal, issued patent claim 1 and new claim 32 are broadly representative of the claims on appeal. Claim 1 defines the invention as:

A system comprising:
a database with entries correlating each of a plurality of user IDs with an individualized rule set;
a dial-up network server that receives user IDs from users' computers;
a redirection server connected to the dial-up network server and a public network, and
an authentication accounting server connected to the database, the dial-up network server and the redirection server;
wherein the dial-up network server communicates a first user ID for one of the users' computers and a temporarily

² We rely on the claims appendix to the appeal brief (Br. 33-42) for the final claims of record. See Ans. 3 (not commenting on claims appendix).

³ J. He and R.D. Hall, *Security system and method for network element access*, U.S. Pat. 6,088,451 (granted 11 July 2000).

⁴ D.N. Zenchelsky et al., *System and method for providing peer level access control on a network*, US 6,233,686 B1 (granted 15 May 2001).

⁵ Ikudome 1:53-57.

⁶ Ans. 4 and 22.

assigned network address for the first user ID to the authentication accounting server;

wherein the authentication accounting server accesses the database and communicates the individualized rule set that correlates with the first user ID and the temporarily assigned network address to the redirection server; and

wherein data directed toward the public network from the one of the users' computers are processed by the redirection server according to the individualized rule set.

Claim 32 depends from claim 1 and adds the further limitation that the redirection server is configured to redirect data from the users' computers by replacing a first destination address in an IP (Internet protocol) packet header by a second destination address as a function of the individualized rule set.

OBVIOUSNESS

Claim 1

LWT contends that the combination of He and Zenchelsky fail to teach or suggest (1) a redirection server, (2) an authentication accounting server communicating an individualized rule set to the redirection server and (3) data directed toward a

public network and processed by the redirection server according to the individualized rule set.⁷ The examiner finds these elements in the He patent. He Figure 10 (right)




FIG. 10

⁷ Br. 18.

depicts a high-level block diagram of a dial-up network including a network security server **208** communicating with a user account registration database **210** and an interconnection network **106**. The network security server **208** comprises an authentication server **202**, a credential server **204** and a network element access server **206**. The examiner relies on He's credential server **204** for the claimed redirection server, on He's authentication server **202** for the claimed authentication server and on text in He describing network authentication and privilege control.⁸

LWT argues that He does not teach redirection, specifically that He's credential server does not redirect a request for one Internet site to a different Internet site.⁹ The examiner counters that the redirection server is only claimed as a structure without any expressly claimed functionality for redirecting a request; rather, the examiner points to dependent claims 3 and 4,¹⁰ "wherein the redirection server further" blocks and allows, respectively, "the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set."

During reexamination, a claim (original, amended or new) is accorded the broadest construction that is reasonable in view of the specification¹¹ because (except for a claim in an expired patent) the patentee is expected to amend the claim to define the invention precisely rather than shift the burden of divining the inventor's intent to the reader.¹² The broadest reasonable construction of "redirection server" requires some sort of redirection

⁸ Ans. 5-6, citing He 18:24-30 & 19:2-8.

⁹ Br. 18-19.

¹⁰ Ans. 27-28.

¹¹ *In re Translogic Tech., Inc.*, 504 F.3d 1249, 1256 (Fed. Cir. 2007).

¹² *Ex parte Papst-Motoren*, 1 USPQ2d 1655, 1655-56 text & n.3 (BPAI 1986), citing *In re Yamamoto*, 740 F.2d 1569, 1571 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

functionality. By their express terms, blocking and allowing are "further" functions of the redirection server rather than its essential function for purposes of the claim.¹³ While LWT has not pointed to an express definition in its written disclosure that would compel this construction, it is more consistent with the disclosure than a construction that did not require redirection. For example, Ikudome writes (emphasis added) that¹⁴

It will be clear to one skilled in the art that the invention may be implemented to control (block, allow *and* redirect) any type of service, such as Telnet, FTP, WWW and the like.

This use is consistent throughout the disclosure. By contrast, the examiner's construction would make the adjective "redirection" inapt,¹⁵ if not superfluous. One skilled in the art, having read the Ikudome disclosure, would necessarily understand the redirection server to control by, inter alia, redirecting.

The examiner contends that the user has been redirected if, having failed in a first attempt, the user elects to request access to something else.¹⁶ While as a description of user behavior the examiner's surmise is reasonable, it describes redirection by the user not by the redirection server. The proposed connection between the redirection server's action and the user's response is too attenuated to be properly attributed to the server.

¹³ New claim 32 claims the third function—redirecting—but with further limitations on how the redirecting is accomplished such that the presumption of claim differentiation is not invoked to bar redirecting generally as a limitation of claim 1.

¹⁴ Ikudome 8:12-14.

¹⁵ The generic term in both He and Ikudome is "control", suggesting that LWT would have used "control server" if it had intended to claim more broadly.

¹⁶ Ans. 28.

The examiner's construction of "redirection server" is overly broad in view of the underlying disclosure. Properly construed, the redirection server must, at a minimum, be configured to redirect something. He's credential server **204**, while providing the control functions of blocking and allowing,¹⁷ does not appear to teach or suggest redirecting, alone or in combination with Zenchelsky.

LWT also contends that the combined references do not teach or suggest the claimed limitation that "data directed toward the public network" is "processed by the redirection server". LWT argues that even if He's credential server were a redirection server, it does not process data directed toward the public network. The examiner responds that LWT is assuming a network topology that claim 1 does not require. The examiner has a point. As He teaches, logical and physical topologies in a network can be very different.¹⁸ The problem lies in the phrase "data directed toward the public network" since He discloses the user communicating with the credential server **204** through the interconnection network **106** directly or via a dial-up network **1004** and server **1002**. Hence, the user sends data ultimately intended for the credential server **204** initially to the interconnection network.¹⁹ Claim 1 does not exclude communication between a user and a control server via a public network. The communication must contain data as that term is broadly construed.

¹⁷ E.g., He 18:42-19:39.

¹⁸ He 4:33-52.

¹⁹ Cf. Reply 6: "Additionally, if the user communicates information (e.g., the general ticket from the authentication server) to the "credential server" in HE, the elements 102 [the user] and 1002 [the dial-up server] are on one side of the network 106 and the credential server is on the other side of the network [.]"

Claims 15 and 25

LWT argues two differences for amended independent claim 15 and issued independent claim 25.²⁰ Claim 15 is a system claim (numbering added) in which the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set:

- [1] correlated to the temporarily assigned network address; and
- [2] as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses.

The examiner notes that the claim says "automated" rather than "automatic" as LWT argues and points to He's "database tool...provided for the system security administrator to create, delete, disable and modify a user account" as the basis for these limitations.²¹ He's database tool certainly meets the "automated" requirement since, as the examiner notes, "automated" merely requires use of automation, not the absence of any human intervention. In a computer context, a database tool necessarily involves automated equipment.

The examiner relies on Zenchelsky to meet the first condition of modification. LWT does not address how the examiner is wrong in this regard. LWT does however argue that He's database tool does not teach or suggest the second condition.²² The examiner relies on He's teaching that authentication should have a "lifetime" to teach the time condition.²³ He does not, however, draw a connection between the authentication lifetime and the administrator's use of the database tool. He, the only reference on

²⁰ Br. 26-28. LWT does not argue these claims separately from each other.

²¹ Ans. 28-29, citing He 17:19-21.

²² Br. 28.

²³ Ans. 30, citing He 17:13.

which the examiner relies to meet the second condition limitation of claim 15, does not in fact teach or suggest this limitation.

Claim 25 is a method claim that does not provide for "automated" modifying or provide conditions facially similar those in claim 15 limitation [2]. The connection between LWT's arguments for these claim 15 elements and the express limitations of claim 25 is unclear. It is not a board function to make arguments for appellants. LWT has not shown prejudicial error in the examiner's rejection of claim 25 beyond the misconstruction of "redirection server".

Claims 32, 37, 42 and 47

Claims 32, 37, 42 and 47 depend from independent claims 1, 8, 15 and 25, respectively. Each adds the further limitation:

wherein the redirection server is configured to redirect data from the users' computers by replacing a first destination address in an IP (Internet protocol) packet header by a second destination address as a function of the individualized rule set.

In addition to the combination of He and Zenchelsky, the examiner relies on the following statement from the background section of the Ikudome disclosure regarding the prior art:²⁴

The browser next sends a request to the server requesting the page. In response to the user's request, the web server sends the requested page to the browser. The page, however, contains html code instructing the browser to request some other WWW page—hence the redirection of the user begins.

²⁴ Ans. 22, citing Ikudome 1:53-57. At p. 32, the examiner more broadly notes the discussion in Ikudome 1:38-67, particularly 1:38-40: "The redirection of Internet traffic is most often done with World Wide Web (WWW) traffic (more specifically, traffic using the HTTP (hypertext transfer protocol))."

The admission shows that those in the art were familiar with redirection (and how to do it) at least in a world-wide web context. LWT argues that Ikudome does not admit that "redirection in the particular combination claimed [was] known prior art."²⁵ This argument is entitled to no weight since the examiner used the admission in combination with other references for obviousness rather than relying on it as an anticipation.

LWT also argues that the examiner has not shown replacement as a function of an individualized rule set.²⁶ The examiner, however, explained that redirection would be used, for example, to direct "users away from closed websites".²⁷ The examiner does not say what he means by "closed", but read in context with his contention "that blocking/passing is a part of the logic in the redirection process and thus readable as 'redirection'"²⁸ he appears to mean "blocked". Thus, an address blocked for a particular user would be replaced with another address, perhaps a safer website or a website explaining organizational policy regarding the blocked websites. While the examiner's contention that blocking necessarily includes redirection is not supported in the record, redirection is an obvious extension of the use of a control to block the user.

LWT has not shown prejudicial error in the examiner's rejection of claims 32, 37 and 47. Claim 42 depends from claim 15, for which the rejection did not support redirection based on "the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location

²⁵ Br. 30.

²⁶ *Id.*

²⁷ Ans. 23-25.

²⁸ Ans. 28.

the user accesses." However, blocking a website based on these bases would have been obvious.²⁹ Since redirection would have been an obvious extension of blocking, it follows that the combination of He and Zenchelsky in view of Ikudome's admission would have made redirection based on the same bases obvious as well.

NEW GROUNDS OF REJECTION

Claims 1, 8, 15 and 25

Since claims 32, 37, 42 and 47 depend from independent claims 1, 8, 15 and 25, respectively, it follows that the independent claims must be obvious as well.³⁰

HOLDING

The rejection of claims 32, 37, 42 and 47 is AFFIRMED;

The rejection of claims 1, 8, 15 and 25 is REVERSED, but a new ground of rejection is entered under 37 C.F.R. § 41.50(b) as described above.

The rejection of the other claims on appeal is REVERSED.

AFFIRMED IN PART

and

REVERSED IN PART

with a new ground of rejection

KMF

²⁹ E.g., blocking a site for a user after discovering inappropriate communications between the user and the website or after discovering the user spends excessive time at a site unrelated to work.

³⁰ *Callaway Golf Co. v. Acushnet Co.*, 576 F.3d 1331, 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2009) (holding jury verdict inconsistent for holding only the dependent claim to have been obvious); *In re Muchmore*, 433 F.2d 824, 824-25 (CCPA 1970) ("Since we agree with the board's conclusion of obviousness as to these narrow claims, the broader claims must likewise be obvious.").

For the appellant: Abraham Hershkovitz & Ed Garcia-Otero, HERSHKOVITZ & ASSOCIATES, LLC, of Alexandria, Virginia.

For the requestor: Jerry Turner Sewell, of Newport Beach, California.

For the Commissioner of Patents: Sam Rimell with Jeffrey D. Carlson and Alexander J. Kosowski, ART UNIT 3392.

Electronic Patent Application Fee Transmittal

Application Number:	95002035
Filing Date:	12-Sep-2012
Title of Invention:	USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM
First Named Inventor/Applicant Name:	6779118
Filer:	David L. McCombs/Theresa O'Connor
Attorney Docket Number:	RI1341006F

Filed as Large Entity

inter partes reexam Filing Fees

Description	Fee Code	Quantity	Amount	Sub-Total in USD(\$)
Basic Filing:				
Pages:				
Claims:				
Miscellaneous-Filing:				
Petition:				
Patent-Appeals-and-Interference:				
Filing Appeal Brief Inter Partes Reexam	1404	1	2000	2000

Post-Allowance-and-Post-Issuance:

Extension-of-Time:

Description	Fee Code	Quantity	Amount	Sub-Total in USD(\$)
Miscellaneous:				
Total in USD (\$)				2000

Electronic Acknowledgement Receipt

EFS ID:	17856317
Application Number:	95002035
International Application Number:	
Confirmation Number:	1745
Title of Invention:	USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM
First Named Inventor/Applicant Name:	6779118
Customer Number:	40401
Filer:	David L. McCombs/Theresa O'Connor
Filer Authorized By:	David L. McCombs
Attorney Docket Number:	RI1341006F
Receipt Date:	08-JAN-2014
Filing Date:	12-SEP-2012
Time Stamp:	16:16:34
Application Type:	inter partes reexam

Payment information:

Submitted with Payment	yes
Payment Type	Credit Card
Payment was successfully received in RAM	\$2000
RAM confirmation Number	3117
Deposit Account	081394
Authorized User	MCCOMBS, DAVID L

The Director of the USPTO is hereby authorized to charge indicated fees and credit any overpayment as follows:

Charge any Additional Fees required under 37 C.F.R. Section 1.16 (National application filing, search, and examination fees)

Charge any Additional Fees required under 37 C.F.R. Section 1.17 (Patent application and reexamination processing fees)

Panasonic-1014

Charge any Additional Fees required under 37 C.F.R. Section 1.19 (Document supply fees)

Charge any Additional Fees required under 37 C.F.R. Section 1.20 (Post Issuance fees)

Charge any Additional Fees required under 37 C.F.R. Section 1.21 (Miscellaneous fees and charges)

File Listing:

Document Number	Document Description	File Name	File Size(Bytes)/ Message Digest	Multi Part /.zip	Pages (if appl.)
1		3PR_Respondent_Brief.pdf	1007451 a4688b3c5ba5fb17480de8de90a4e984c3babe97	yes	19

Multipart Description/PDF files in .zip description

Document Description	Start	End
Respondent Brief - Requester	1	18
Reexam Certificate of Service	19	19

Warnings:

Information:

2	Reexam - Affidavit/Decl/Exhibit Filed by 3rd Party	Appendix.pdf	463727 38542f4cd087cfd9f536bd99011eb09afce67e	no	13
---	--	--------------	--	----	----

Warnings:

Information:

3	Fee Worksheet (SB06)	fee-info.pdf	30223 c9c1217f395e1780914466c4dc1f3831a9ac72c4	no	2
---	----------------------	--------------	---	----	---

Warnings:

Information:

Total Files Size (in bytes): 1501401

This Acknowledgement Receipt evidences receipt on the noted date by the USPTO of the indicated documents, characterized by the applicant, and including page counts, where applicable. It serves as evidence of receipt similar to a Post Card, as described in MPEP 503.

New Applications Under 35 U.S.C. 111

If a new application is being filed and the application includes the necessary components for a filing date (see 37 CFR 1.53(b)-(d) and MPEP 506), a Filing Receipt (37 CFR 1.54) will be issued in due course and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the filing date of the application.

National Stage of an International Application under 35 U.S.C. 371

If a timely submission to enter the national stage of an international application is compliant with the conditions of 35 U.S.C. 371 and other applicable requirements a Form PCT/DO/EO/903 indicating acceptance of the application as a national stage submission under 35 U.S.C. 371 will be issued in addition to the Filing Receipt, in due course.

New International Application Filed with the USPTO as a Receiving Office

If a new international application is being filed and the international application includes the necessary components for an international filing date (see PCT Article 11 and MPEP 1810), a Notification of the International Application Number and of the International Filing Date (Form PCT/RO/105) will be issued in due course, subject to prescriptions concerning national security, and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the international filing date of the application.



HERSHKOVITZ & ASSOCIATES, PLLC

PATENT AGENCY

2845 DUKE STREET, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

TEL. 703-370-4800 ~ FACSIMILE 703-370-4809

patent@hershkovitz.net ~ www.hershkovitz.net

Inventor: Koichiro Ikudome et al.

Art Unit: 3992

Reexamination Proceeding: 95/002,035
(based on U.S. Patent No. 6,779,118)

Confirmation No.: 1745

Reexamination Filed: September 12, 2012

Examiner: Jalatee Worjloh

For: USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM

Mail Stop "inter partes Reexam"
Attn.: Central Reexamination Unit
Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 23313-1450

Honorable Commissioner:

Transmitted herewith are PATENT OWNER'S APPELLANT BRIEF UNDER 37 CFR §41.67(c) and a Certificate of Service in the above-captioned Proceeding.

The fee has been calculated as shown below:

Claims After Amendment	No. of Claims Previously Paid	Present Extra	Small Entity		Large Entity	
			Rate	Fee	Rate	Fee
*Total Claims:			x 30=	\$	x 60=	\$
**Indep. Claims:			x125=	\$	x250=	\$
Extension Fee for _____ Months				\$		\$
Other: Appellant Brief				\$		\$2,000.00
Total:				\$	Total:	\$2,000.00

Fee Payment made through EFS.

Payment is made herewith by Credit Card (see attached Form PTO-2038).

The Director is hereby authorized to charge all fees, including those under 37 CFR §§1.16 and 1.17, which are required for entry of the papers submitted herewith, and any fees which may be required to maintain pendency of this Proceeding, to Deposit Account No. 50-2929.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge all fees under 37 CFR § 1.18 which may be required to complete issuance of this application to Deposit Account No. 50-2929.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 9, 2013

/Abe Hershkovitz/
Abraham Hershkovitz
Registration No. 45,294

R1341006F.A09; AH/pjj

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor: Koichiro Ikudome

Art Unit 3992

Merged Reexam Proceeding No. 95/002,035 (Main)
and Reexam Proceeding No. 90/012,342
(Based on US 6,779,118 C1)

Conf. No. 1745
Conf. No. 5786

Examiner Jalatee Worjloh

Filed: September 12, 2012 (Main) and June 8, 2012

For: USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM

PATENT OWNER'S APPELLANT BRIEF UNDER 37 CFR §41.67(c)

Mail Stop “*inter partes* Reexam”
Attn.: Central Reexamination Unit
Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 23313-1450

Honorable Commissioner:

This is Patent Owner’s Appellant Brief under 37 CFR §41.67(c) in support of the Notice of Appeal filed October 8, 2013. A Right of Appeal Notice (RAN) was mailed on September 9, 2013 in the above-identified merged *inter partes/ex parte* Reexamination Proceedings (the present Proceedings) for underlying US Patent No. 6,779,118 (the '118 Patent).

Inasmuch as the Notice of Appeal was filed October 8, 2013, and this Appellant Brief is being filed on or before December 9, 2013 (December 8, 2013 falls on a Sunday), Patent Owner respectfully submits that this Appellant Brief is timely filed.

The fee for this Patent Owner’s Appellant Brief is being submitted concurrently through EFS. However, the Office is authorized to charge any fee in connection herewith or any fees necessary to preserve the pendency of these Proceedings, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-2929, referencing Docket No. RI1341006F.

This Patent Owner’s Appellant Brief is 30 pages or fewer, not including the Claims Appendix and any reference materials such as prior art references, in accordance with 37 CFR §1.943(c).

A Decision confirming patentability of all claims, and with the “Special Dispatch” to which all Appeals in *inter partes* Reexamination Proceedings are to be held, as set forth in under 35 USC §314 (c), is respectfully requested.

Appeal Brief Under 37 CFR §41.67(c)(1)(i)-(c)(1)(xi)

The following is a Table of Contents for this Brief, with Roman numeral indicators in compliance with 37 CFR §41.67(c).

Table of Contents

(i) Real Party in Interest.....	3
(ii) Related Appeals, Interferences and Trials.....	3
(iii) Status of Claims.....	3
(iv) Status of Amendments.....	3
(v) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter.....	3
(vi) Issues to be Reviewed on Appeal.....	7
(vii) Argument.....	8
(viii) Claims Appendix	23
(ix) Evidence Appendix.....	38
(x) Related Proceedings Appendix.....	39
(xi) Certificate of Service	40

(i) Real Party in Interest

The real party in interest in this Appeal is LINKSMART WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC, as evidenced by the Assignment recorded on July 2, 2008 at Reel/Frame 021185/0416.

(ii) Related Appeals, Interferences, and Trials

There are no other Appeals, Interferences or pending litigation known to Appellant which may be related to, directly affect, be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the present Appeal, other than the merged Reexamination Proceedings identified above.

(iii) Status of Claims

Claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-24 and 26-90 are subject to reexamination in these merged Proceedings, and are finally rejected as indicated in the Right of Appeal Notice (RAN) mailed September 9, 2013. Claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-43 and 68-90 are subject to the present Appeal.

(iv) Status of Amendments

The RAN expressly entered the Patent Owner's Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.951 and Response to Action Closing Prosecution (ACP) filed June 28, 2013 and third party requester's comments on Patent Owner's Amendment filed July 26, 2013. No additional submissions were made after the ACP.

(v) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

Independent claims 16-23 and 36-39 correspond to claims that were dependent from cancelled claim 15 and written in independent form, and dependent claim 24 depends directly from independent claim 23. Claim 68 is somewhat similar to cancelled claim 15, and dependent claims 69-82 depend from independent claim 68. Claim 83 is somewhat similar to cancelled independent claim 25, and dependent claims 84-90 depend from independent claim 83. Dependent claims 26, 27 and 40-43 depend from cancelled independent claim 25.

For the sake of convenience, the claimed invention will be described with respect to independent claims 16-23, 36-39, 68 and 83 with reference to Fig. 2, Column 4, lines 50-66, Column 5, lines 12-44, Column 6, lines 37-49 and Column 7, line 1 through Column 8, line 10 of the '118 Patent, and also by a brief background of the claimed subject matter.

The summary of the claimed subject matter in Claims 16-23 and 36-39 is as follows:

Claim 16...

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address (redirection server 208 in Fig. 2);

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network (Col. 6, lines 37-49);

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address (Col. 5, lines 12-44);

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses (Col. 5, lines 12-44);

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of time (Col 5, lines 12-44);

Claim 17...

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of the data transmitted to or from the user (Col. 5, lines 12-44);

Claim 18...

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of the location or locations the user accesses (Col. 5, lines 12-44);

Claim 19...

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow the removal or reinstatement of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of time (Col. 5, lines 12-44);

Claim 20...

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow the removal or reinstatement of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of the data transmitted to or from the user (Col. 5, lines 12-44);

Claim 21...

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow the removal or reinstatement of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of the location or locations the user accesses (Col. 5, lines 12-44);

Claim 22...

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow the removal or reinstatement of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location or locations the user accesses (Col. 5, lines 12-44);

Claim 23...

wherein the redirection server has a user side that is connected to a computer using the temporarily assigned network address and a network side connected to a computer network and wherein the computer using the temporarily assigned network address is connected to the computer network through the redirection server (redirection server in Fig. 2, user's computer 100 in Fig. 2 connected through the redirection server 208 in Internet 110);

Claim 36...

wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP (Internet Protocol) service (Col. 5, lines 12-44);

Claim 37...

wherein the modified rule set includes an initial temporary rule set and a standard rule set, and wherein the redirection server is configured to utilize the temporary rule set for an initial period of time and to thereafter utilize the standard rule set (Col. 5, lines 12-44);

Claim 38...

wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a request type and a destination address (Col. 6, lines 37-49)

Claim 39...

wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule redirecting the data to a new destination address based on a request type and an attempted destination address (Col. 6, lines 37-49).

The summary of the claimed subject matter in Claim 68 is as follows:

a redirection server connected between a user computer and a public network, the redirection server programmed with a users' rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address (Col. 4, lines 40-66);

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network (Col. 6, lines 37-49);

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address (Col. 5, lines 12-44);
and

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses (Col. 5, lines 12-44).

The summary of the claimed subject matter in Claim 83 is as follows:

In a system comprising a redirection server connected between a user computer and a public network (redirection server 208 in Fig. 2, Col. 4, lines 50-66), the redirection server containing a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address (Col. 5, lines 12-44) wherein the user's rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network (Col. 5, lines 12-44); a method comprising the step of:

modifying at least a portion of the user's rule set while the user's rule set remains correlated to the temporarily assigned network address in the redirection server (Col. 5, lines 12-44); and

wherein the redirection server has a user side that is connected to a computer using the temporarily assigned network address and a network address and a network side connected to a computer network (redirection server in Fig. 2, user's computer 100 in Fig. 2 connected through the redirection server 208 in Internet 110); and

wherein the computer using the temporarily assigned network address is connected to the computer network through the redirection server (redirection server in Fig. 2, user's computer 100 in Fig. 2 connected through the redirection server 208 in Internet 110) and the method further includes the step of receiving instructions by the redirection server to modify at least a portion of the user's rule set through one or more of the user side of the redirection server and the network side of the redirection server (Col. 5, lines 12-44).

Brief Discussion of Claimed Subject Matter (Background)

The '118 Patent to Linksmart discloses and claims a system and method for controlling access to a public network (for example, the Internet). The purpose of the '118 Patent is described in the "Summary of the Invention" section as a system and method "for creating and implementing dynamically changing rules to allow the redirection, blocking, or allowing, of specific data traffic for specific users, as a function of database entries and the user's activity." See '118 Patent at 2:61-65.

The '118 Patent system enables a provider, such as a hotel or a Wi-Fi hotspot operator, to allow access to a network such as the Internet, conditioned on the payment of a fee, the duration of use, or any other desired condition. To achieve this functionality, the '118 Patent claims a redirection server that enables automated modification of a rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network

address (hereinafter referred to as TANA), and that rule set is programmed in the redirection server. To illustrate, once the rule set correlated with the TANA has been programmed in a redirection server, data packets to and from the user's computer are processed by the redirection server according to that rule set correlated with the TANA. The rule set correlated with the TANA programmed in the redirection server may, for example, provide that the redirection server prevent data from passing between the user and the internet for users who have not yet paid for such access and redirect the user to a billing web page where the user can pay for the desired access. Once payment has been made, the rule set is modified by the redirection server to allow access, at least for a period of time. Thus, claim 16 provides that the "the redirection server is configured (i.e., programmed) to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address."

In this way, Internet access (such as through Wi-Fi hotspots or wired connection points in hotels) can be made available to transitory, temporary or new users for different periods of time or for different user-specific conditions.

(vi) Issues to be Reviewed on Appeal

1. Whether Willens in combination with RFC2138, Stockwell or "Admitted Prior Art" (APA), alone or in combination, discloses or renders obvious: "the redirection server...configured to allow automated modification of...the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address."

The rejections under this issue include:

Claims 16-18, 23, 24, 26, 36-43, 68-71, 76-84 and 86-90 as being obvious over Willens in view of RFC2138 and Stockwell; and

Claims 16-18, 23, 24, 26, 36-43, 68-71, 76-84 and 86-90 as being obvious over Willens in view of RFC2138 and APA.

2. Whether Radia in view of Wong '727, Stockwell, Wong '178 or APA, alone or in combination, discloses or renders obvious "the redirection server...configured to allow automated modification of...the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address." The rejections under this issue include:

Claims 16-24, 26-27, 36-43 and 68-90 as being obvious over Radia in view of Wong '727, and further in view of Stockwell; and

Claims 16-24, and 68-90 as being obvious over Radia in view of Wong '727, and further in view of APA.

3. Whether He, Zenchelsky, Fortinsky and APA, alone or in combination, disclose or render obvious “the redirection server...configured to allow automated modification of...the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address.” The rejections under this issue include:

Claims, 40-43 as being obvious over He, Zenchelsky, and APA; and

Claims 40-43 as being obvious over He, Zenchelsky, Fortinsky and APA.

4. Whether Coss is prior art citable against the '118 Patent in view of the Declarations of the Inventors under 37 CFR §1.131.

5. If Coss is properly citable prior art against the '118 Patent, whether Coss in view of APA renders obvious “the redirection server...configured to allow automated modification of...the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address.” The rejections under this issue include:

Claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-43 and 68-90 as being obvious over Coss in view of APA.

(vii) Argument

I. Rejection of Claims 16-18, 23, 24, 26, 27, 36-43, 68-71, 76-84, 86-90 (modification of rule set) as being obvious over Willens in view of RFC2138 and Stockwell/Admitted Prior Art

A. Explanation of System Claims 16-18, 23, 24, 36-39, 68-71, 76-82

Each of the above claims includes the limitation “*redirection server is configured (i.e., programmed) to allow automated modification of...the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address (TANA).*” See, e.g., the '118 Patent, Claim 16, paragraph 3. Modification of any rule set that is not correlated to the TANA does not meet this explicit requirement of the above system claims. Modification of any rule set not programmed in the redirection server also would not meet the requirement of the above system claims. In short, the claims explicitly require that modification occurs only to a rule set programmed in the redirection server that is correlated with a TANA.

In its response to the first Office Action and to the ACP, Patent Owner argued that modification to the rule must occur during a “user session.” The Examiner acknowledged that the claims recite that a rule set be correlated to a temporarily assigned network address (RAN at page 5), but then took the invalid position that, since the claims do not recite the actual word “session,” the shorthand term “session” used by Patent Owner in its response to the Office Action and the ACP improperly attempted to import the “session” limitation into the claims (and somehow in contravention of *In re Yamamoto*, 740 F.2d 1389 (CCPA 1974)).

However, Patent Owner’s use of “session” was only a shorter and quicker way to refer to the explicit and unabridged claim language that the “*redirection server be programmed with a user’s rule*

set correlated with a temporarily assigned network address (TANA),” and therefore, Patent Owner does not add any limitations that the claim language itself does not require. Furthermore, by focusing on Patent Owner’s use of the term “session,” the Examiner appears to have missed the point of Patent Owner’s position. For modification of a rule set to occur, the rule set must first be programmed in the redirection server and second must be correlated with a TANA. As will be discussed hereinafter in greater detail, none of the references, alone or in combination, recite modification of a rule set correlated with a TANA that is programmed in a redirection server that processes data passing between the network and the user computer to which the TANA has been assigned. The invention as recited in the limitations of the claims is explicit enough. For modification of the rule set to occur, no bigger point has been missed by the Examiner than that requiring that the rule set programmed into the redirection server be correlated with the TANA for that user. Therefore, contrary to the Examiner’s position, Patent Owner’s use of a shorthand term like “session” does not add or import any limitation or anything else into the claims that is not already there. To try to make the point that modification could only occur during a TANA (an acronym also used as a shorthand term) indicates that use of the term “session” as a quicker way to express what the claims already actually explicitly and fully say does not read any limitation from the specification into the claims, as asserted by the Examiner (RAN page 5).

For all of these reasons, *In re Yamamoto* does not provide any basis for rejection merely by the use of the term “session.”

B. Interpretation of Method Claims 26, 40-43 and 83-90

Method claims 26 and 40-43, dependent from claim 25, and method claims 83-90 each require the step of “*modifying...the user’s rule set while the user’s rule set remains correlated to the temporarily assigned network address in the redirection server....*” See, e.g., [25.4] and [83.5]. The interpretation of these claims is essentially the same as for the language used in the system claims above. Specifically, modification only occurs to a rule set in the redirection server and only while the rule set remains correlated to the TANA.

C. User’s Rule Set Correlated With a Temporarily Assigned Network Address - Willens

The rejection of the above-identified method and system claims is based on a flawed understanding and application of Willens. For example, the Examiner asserts that Willens teaches a “*user’s rule set correlated with a temporarily assigned network address*” as in the '118 Patent. In

support of that position, the Examiner states that Willens discloses a “communications server [14] (redirection server) that stores recently used portions of a PTA list and that the rule set (PTA list) is therefore correlated to a temporarily assigned network address (cache).” See RAN, page 5. However, *the “PTA list” is not a “rule set.”* Rather, the PTA list is a specific example of a list of web sites, i.e., a “site list.” The site list according to Willens has no associated control functionality. See Willens, Figure 3.¹ However, the '118 Patent requires that a rule set include “*a plurality of functions used to control...*” See, e.g., claim [16.2].

Willens at 5:64-6:9, cited by the Examiner, also does not support the Examiner’s analysis or rejection. The following annotation of that section demonstrates that the site list is not a rule set as defined by the '118 Patent claims:

The server 14 looks at each filter rule found in “F(Timmy)” starting from the top. When it reaches the rule permit “PTA List,” the server 14 looks into its local cache 50 to see if *www.playboy.com* is on the “*PTA List*”. If not, the server 14 sends a filter look-up request to the server 18. This look-up contains the list name...and the site Timmy [the user] is trying to access. Based on the result, server 14 either permits or denies access [to that site] and updates the local cache 50. (underline and italic emphasis)

The Examiner maintains that, because the *PTA List* may be stored in the cache, it is “correlated to a temporarily assigned network address (cache).” However, the cache does not have an associated TANA (as, e.g., claims 16-23 and 36-39 in the '118 Patent have, “...a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address...”). Obviously, there can be no “correlation” with something that does not exist. Further, neither Willens nor the Examiner provides any support for the Examiner’s assertion. In fact, the Examiner’s assertion actually contradicts the teaching of Willens. For example, the *site list* as taught by Willens does not “control” anything (as the rule set in, e.g., claims 16-23 and 36-39 in the '118 Patent is required to do, “...rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network”), and therefore cannot be “programmed” into the communications server 14 (as the rule set in, e.g., claims 16-23 and 36-39 in the '118 Patent is required to be, “...a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set...”) in order to control communication between the user and the network, as required by the '118 Patent claims (e.g., in claims 16-23 and 36-39, “...rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network”). Also, the *site list* cannot be correlated with a TANA and still be available to multiple users and over multiple

¹ Compare “SITE LIST” in server 18 and memory 52 with “FILTERS” in server 18 and memory 54. The “site list” of the ChoiceNet Server 18 in Figure 3 is simply a list of web sites without any associated control function.

sessions each having a different TANA. Finally, the correlation recited in the '118 Patent is the rule set correlated with a TANA assigned to a user computer that is programmed in a redirection server (as the rule set in, e.g., claims 16-23 and 36-39 of the '118 Patent is required to be, "...a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address..."), it is not correlation between a *site list* and a TANA, something that in any event is not even taught by Willens.

D. Automated Modification of Rule Set

The Examiner also rejects the claims on the assertion that the claimed modification of the rule set correlated with a TANA is taught by Willens. Specifically, the Examiner (RAN at page 9) states that the "claims require the redirection server to allow modification of the rule set, which is taught by Willens." For this proposition, the Examiner cites Willens 4:40-45, which actually only states, "Finally, instead of trying to maintain an unwieldy list of deny keywords on every desktop, the subsystem 12 provides a central, server based *permit list* that can be easily updated on a daily or hourly basis, and that cannot be tampered with by the end users" (emphasis added). However, as above discussed in detail, Willens teaches the updating of the *permit list*, which is not a filter (rule set) correlated with a TANA programmed in the communications server, as the claims in the '118 Patent require (e.g., in claims 16-23 and 36-39, "...a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address...").

The Examiner further relies on Willens 5:9-46 for the allegation that Willens teaches modification in the redirection server of a rule set correlated with a TANA. However, the section in Willens actually teaches the opposite -- that the rule set in the communication server is not modified during a user "session," but once downloaded, "*is maintained in the server 14 memory for the rest of the user 22's session.*" See, Willens 4:19-26. The only modification that is taught by Willens is modification of the uncorrelated *site list*, not the filters. For example, Willens at 4:41-46 states:

The [ChoiceNet server 18] software also automatically maintains the *permit list* by downloading updated versions of the *list* over the internet and compiling the *list* for use by the client software 42 [i.e., the filter programmed in the server 14]. As a result of this self-maintenance capability, the server 18 [not the "communications server" 14] requires minimal administrative attention. (*list terminology in italics added*)

Willens therefore unambiguously teaches that the only automatic modification done is the modification of the *site list*, not the rule set, that the *site list* modification occurs at any time and regardless of correlation to a TANA (particularly since there is no correlation of the site list to a TANA in Willens), and the modification occurs in the ChoiceNet Server 18 and not in the communications server 14.

Accordingly, Willens does not teach “automated modification of...the rule set correlated to the TANA programmed in the redirection server,” as required by the claims of the '118 Patent. The rejection of the claims of the '118 Patent reciting modification of the rule set based on any teachings of Willens must therefore be overturned.

E. Non-Obviousness Over Willens in View of Stockwell

Claims 16-18, 23, 24, 26, 36-43, 68-71, 76-84 and 86-90 (all related to modification of the rule set) were rejected as obvious over Willens in view of Stockwell. Willens was cited for its teaching related to modification of the rule set as claimed in the '118 Patent (see Section I(D) above), and Stockwell was cited solely for its teaching of redirection because Willens did not explicitly teach redirection.

The Examiner, disregarding the above arguments and failing to apply the non-obviousness analysis required by *Graham v. John Deer*, interposed an inapplicable, *pro forma* MPEP rejection that “one cannot show non-obviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references,” citing *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413 (CCPA 1981). See RAN, page 10.

However, application of a proper *Graham v. John Deer* analysis demonstrates non-obviousness of the '118 Patent claims related to modification of the rule set. As to the scope and content of the prior art, Willens relates to content monitoring and user authorization for a user Internet access system, and Stockwell relates to a system and method for controlling the flow of Internet connections through a firewall. The differences between the claimed invention in the '118 Patent -- redirection server allowed modification of a rule set correlated to a TANA programmed in the redirection server -- and the Willens reference have been described in Section I(D) above. Stockwell says nothing about “redirection server [allowed] modification of a rule set correlated to a TANA programmed in the redirection server.” This fact is at least implicitly conceded because Stockwell was cited by the Examiner exclusively for its teaching of redirection. While Willens, Stockwell and the '118 Patent may be in the same field, the above discussion demonstrates that the rule set modification limitations of the '118 Patent are not taught or suggested by Willens, and are certainly not taught or suggested by Stockwell. Willens simply does not disclose or suggest, whether alone or in combination with Stockwell, modification of a rule set correlated with a TANA programmed in the redirection server, and the Examiner has provided no objective rationale as to why those differences would be obvious to one skilled in the art without a clear teaching of such in any prior art references. Accordingly, as to the above patentable differences, the above claims pass the *Graham v. John Deere* test for non-obviousness, and the Examiner’s disregard of

the differences between these claims of the '118 Patent and Willens, taken alone or together with Stockwell, in reliance on *In re Keller*, is clearly in error.

II. Rejection of Claims 16-24, 26-27, 36-43, 68-90 as being obvious over Radia in view of Wong '727 and Stockwell/APA and further in view of Wong '178.

A. RAN, Pages 11-12 - “is configured to allow modification”

Radia² teaches exchanging one filter for another through the reconfiguration of a router/modem by the ANCS in response to events (logging in, logging out, or connecting a client system), all of which are extrinsic to the router/modem and the filter programmed in the router/modem.

By contrast, the redirection server of the '118 Patent is “configured to allow modification” as recited in claims 16-23, 36-39 and 68-82. By “allowing,” (i.e., “permitting”) modification, the redirection server is nevertheless a required component for the function of modification of the rule set correlated with a TANA to occur. Without the redirection server, modification of the rule set correlated with a TANA would not occur.

The Examiner proposes a different interpretation: that “allowing” modification means that something other than the redirection server can be the sole cause of modification of the rule set, and the redirection server is not required for the modification to occur. Radia teaches a router or modem in which the filter is configured where the filter can be *removed and replaced* by the extrinsic action of the ANCS without any involvement or participation by the router/modem. Radia does not teach *modifying* a rule set in the router/modem without removing and replacing it. Further, Radia only teaches that the ANCS, not the router/modem, replaces one filter with another filter by reconfiguring the router/modem with a new rule from the SMS/ANCS based on a detected event. Nothing in Radia teaches or suggests that the redirection server (router/modem) actually does or actively enables the modification.

Therefore, the question is, which interpretation is correct? The Examiner’s answer is that the Examiner’s interpretation is the broadest interpretation and that “during reexamination, claims are given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification...,” citing *In re*

² The Examiner correctly treats Radia, Wong '727 and Wong '178 as encompassing common teaching insofar as the '118 Patent is concerned and, accordingly, the rejection only refers to the teaching of Radia. Patent Owner adopts the same approach in referencing only Radia in its discussion of non-obviousness. Similarly, APA and Stockwell are cited for their teaching of redirection and are addressed collectively.

Yamamoto, 740 F.23d 1569 (Fed Cir. 1984). However, the Examiner's position is erroneous for the following reasons.

(1) Even if the Examiner's interpretation of "configured to allow modification" was correct, which it is not, only claims 16-23, 36-39 and 68-82 include that language. The remaining "rule set modification" claims 24, 26, 40-43 and 83-90 recite different language that requires that the redirection server do the modifying of the rule set while it is correlated with a TANA. Claim 24 recites "*instructions to the redirection server to modify the rule set...*," and claims 26, 40-43 and 83-90 each recite "*receiving instructions by the redirection server to modify the rule set...*" Each of these claims requires that instructions be given to the redirection server and are simply not amenable to the Examiner's expansive interpretation. Therefore, as to these claims, the only interpretation possible (and hence, the "broadest reasonable interpretation") consistent with the '118 Patent teachings is that the redirection server programmed with a rule set correlated with a TANA actually does the modification. The Examiner has failed to recognize or address this difference in language. The rejection of at least claims 24, 26, 40-43 and 83-90 must therefore be reversed because, as conceded at least implicitly by the Examiner, Radia does not teach or suggest that the router/modem in which the filter is configured actually effects modification of the rules set.

(2) The Examiner's interpretation of the phrase "*redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of...the rule set...*" in claims 16-23, 36-39 and 68-82 as not being supported by the specification as required by *In re Yamamoto* is clearly erroneous. The Examiner inaccurately interprets "allow" as modifying the "redirection server," that is, the redirection server allows or does not allow some extrinsic (unidentified) agent to modify the rules set. However, "allows" modifies "configured," not "redirection server." In other words, it is the configuration of the redirection server that "allows" the modifying. "Configured" is simply another way of saying "programmed." Therefore, the phrase "is configured to allow" means that the redirection server does the modifying under the control of the redirection server program programmed *in the redirection server*. This is consistent with the teaching of the '118 Patent. See, e.g., 3:15-20 ("The redirection server uses the filter...information to either allow...block, or modify..."), and 4:52-3 ("The redirection server performs *all* the central tasks of the system..."). See also, the '118 Patent at 5:39-44; '118 at 4:53-66 and '118 at 6:1-3.

Claim 24 likewise supports Patent Owner's interpretation. Specifically, claim 24, which is dependent on claim 23 and includes the "is configured to modify" language, actually provides the proper interpretation "wherein instructions to the redirection server to modify the rule set are received by...the redirection server..." In other words, regardless of the origin of the instructions to modify the rule set,

the instructions are sent to and received by the redirection server. The only possible way for modification of the rule set to occur if the instructions are received by the redirection server is for the redirection server to do the modification in response to the instructions. This is consistent with the teachings in the '118 Patent and Patent Owner's interpretation, and is contrary to the Examiner's interpretation.

(3) The only support cited for the Examiner's interpretation that something other than the redirection server modifies the rule set programmed in the redirection server is the '118 Patent at 8:3-11 quoted below. However, the Examiner takes that quote out of context and misreads that section:

...the web site then sends an *authorization* [**the web site sends authorization, i.e., permission...it does not do the act authorized**] to the *redirection server that deletes* the redirection to the questionnaire web site from the rule set [**it is the redirection server that "deletes" the rule from the rule set...the web site does not delete anything**] for the user who successfully completed the questionnaire. ('118 Patent at 8:3-6, annotations bracketed in bold and italic emphasis added)

The next part of the quote expands solely on the *types of modification* that are possible for the redirection server to do in the above example and cannot be interpreted as an alternative way of effecting modification of the rule set apart from the redirection server.

Of course, the *type of modification* an outside server can make to the rule set on the redirection server is not limited to deleting a redirection rule [**this language refers to the action of "deleting a redirection rule" previously described as being done by the redirection server at 8:4 above**], but can include any other *type of modification* to the rule set that is supported by the redirection server *as discussed above* [**this sentence clearly is intended to modify and amplify the example given above which describes a web site that "authorizes" and a redirection server that acts to delete**]. ('118 Patent at 8:6-10, bracketed annotations in bold and italic emphasis added)

For the above reasons, Patent Owner respectfully requests that the Board reverse the rejections of the claims which include the requirement that the redirection server modify the rule set.

B. RAN, Pages 12-13 – Router And ANCS Function As The Redirection Server

The Examiner took the position in the ACP that the router and ANCS together function as the redirection server claimed in the '118 Patent. However, combining the ANCS and router of Radia would be equivalent to combining the authentication server and the redirection server of the '118 Patent to create the redirection server. This makes no sense. The authentication server, like the ANCS, has separate and necessary functionality different and independent from the redirection server

as delineated in the claims, just as the ANCS is separate and distinct in functionality from the router. Thus, Radia teaches that once a client system connection has been accepted, the ANCS establishes a packet filter for IP packets originating from a newly-connected client system, and that ANCS then uses the packet filter to configure the router and that the router then processes data packets passing between the client system and the network (Radia '233 9:17-19, 21-25, and 29-32). The ANCS never processes data packets just as the authentication service does not process data packets. Once a user computer has been authenticated, the authentication server of the '118 Patent creates a rule set correlated to the TANA of the user computer and then programs that correlated rule set into the redirection server where the redirection server processes data packets passing between the user computer and the network -- the same function as the router.

Furthermore, Radia does not teach or suggest that the filter (whether a login filter or an IP packet filter after login) configured in the router/modem causes or controls *modification* of the filter configured in the router without the ANCS. Indeed, Radia only teaches creation and configuration (but not modification) of filters in the router/modem by the ANCS. If a filter has outlived its usefulness to process data packets, the ANCS creates a new filter and configures the new filter in the router/modem. Radia does not teach or suggest that the router or IP packet filter configured in the router modify the IP packet filter while it is correlated with a temporarily assigned network address.

The Examiner has nevertheless maintained the rejection, asserting that “the claims do not require the redirection server to do the modification, but to ‘allow automated modification of a least a portion of the rule set.’” See RAN, page 13. However, as discussed in Section II(A) above, the only interpretation of the limitation “allow automated modification of the rule set” that is consistent with the specification and claims in the '118 Patent, i.e., that is taught and claimed in the '118 Patent alone, is that the redirection server modifies the rule set. Any other interpretation would be inconsistent with the teachings of, and the invention claimed in, the '118 Patent, and would therefore be an improper interpretation under *In re Yamamoto*, which requires that a claim interpretation “*must be consistent with the specification.*”

Patent Owner respectfully requests that the Examiner’s rejection on these grounds be reversed.

C. RAN, Page 13 – Combining Radia and Stockwell

Patent Owner refers to and incorporates by reference the arguments against combining Stockwell and Willens above as being equally applicable to the rejection of the above identified

claims. Specifically, Stockwell was cited solely for its teaching related to redirection not taught by Radia, and Radia was cited solely for its teaching related to configurations of filters in the router/modem by the ANCS not taught by Stockwell.

As with the rejection based on the combination of Willens and Stockwell above, the redirection of Stockwell bears no relationship to the modification arguments that distinguish Radia from the '118 Patent. As with Willens and Stockwell, the Examiner failed to do the non-obviousness analysis required by *Graham v. John Deer*, and instead interposed an inapplicable, *pro forma* MPEP rejection that “one cannot show non-obviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references,” citing *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413 (CCPA 1981). See RAN, page 13. However, the *Keller* form rejection from the MPEP is inapplicable because patentability based on modification of a rule set has nothing to do with the redirection for which Stockwell was cited, and Stockwell includes no teaching related to modification of a rule set as claimed in the '118 Patent. Accordingly, combining Stockwell with Radia may result in a combination that includes redirection, but any such combination still would not disclose or even suggest the modification by the redirection server of a rule set correlated with a TANA programmed in a redirection server. It is perfectly proper, as was done here, to point out that a particular reference relied upon to teach a feature as part of combining teachings in a Section 103 rejection does not, in fact, teach the subject matter relied upon by the Examiner in that rejection.

By contrast, application of a proper *Graham v. John Deer* analysis demonstrates the non-obviousness of the claims of the '118 Patent. As to the scope and content of the prior art, Radia relates to a method and apparatus that allows IP packets within a network to be selectively filtered based on events within the network. Stockwell relates to a system and method for controlling the flow of internet connections through a firewall. The differences between the claimed invention in the '118 Patent -- redirection server allowed modification of a rule set correlated to a TANA programmed in the redirection server -- and Radia have been described in detail above. Stockwell says nothing about a “redirection server allowed modification of a rule set correlated to a TANA programmed in the redirection server.” This must be conceded by the Office, since Stockwell has been cited exclusively for its teaching of redirection. The above discussion of the differences between the novel invention claimed in the '118 Patent and Radia, and the novel invention claimed in the '118 Patent and Stockwell, demonstrate that neither of the cited references, whether alone or in any combination, disclose or suggest modification by the redirection server of a rule set correlated with a TANA programmed in the redirection server. The Examiner has provided no objective rationale why that difference would be

obvious to one skilled in the art. Accordingly, as to the above patentable differences, the claims of the '118 Patent pass the Graham v. John Deere test for non-obviousness, and the Examiner's disregard of the differences between the claimed invention and Radia, and the claimed invention and Stockwell, in reliance on *In re Keller*, is in error.

In view of the above arguments, Patent Owner respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 16-24, 26-27, 36-43 and 68-90 as obvious in view of Radia/Wong and/or obvious in view of Stockwell/APA be reversed.

III. Rejection of Claims 40-43 as Being Obvious over He, Zenchelsky, Fortinsky and Admitted Prior Art

The Examiner previously withdrew the obviousness rejection of claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-39, 68-82 and 84-85 over He, Zenchelsky, APA and Fortinsky (see ACP, pages 34-35), but maintained the rejection of claims 40-43, 83 and 86-90 (all of which include the limitation of modifying the rule set). However, in the RAN, the Examiner agreed with Patent Owner's response to the ACP and withdrew the rejection of claims 83 and 86-90 (see RAN, page 17), but continued to maintain the rejection of claims 40-43. Patent Owner submits that the rejection of claims 40-43 based on these references also should also have been withdrawn.

The basis for the Examiner's withdrawal of the rejection regarding claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-39, 68-82 and 84-85 was that none of the cited references teach automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set. However, claims 40-43 include this same limitation. To illustrate, each of claims 40-43 is dependent on claim 25, which includes the limitation in ¶[25.7]: "the method further includes the step of receiving instructions by the redirection server *to modify at least a portion of the user's rule set...*" Furthermore, each of claims 40-43 includes an additional limitation for the modified rule set as set out in claim 25: "The method of claim 25, wherein the *modified rule set includes...*" Because the same reasons given by the Examiner for allowance of claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-39, 68-82 and 84-85 apply to claims 40-43, the rejection of claims 40-43 is without merit and should be reversed.

IV. Rejection of Claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-43 and 68-90 as Being Obvious Over Coss in View of Admitted Prior Art.

A. Coss is not citable as prior art: Declarations of Inventors under 37 C.F.R. §1.131.

In the RAN, at page 17, in a section entitled "Declaration under 37 CFR1.131," the Examiner states:

The Declarations filed on June 28, 2013 from Moon Tai Yeung and Koichiro Ikudome have been considered, but are ineffective to overcome the Coss reference.³ The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a conception of the invention prior to the effective date of Silverman [sic, should be Coss] reference. While conception is the mental part of the inventive act, it must be capable of proof, such as by demonstrative evidence or by a complete disclosure to another. Conception is more than a vague idea of how to solve a problem. The requisite means themselves and their interaction must also be comprehended. See *Mergenthaler v. Scudder*, 1897 C.D. 724, 81 O.G. 1417 (D.C. Cir. 1897).

This position is clearly erroneous, because the record contains Declarations Under 37 CFR §1.131 by each of Inventors Yeung and Ikudome that state unequivocally that they *actually demonstrated* the concept of their invention prior to mid-August 1997. As set forth in the Ikudome Declaration, when the Examiner maintained the rejection in the April 29, 2013 ACP, Inventor Ikudome undertook a detailed investigation of his records, and discovered not only receipts for the purchase of equipment acquired for the purpose of **testing** the invention concept, but also located a document dated August 14, 1997 which was submitted with his 37 C.F.R. §1.131 Declaration which showed that the invention was **actually reduced to practice before the Coss filing date**.

The individual Declaration of Moon Tai Yeung further references copies of invoices showing hardware purchased throughout the month of May 1997, and a Technical Innovation Report dated August 14, 1997 memorializing the actual reduction to practice prior to August 14, 1997. The Declaration of Koichiro Ikudome also references those documents, and further references pages 238-239 of a videotaped Deposition taken on March 4, 2010. **Therefore, the documents attached to the respective 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 Declarations of the joint Inventors clearly establish both conception and actual reduction to practice of the invention disclosed and claimed in the '118 Patent prior to the earliest effective filing date of Coss.**

In addition, the Examiner has overlooked the fact that, in the earlier *ex parte* Reexamination Proceeding 90/009,301 for the '118 Patent, the Primary Examiner held that Provisional Application No. 60/084,014 filed May 4, 1998 (the '014 Application) clearly supports the disclosure in the '118 Patent. More particularly, the Examiner makes that statement in an Order granting *ex parte* Reexamination in Control No. 90/009,301, which Reexamination resulted in confirmation of all but four claims and the addition of fifty-some new claims held patentable. Indeed, the August 14, 1997

³ The Examiner's continued reliance on Coss as a valid prior art reference was subject to a Petition filed on September 27, 2013. The Director of the CRU held in a Decision dated November 18, 2013 that this dispute is an appealable issue rather than a petitionable issue. Hence, these issues are now raised in this Appeal.

Technical Innovation Report that was attached to each of the two 37 C.F.R §1.131 Declarations is essentially identical to the disclosure of the '014 Application.

Accordingly, the August 14, 1997 Technical Innovation Report contains a description of the invention disclosed and claimed in the '118 Patent which is the subject of the present merged Reexamination Proceedings. The Examiner has improperly refused to permit antedating of a reference used in rejecting the claims on the basis of (1) improper lack of showing of diligence between the dates of conception and reduction to practice; and (2) improper lack of showing of a nexus between the claimed subject matter and the reduced to practice documentation. However, where the 37 C.F.R §1.131 Declarations demonstrate actual reduction to practice before the filing date of the cited reference, as is the case here, a showing of diligence is unnecessary. Patent Owner respectfully requests that the Board overturn the Examiner's improper holding and improper application of Coss as prior art.

The 37 C.F.R. §1.131 Declarations of the Inventors have not been given the consideration that they should have been given by the Examiner, since (1) they are necessary to eliminate Coss as prior art and (2) they could not have been presented earlier than when filed because the Inventors did not have a recollection of all of the evidence establishing the actual reduction to practice before the Coss filing date until after the mailing of the ACP.

B. Coss Does Not Teach Redirection Server Automated Modification Of At Least A Portion Of A Rule Set Correlated With TANA Programmed In Redirection Server

The rejected claims each require that the redirection server be configured to allow automated modification of the rule set correlated to the TANA by the redirection server into which the rule set is programmed. Even if Coss were to be considered as prior art, which it properly is not, Coss does not teach that a redirection server be configured to allow automated modification of the rule set correlated to the TANA, as taught in, e.g., claims 16-23 and 36-39 of the '118 Patent (“...wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address...” (Col. 5, lines 12-44). Indeed, the Coss rule set is shared across multiple users (Coss 1:63-67) with the rule set for a specific user session stored as a “session key” derived from a User ID in the packet header after approval by security policies (Coss 6:28). Coss does not teach or suggest a correlation between a user's rule set and a TANA for that user's computer.

Further, the Examiner continues to equate the “dynamic” rules of Coss with the automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network

address, as recited in, e.g., claims 16-23 and 36-39 of the '118 Patent (“...wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address...” (Col. 5, lines 12-44). In the '118 Patent, the modification of the rule set as described above in detail is done by the redirection server, and only when a rule set correlated to a TANA is programmed in the redirection server. The firewall of Coss does not operate the same way. See, e.g., “Request for *ex parte* Reexamination” at page 343 of 484, where the Requester concedes that: “Coss et al. **do not explicitly disclose** [that] the firewall 211 is configured to allow automated modification of a least a portion of the rule set correlated to the *temporarily assigned* network address” (emphasis added).

Even if Coss were properly prior art, any combination of APA with Coss still does not render claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-43 and 68-90 obvious under *Graham v. John Deere* for the same reasons set above in Section II.1.C.

Conclusion

Appellant respectfully requests a reversal of all of the Examiner's rejections of the claims on appeal, and confirmation of all claims.

Appellant also respectfully requests a reversal of the Examiner's improper handling of the Inventor Declarations Under 37 CFR §1.131, and withdrawal of improper prior art Coss.

Appellant further respectfully requests remand to the Examiner for issuance of a Notice of Intent to Issue a Reexamination Certificate (NIIRC) of all the claims on appeal.

Evidence of service of this Appellant Brief on third party requester is attached hereto.

Please direct any questions to the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC

 /Abe Hershkovitz/
Abraham Hershkovitz
Reg. No. 45,294

Stephen Marcus
Reg. No. 64,075

Appendices: (viii) Claims Appendix
 (ix) Evidence Appendix
 (x) Related Proceedings Appendix

Date: December 9, 2013

Hershkovitz & Associates, PLLC
2845 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 370-4800
Facsimile (703) 370-4809
E-Mail patent@hershkovitz.net

(viii) Claims Appendix

1. (Cancelled)
2. The system of claim 1, wherein the redirection server further provides control over a plurality of data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.
3. The system of claim 1, wherein the redirection server further blocks the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.
4. The system of claim 1, wherein the redirection server further allows the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.
5. The system of claim 1, wherein the redirection server further redirects the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.
6. The system of claim 1, wherein the redirection server further redirects the data from the users' computers to multiple destinations as a function of the individualized rule set.
7. The system of claim 1, wherein the database entries for a plurality of the plurality of users' IDs are correlated with a common individualized rule set.
8. (Cancelled)
9. The method of claim 8, further including the step of controlling a plurality of data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.
10. The method of claim 8, further including the step of blocking the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.
11. The method of claim 8, further including the step of allowing the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

12. The method of claim 8, further including the step of redirecting the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

13. The method of claim 8, further including the step of redirecting the data from the users' computers to multiple destinations a function of the individualized rule set.

14. The method of claim 8, further including the step of creating database entries for a plurality of the plurality of users' IDs, the plurality of users' ID further being correlated with a common individualized rule set.

15. (Cancelled)

16. A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of time.

17. A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of the data transmitted to or from the user.

18. A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of the location or locations the user accesses.

19. A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow the removal or reinstatement of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of time.

20. A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow the removal or reinstatement of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of the data transmitted to or from the user.

21. A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow the removal or reinstatement of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of the location or locations the user accesses.

22. A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow the removal or reinstatement of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location or locations the user accesses.

23. A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the redirection server has a user side that is connected to a computer using the temporarily assigned network address and a network side connected to a computer network and wherein the computer using the temporarily assigned network address is connected to the computer network through the redirection server.

24. The system of claim 23 wherein instructions to the redirection server to modify the rule set are received by one or more of the user side of the redirection server and the network side of the redirection server.

25. (Cancelled)

26. The method of claim 25, further including the step of modifying at least a portion of the user's rule set as a function of one or more of: time, data transmitted to or from the user, and location or locations the user accesses.
27. The method of claim 25, further including the step of removing or reinstating at least a portion of the user's rule set as a function of one or more of: time, the data transmitted to or from the user and a location or locations the user accesses.
28. The system of claim 1, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP (Internet Protocol) service.
29. The system of claim 1, wherein the individualized rule set includes an initial temporary rule set and a standard rule set, and wherein the redirection server is configured to utilize the temporary rule set for an initial period of time and to thereafter utilize the standard rule set.
30. The system of claim 1, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a request type and a destination address.
31. The system of claim 1, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule redirecting the data to a new destination address based on a request type and an attempted destination address.
32. The method of claim 8, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP (Internet Protocol) service.
33. The method of claim 8, wherein the individualized rule set includes an initial temporary rule set and a standard rule set, and wherein the redirection server is configured to utilize the temporary rule set for an initial period of time and to thereafter utilize the standard rule set.
34. The method of claim 8, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a request type and a destination address.

35. The method of claim 8, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule redirecting the data to a new 20 destination address based on a request type and an attempted destination address.

36. A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP (Internet Protocol) service.

37. A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the modified rule set includes an initial temporary rule set and a standard rule set, and wherein the redirection server is configured to utilize the temporary rule set for an initial period of time and to thereafter utilize the standard rule set.

38. A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a request type and a destination address.

39. A system comprising:

a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address;

wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses; and

wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule redirecting the data to a new destination address based on a request type and an attempted destination address.

40. The method of claim 25, wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP (Internet Protocol) service.

41. The method of claim 25, wherein the modified rule set includes an initial temporary rule set and a standard rule set, and wherein the redirection server is configured to utilize the temporary rule set for an initial period of time and to thereafter utilize the standard rule set.

42. The method of claim 25, wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a request type and a destination address.

43. The method of claim 25, wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule redirecting the data to a new destination address based on a request type and an attempted destination address.

44. A system comprising:

- a database with entries correlating each of a plurality of user IDs with an individualized rule set;

- a dial-up network server that receives user IDs from users' computers;

- a redirection server connected between the dial-up network server and a public network, and an authentication accounting server connected to the database, the dial-up network server and the redirection server;

- wherein the dial-up network server communicates a first user ID for one of the users' computers and a temporarily assigned network address for the first user ID to the authentication accounting server;

- wherein the authentication accounting server accesses the database and communicates the individualized rule set that correlates with the first user ID and the temporarily assigned network address to the redirection server; and

- wherein data directed toward the public network from the one of the users' computers are processed by the redirection server according to the individualized rule set.

45. The system of claim 44, wherein the redirection server further provides control over a plurality of data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

46. The system of claim 44, wherein the redirection server further blocks the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

47. The system of claim 44, wherein the redirection server further allows the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

48. The system of claim 44, wherein the redirection server further redirects the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

49. The system of claim 44, wherein the redirection server further redirects the data from the users' computers to multiple destinations as a function of the individualized rule set.

50. The system of claim 44, wherein the database entries for a plurality of the plurality of users' IDs are correlated with a common individualized rule set.

51. The system of claim 44, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP (Internet Protocol) service.

52. The system of claim 44, wherein the individualized rule set includes an initial temporary rule set and a standard rule set, and wherein the redirection server is configured to utilize the temporary rule set for an initial period of time and to thereafter utilize the standard rule set.

53. The system of claim 44, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a request type and a destination address.

54. The system of claim 44, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule redirecting the data to a new destination address based on a request type and an attempted destination address.

55. The system of claim 44, wherein the redirection server is configured to redirect data from the users' computers by replacing a first destination address in an IP (Internet Protocol) packet header by a second destination address as a function of the individualized rule set.

56. In a system comprising a database with entries correlating each of a plurality of user IDs with an individualized rule set; a dial-up network server that receives user IDs from users' computers; a redirection server connected between the dial-up network server and a public network, and an authentication accounting server connected to the database, the dial-up network server and the redirection servers, a method comprising the steps of:

communicating a first user ID for one of the users' computers and a temporarily assigned network address for the first user ID from the dial-up network server to the authentication accounting server;

communicating the individualized rule set that correlates with the first user ID and the temporarily assigned network address to the redirection server from the authentication accounting server; and

processing data directed toward the public network from the one of the users' computers according to the individualized rule set.

57. The method of claim 56, further including the step of controlling a plurality of data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

58. The method of claim 56, further including the step of blocking the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

59. The method of claim 56, further including the step of allowing the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

60. The method of claim 56, further including the step of redirecting the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

61. The method of claim 56, further including the step of redirecting the data from the users' computers to multiple destinations a function of the individualized rule set.

62. The method of claim 56, further including the step of creating database entries for a plurality of the plurality of users' IDs, the plurality of users' ID further being correlated with a common individualized rule set.

63. The method of claim 56, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP (Internet Protocol) service.

64. The method of claim 56, wherein the individualized rule set includes an initial temporary rule set and a standard rule set, and wherein the redirection server is configured to utilize the temporary rule set for an initial period of time and to thereafter utilize the standard rule set.

65. The method of claim 56, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a request type and a destination address.

66. The method of claim 56, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule redirecting the data to a new destination address based on a request type and an attempted destination address.

67. The method of claim 56, wherein the redirection server is configured to redirect data from the users' computers by replacing a first destination address in an IP (Internet Protocol) packet header by a second destination address as a function of the individualized rule set.

68. A system comprising:

- a redirection server connected between a user computer and a public network, the redirection server programmed with a users' rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address;

- wherein the rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network;

- wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address; and

- wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user accesses.

69. The system of claim 68, wherein the redirection server is configured to allow modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of time.

70. The system of claim 68, wherein the redirection server is configured to allow modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of the data transmitted to or from the user.

71. The system of claim 68, wherein the redirection server is configured to allow modification of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of the location or locations the user accesses.

72. The system of claim 68, wherein the redirection server is configured to allow the removal or reinstatement of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of time.

73. The system of claim 68, wherein the redirection server is configured to allow the removal or reinstatement of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of the data transmitted to or from the user.

74. The system of claim 68, wherein the redirection server is configured to allow the removal or reinstatement of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of the location or locations the user accesses.

75. The system of claim 68, wherein the redirection server is configured to allow the removal or reinstatement of at least a portion of the rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location or locations the user accesses.

76. The system of claim 68, wherein the redirection server has a user side that is connected to a computer using the temporarily assigned network address and a network side connected to a computer network and wherein the computer using the temporarily assigned network address is connected to the computer network through the redirection server.

77. The system of claim 68 wherein instructions to the redirection server to modify the rule set are received by one or more of the user side of the redirection server and the network side of the redirection server.

78. The system of claim 68, wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP (Internet Protocol) service.

79. The system of claim 68, wherein the modified rule set includes an initial temporary rule set and a standard rule set, and wherein the redirection server is configured to utilize the temporary rule set for an initial period of time and to thereafter utilize the standard rule set.

80. The system of claim 68, wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a request type and a destination address.

81. The system of claim 68, wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule redirecting the data to a new destination address based on a request type and an attempted destination address.

82. The system of claim 68, wherein the redirection server is configured to redirect data from the users' computers by replacing a first destination address in an IP (Internet Protocol) packet header by a second destination address as a function of the modified rule set.

83. In a system comprising a redirection server connected between a user computer and a public network, the redirection server containing a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address wherein the user's rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network; a method comprising the step of:

modifying at least a portion of the user's rule set while the user's rule set remains correlated to the temporarily assigned network address in the redirection server; and

wherein the redirection server has a user side that is connected to a computer using the temporarily assigned network address and a network address and a network side connected to a computer network; and

wherein the computer using the temporarily assigned network address is connected to the computer network through the redirection server and the method further includes the step of receiving instructions by the redirection server to modify at least a portion of the user's rule set through one or more of the user side of the redirection server and the network side of the redirection server.

84. The method of claim 83, further including the step of modifying at least a portion of the user's rule set as a function of one or more of time, data transmitted to or from the user, and location or locations the user accesses.

85. The method of claim 83, further including the step of removing or reinstating at least a portion of the user's rule set as a function of one or more of time, the data transmitted to or from the user and a location or locations the user accesses.

86. The method of claim 83, wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP (Internet Protocol) service.

87. The method of claim 83, wherein the modified rule set includes an initial temporary rule set and a standard rule set, and wherein the redirection server is configured to utilize the temporary rule set for an initial period of time and to thereafter utilize the standard rule set.

88. The method of claim 83, wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a request type and a destination address.

89. The method of claim 83, wherein the modified rule set includes at least one rule redirecting the data to a new destination address based on a request type and an attempted destination address.

90. The method of claim 83, wherein the redirection server is configured to redirect data from the users' computers by replacing a first destination address in an IP (Internet Protocol) packet header by a second destination address as a function of the individualized rule set.

(ix) Evidence Appendix

No evidence is being submitted.

(x) Related Proceedings Appendix

No related proceedings (other than the present merged Reexaminations) are noted.

(xi) Certificate of Service

It is hereby certified that the attached Patent Owner's Appellant Brief (including Appendices) and a copy of this Certificate of Service **are being served on December 9, 2013 by first class mail** on third party requesters at third party requesters' addresses of record:

David L. McCombs
Haynes & Boone, LLP
2323 Victory Avenue, Suite 700
Dallas, TX 75219

[for *inter partes* Proceeding No. 95/002,035]

James J. Wong
2108 Gossamer Ave.
Redwood City, CA 94065

[for *ex parte* Proceeding No. 90/012,342]

 /Abe Hershkovitz/
Abraham Hershkovitz

Electronic Patent Application Fee Transmittal

Application Number:	95002035
Filing Date:	12-Sep-2012
Title of Invention:	USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM
First Named Inventor/Applicant Name:	6779118
Filer:	Abraham Hershkovitz
Attorney Docket Number:	RI1341006F

Filed as Large Entity

inter partes reexam Filing Fees

Description	Fee Code	Quantity	Amount	Sub-Total in USD(\$)
Basic Filing:				
Pages:				
Claims:				
Miscellaneous-Filing:				
Petition:				
Patent-Appeals-and-Interference:				
Filing Appeal Brief Inter Partes Reexam	1404	1	2000	2000

Post-Allowance-and-Post-Issuance:

Extension-of-Time:

Description	Fee Code	Quantity	Amount	Sub-Total in USD(\$)
Miscellaneous:				
Total in USD (\$)				2000

Electronic Acknowledgement Receipt

EFS ID:	17608519
Application Number:	95002035
International Application Number:	
Confirmation Number:	1745
Title of Invention:	USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM
First Named Inventor/Applicant Name:	6779118
Customer Number:	40401
Filer:	Abraham Hershkovitz
Filer Authorized By:	
Attorney Docket Number:	RI1341006F
Receipt Date:	09-DEC-2013
Filing Date:	12-SEP-2012
Time Stamp:	18:49:16
Application Type:	inter partes reexam

Payment information:

Submitted with Payment	no
------------------------	----

File Listing:

Document Number	Document Description	File Name	File Size(Bytes)/ Message Digest	Multi Part /.zip	Pages (if appl.)
1	Trans Letter filing of a response in a reexam	RI1341006F-A09_Transmittal.pdf	163736 <small>9917a545a491b3da157264315f3a7db889d08163</small>	no	1

Warnings:

Information:

2		RI1341006F-R1341006D-A09_Appeal-Brief.pdf	386385 <small>85f9b84d0e9cd54526b11606e363023d48b2c7c3</small>	yes	40
Multipart Description/PDF files in .zip description					
Document Description		Start		End	
Appeal Brief-Owner		1		39	
Reexam Certificate of Service		40		40	
Warnings:					
Information:					
3	Fee Worksheet (SB06)	fee-info.pdf	30200 <small>420209af55d1ee4b4bc6de8e9563aebb547e0297</small>	no	2
Warnings:					
Information:					
Total Files Size (in bytes):			580321		
<p>This Acknowledgement Receipt evidences receipt on the noted date by the USPTO of the indicated documents, characterized by the applicant, and including page counts, where applicable. It serves as evidence of receipt similar to a Post Card, as described in MPEP 503.</p> <p><u>New Applications Under 35 U.S.C. 111</u> If a new application is being filed and the application includes the necessary components for a filing date (see 37 CFR 1.53(b)-(d) and MPEP 506), a Filing Receipt (37 CFR 1.54) will be issued in due course and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the filing date of the application.</p> <p><u>National Stage of an International Application under 35 U.S.C. 371</u> If a timely submission to enter the national stage of an international application is compliant with the conditions of 35 U.S.C. 371 and other applicable requirements a Form PCT/DO/EO/903 indicating acceptance of the application as a national stage submission under 35 U.S.C. 371 will be issued in addition to the Filing Receipt, in due course.</p> <p><u>New International Application Filed with the USPTO as a Receiving Office</u> If a new international application is being filed and the international application includes the necessary components for an international filing date (see PCT Article 11 and MPEP 1810), a Notification of the International Application Number and of the International Filing Date (Form PCT/RO/105) will be issued in due course, subject to prescriptions concerning national security, and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the international filing date of the application.</p>					



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Table with columns: APPLICATION NO., FILING DATE, FIRST NAMED INVENTOR, ATTORNEY DOCKET NO., CONFIRMATION NO., EXAMINER, ART UNIT, PAPER NUMBER, MAIL DATE, DELIVERY MODE. Includes application details for 95/002,035 and examiner WORJLOH, JALATEE.

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patents and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

THIRD PARTY REQUESTER'S CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS

David L. McCombs
HAYNES & BOONE, LLP, IP Section
2323 Victory Ave., Suite 700
Dallas, TX 75219

Date:

MAILED

NOV 18 2013

CENTRAL REEXAMINATION UNIT

**Transmittal of Communication to Third Party Requester
Inter Partes Reexamination**

REEXAMINATION CONTROL NO. : 95002035 + 90012342
PATENT NO. : 6779118
ART UNIT : 3993

Enclosed is a copy of the latest communication from the United States Patent and Trademark Office in the above-identified reexamination proceeding. 37 CFR 1.903.

Prior to the filing of a Notice of Appeal, each time the patent owner responds to this communication, the third party requester of the inter partes reexamination may once file written comments within a period of 30 days from the date of service of the patent owner's response. This 30-day time period is statutory (35 U.S.C. 314(b)(2)), and, as such, it cannot be extended. See also 37 CFR 1.947.

If an ex parte reexamination has been merged with the inter partes reexamination, no responsive submission by any ex parte third party requester is permitted.

All correspondence relating to this inter partes reexamination proceeding should be directed to the Central Reexamination Unit at the mail, FAX, or hand-carry addresses given at the end of the communication enclosed with this transmittal.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

MAILED

NOV 18 2013

CENTRAL REEXAMINATION UNIT

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Hershkovitz & Associates : (For Patent Owner)
2845 Duke Street :
Alexandria, VA 22314 :

David L. McCombs :
Haunes & Boones, LLP : (For Third Party
2323 Victory Avenue : Requester)
Suite 700 :
Dallas, Texas 75219 :

James J. Wong :
2108 Gossamer Avenue : (For Third Party
Redwood City, CA 94065 : Requester)

In re: Ikudome et al. :
Merged Reexamination Proceeding : DECISION ON PETITION
Control No.: 95/002,035 & 90/012,342 : UNDER 37 CFR § 1.181
Filed: July 12, 2012 & June 8, 2012 : 1.181
For: U.S. Patent No.: 6,779,118 :

This is a decision on the petition filed by the Patent Owner on September 27, 2012, entitled "PETITION UNDER 37 CFR § 1.181 TO VACATE IMPROPER RIGHT OF APPEAL NOTICE," [hereinafter "the petition"]. Petitioner seeks supervisory review of the Examiner's determination that the evidence submitted by the Patent Owner is insufficient to overcome the rejections applied.

The petition is before the Director of the Central Reexamination Unit.

The petition is dismissed.

Art Unit: 3992

Review of Relevant Facts

- U.S. Patent No. 6,779,118 [“the ‘118 patent”] issued on August 17, 2004.
- A request for *inter partes* reexamination was filed July 12, 2012 and assigned control no. 95/002,035. Reexamination was requested of claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-24, and 26-90 of the ‘118 patent.
- In an order mailed October 19, 2012 [“Order”], the *inter partes* request was granted. In the first Office action on the merits mailed concurrently, all claims under reexamination were rejected.
- On January 17, 2013, the Patent Owner timely filed a response to the first Office action.
- On February 15, 2013, the Third Party Requester filed comments.
- On March 20, 2013, a decision merging the 95/002,035 and 90/012,342 proceedings was mailed.
- On April 29, 2013, an Action Closing Prosecution (“ACP”) was mailed in the merged proceeding.
- On June 28, 2013, the Patent Owner filed a response to the ACP.
- On July 26, 2013 the Third Party Requester filed comments.
- On November 9, 2013, the Examiner issued a Right of Appeal Notice (“RAN”).
- On November 27, 2013, the Patent Owner timely filed the instant petition.

Art Unit: 3992

Relevant Regulations and Procedures

37 CFR §1.181 Petition to the Director.

(a) Petition may be taken to the Director:

- (1) From any action or requirement of any examiner in the *ex parte* prosecution of an application, or in *ex parte* or *inter partes* prosecution of a reexamination proceeding ***which is not subject to appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences*** or to the court;
- (2) In cases in which a statute or the rules specify that the matter is to be determined directly by or reviewed by the Director; and
- (3) To invoke the supervisory authority of the Director in appropriate circumstances. For petitions in interferences, see § 1.644. (emphasis added).

MPEP §1201 Appeal, Introduction

The United States Patent and Trademark Office (Office) in administering the Patent Laws makes many decisions of a substantive nature which the applicant may feel deny him or her the patent protection to which he or she is entitled. The differences of opinion on such matters can be justly resolved only by prescribing and following judicial procedures. Where the differences of opinion concern the denial of patent claims because of prior art or other patentability issues, the questions thereby raised are said to relate to the merits, and appeal procedure within the Office and to the courts has long been provided by statute (35 U.S.C. 134).

The line of demarcation between appealable matters for the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (Board) and petitionable matters for the Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (Director) should be carefully observed. The Board will not ordinarily hear a question that should be decided by the Director on petition, and the Director will not ordinarily entertain a petition where the question presented is a matter appealable to the Board. However, since 37 CFR 1.181(f) states that any petition not filed within 2 months from the action complained of may be dismissed as untimely and since 37 CFR 1.144 states that petitions from restriction requirements must be filed no later than appeal, petitionable matters will rarely be present in a case by the time it is before the Board for a decision. *In re Watkinson*, 900 F.2d 230, 14 USPQ2d 1407 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Decision

Petitioner alleges that “the Examiner refused to permit antedating of a reference used in rejecting claims on the basis of (1) lack of showing of diligence between the dates of conception and

Art Unit: 3992

reduction to practice; and (2) lack of showing of a nexus between the claimed subject matter and the reduced to practice document". Petition at 4. According to the petitioner, "these are clear errors by the Examiner because (1) there is no requirement in the regulations for a showing of diligence where, as here, actual reduction to practice took place before the effective date of the reference [1]; and (2) the reduced to practice document is essentially identical to the disclosure of the provisional application which forms the basis of the '118 patent". Petition at 5.

All of petitioner's arguments pertain to the merits of the Examiner's rejections or determinations (e.g., whether the evidence is sufficient to establish prior inventorship). These issues are appealable matters and are not appropriate to address via a petition. See MPEP §§1201 and 1002. In other words, all these issues are subject to appeal to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board. Therefore, this petition cannot be deemed a proper petition under 37 CFR 1.181(a)(1).

Conclusion

1. The September 27, 2013 petition filed in the merged proceeding is **dismissed**.
2. Telephone inquiries related to this decision should be directed to Woo H. Choi, Supervisory Patent Examiner, at (571) 272-4179 or to Daniel Ryman, Supervisory Patent Examiner, at (571) 272-3152.



Irem Yucel

Director

Central Reexamination Unit

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor: Koichio Ikudome

Art Unit 3992

Merged Reexam Proceeding No. 95/002,035 (Main)
and Reexam Proceeding No. 90/012,342
(Based on US 6,779,118 C1)

Conf. No. 1745
Conf. No. 5786

Examiner: Jalatee Worjloh

Filed: September 12, 2012 (Main) and June 8, 2012

For: USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM

OPPOSITION TO PETITION TO STRIKE PATENT OWNER'S DECLARATIONS

Mail Stop "inter partes Reexam"
Attn.: Central Reexamination Unit
Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 23313-1450

Honorable Commissioner:

Patent Owner respectfully submits this opposition to third party requester's (TPR's) improper and groundless "petition" to strike Patent Owner's Declarations of record.

In response to the Action Closing Prosecution (ACP) mailed in the above-identified merged Proceedings by the Office on April 29, 2013, Patent Owner timely filed a Response, and submitted Declarations of the Inventors to present additional evidence requested by the Office to support Patent Owner's position that the reference to Coss is not proper prior art. Such Response and Declarations with Exhibits proving Coss is not prior art were correctly submitted within two months of the ACP on June 28, 2013. The Examiner properly considered the Declarations and Exhibits, and properly entered them into the record in these merged Proceedings.

TPR now petitions to have the Declarations and Exhibits stricken from the record, without cause or support.

The first thing to consider is that the Primary Examiner in these merged Proceedings elected to enter and comment on Patent Owner's 37 C.F.R. §1.131 Declarations after the ACP and prior to issuance of a Right of Appeal Notice (RAN). That was the Primary Examiner's decision, and neither Patent Owner nor TPR had control over that decision.

Consideration of those Declarations by the Primary Examiner made the Declarations part of the record. Accordingly, there is no basis for striking those Declarations. The fact that Patent Owner has taken the substantive position that the Declarations in fact antedate the Coss reference because they establish a prior reduction to practice at a date earlier than the effective filing date of Coss does not bear on whether the Primary Examiner violated any procedural guideline by entering the Section 1.131 Declarations. That TPR now belatedly takes the position that “apparently” Patent Owner deliberately chose not to file the Declarations until after the ACP does not somehow destroy those Declarations as evidence that should be and have been treated by the Primary Examiner, and are of record.

Patent Owner has pointed out, in Patent Owner’s September 27, 2013 Petition to Vacate the Right of Appeal Notice (RAN) that the Primary Examiner has not correctly assessed the Rule 131 Declarations. However, that does not somehow trigger any right for TPR to now, belatedly, argue that the record “suggests” that Patent Owner “apparently” knew of evidence that could be cast in the form of Section 1.131 Declarations and filed to successfully obviate all standing rejections in these Proceedings, but “deliberately chose” to delay filing those Declarations. That Patent Owner was “prepared to file Affidavits” after the first Office Action in the *ex parte* Reexamination Proceeding prior to the merger of that Proceeding with the present *inter partes* Reexamination Proceeding does not indicate any intent on Patent Owner’s part to conceal evidence which, after all, actually benefits Patent Owner’s position in the present merged Proceedings by demonstrating reduction to practice of the claimed invention prior to the earliest effective filing date for the Coss patent. Indeed, the record shows that the Coss reference was cited in the *inter partes* Reexamination Proceeding only after merger of the *ex parte* and *inter partes* Reexamination Proceedings.

Secondly, it would not be proper to argue that merger of these *ex parte* and *inter partes* Reexamination Proceedings was improper. The merger is purely discretionary with the Office, as 37 C.F.R §1.989 provides that the Office may issue a Decision merging Reexamination Proceedings at its discretion. The language of the rule is that “a decision may be made to merge the two proceedings or to suspend one of the proceedings” (that language appears in 37 C.F.R. §1.989(a); subsection (b) of the rule provides for merger of *inter partes* and *ex parte* Reexamination Proceedings, as in the present case). Further, it should be noted that MPEP §2686.01(I) provides that, “[w]here a second request for reexamination is filed and reexamination is ordered, and a first reexamination proceeding is pending, the proceedings will be merged where the Office (in its discretion) deems it

appropriate to do so, to facilitate the orderly handling of the proceedings.” However, a decision not to merge is within the sole discretion of the Office to facilitate/carry out the statutory mandate of 35 U.S.C. §314(c) to conduct Reexamination Proceedings with “special dispatch.” The Primary Examiner in merged *inter partes/ex parte* Reexamination Proceedings certainly has the right to use prior art from the earlier-filed *ex parte* Reexamination in the merged Proceedings to form rejections in the records of both the *inter partes* and *ex parte* Reexamination components of the merged Proceedings.

Finally, it is certain that TPR had already included, at pages 17-20 of its comments on the timely-filed Patent Owner’s Response to the ACP and Declarations/Exhibits, not only precisely the same arguments that it now again tries to make in its October 4, 2013 petition, but also has already made arguments against the contents of the Declarations themselves, which arguments are strangely entirely lacking in the petition to strike them. Attached is a column comparison of TPR’s comments on Patent Owner’s Response to the ACP and TPR’s petition to strike Patent Owner’s Declarations. The contents of the petition to strike are enumerated alongside the contents of TPR’s comments on Patent Owner’s Response to the ACP.

It also should be noted that TPR’s petition is now addressed to the Director of the CRU, since TPR apparently considers this to be only the issue of entry of the Declarations and, as such, holds that it is merely “one of compliance with Patent Office procedure, it is not subject to appeal to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board.”

However TPR attempts to justify filing the petition at this point [within one month of the mailing date of the RAN, since it is first in the RAN that it is stated that Patent Owner’s Declarations have been accepted, made of record and considered by the Examiner], TPR’s petition nevertheless remains improper and without grounds, no matter when it is filed, because it is merely a refabrication of what is already in the substantive record, and again presents precisely the same arguments that have already been made by TPR in TPR’s comments on Patent Owner’s Response to the ACP, which have already have been considered by the Primary Examiner, and have not been adopted.

Therefore, Patent Owner respectfully requests that TPR’s petition be expunged and not considered.

Evidence of service of this Opposition on TPR appears on the last page of this Opposition and before the attached Columns.

The Office is invited to direct any questions or comments regarding this matter to the undersigned practitioner at the below-listed e-mail address, and telephone and facsimile numbers.

Respectfully submitted,
Linksmart Wireless Technology, L.L.C.

/Abe HersHKovitz/
Abraham HersHKovitz
Reg. No. 45,294

Stephen Marcus
Reg. No. 64,075

Attachment: Comparison of TPR's petition and
TPR's comments on Patent Owner's
Response to ACP

Date: November 4, 2013

HERSHKOVITZ & ASSOCIATES, PLLC
2845 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
TEL: (703) 370-4800
FAX: (703) 370-4809
E-MAIL: patent@hershkovitz.net

RI1341006F-R1341006D; AH/SM/pjj

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

It is hereby certified that the attached OPPOSITION TO PETITION TO STRIKE PATENT OWNER'S DECLARATIONS, AND COLUMN COMPARISON OF TPR'S PETITION AND TPR'S COMMENTS, along with this Certificate of Service, **are being served on November 4, 2013 by first class mail** on third party requesters at third party requesters' addresses as identified below for each merged Proceeding:

David L. McCombs
Haynes & Boone, LLP
2323 Victory Avenue, Suite 700
Dallas, TX 75219

[for *inter partes* Proceeding No. 95/002,035]

James J. Wong
2108 Gossamer Ave.
Redwood City, CA 94065

[for *ex parte* Proceeding No. 90/012,342]

 /Abe Hershkovitz/
Abraham Hershkovitz

TPR's comments on PO's Response to ACP

1. These late-filed declarations should be denied entry. An affidavit or declaration filed after the issuance of an Action Closing Prosecution may be entered only "upon a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented." 37 C.F.R. 1.116(e). Patent Owner fails to demonstrate such "good and sufficient reasons."

2. Patent Owner asserts that until the Action Closing Prosecution, "the inventors did not have a recollection of the evidence establishing an earlier reduction to practice." (Resp. at 18.)

3. A review of the record, however, suggests that the Patent Owner apparently knew of the alleged evidence and *deliberately chose* not to provide it earlier.

4. The file history of Ex Parte Reexamination No. 90/012342 (prior to its merger with this proceeding) indicates that Patent Owner knew of the alleged evidence but deliberately chose not to submit it after the first Office Action: If necessary, Patent Owner is prepared to file Affidavits under 37 CFR § 131 in support of prior conception and reduction to practice before the filing date of Coss. (Control No. 90/012342, Response at 10 n. 14. (Feb. 7, 2013).) Since Patent Owner was "**prepared to file Affidavits**" after the first Office Action but chose not to, the declarations submitted following the Action Closing Prosecution *could have been* provided earlier. Patent Owner does not explain why it chose to withhold the declarations until now. Since it consciously pursued a strategy of delaying the presentation of its allegedly antedating evidence, Patent Owner does not have "good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence ... was not earlier presented." The evidence should be refused entry.

TPR's petition to strike PO's Declarations

1. The declarations by Moon Tai Yeung and Koichiro Ikudome from should be denied entry into the record of this proceeding. An affidavit or declaration filed after the issuance of an Action Closing Prosecution may be entered only "upon a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented." 37 C.F.R. 1.116(e). Patent Owner has provided no reasons whatsoever for why the declarations and evidence were not earlier presented.

2. Patent Owner asserts that until the Action Closing Prosecution, "the inventors did not have a recollection of the evidence establishing an earlier reduction to practice." (ACP Resp. at 18 (Jun. 28, 2013).)

3. The record of this merged proceeding, however, suggests that the Patent Owner apparently knew of the alleged evidence and *deliberately chose* not to provide it earlier.

4. The file history of Ex Parte Reexamination No. 90/012342 (prior to its merger with this proceeding) indicates that Patent Owner knew of the alleged evidence but deliberately chose not to submit it after the first Office Action: If necessary, Patent Owner is prepared to file Affidavits under 37 CFR § 131 in support of prior conception and reduction to practice before the filing date of Coss. (Control No. 90/012342, Response at 10 n. 14 (Feb. 7, 2013).) Since Patent Owner was "**prepared to file Affidavits**" after the first Office Action but chose not to, the declarations submitted following the Action Closing Prosecution *could have been* provided earlier. Patent Owner has not explained why it chose to withhold the declarations. Since it consciously pursued a strategy of delaying the presentation of its allegedly antedating evidence, Patent Owner does not have "good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence ... was not earlier presented." The evidence should have been refused entry.

TPR's comments on PO's Response to ACP

5. Furthermore, all of the evidence and information presented was accessible to the Patent Owner at the time of the previous Office Action. The declaration of Ikudome does not state where he found the submitted receipts from various computer-related purchases ("Appendix A") or why they would have been inaccessible to him until now. The other allegedly antedating exhibit ("Appendix B") is a Technical Innovation Report" that he previously discussed at his 2010 deposition in related litigation. (Ikudome Dec., ¶ 4.) Thus, the Patent Owner had access to all of the information that it now, belatedly, submits in an attempt to antedate Coss.

TPR's petition to strike PO's Declarations

5. Furthermore, all of the evidence and information presented was accessible to the Patent Owner at the time of the previous Office Action. The declaration of Ikudome does not state where he found the submitted receipts from various computer-related purchases ("Appendix A") or why they would have been inaccessible to him until now. The other allegedly antedating exhibit ("Appendix B") is a "Technical Innovation Report" that he previously discussed at his 2010 deposition in related litigation. (Ikudome Decl., ¶ 4.) Thus, the Patent Owner had access to all of the information that it belatedly submitted in an attempt to antedate prior art.

Electronic Acknowledgement Receipt

EFS ID:	17311215
Application Number:	95002035
International Application Number:	
Confirmation Number:	1745
Title of Invention:	USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM
First Named Inventor/Applicant Name:	6779118
Customer Number:	40401
Filer:	Abraham Hershkovitz
Filer Authorized By:	
Attorney Docket Number:	RI1341006F
Receipt Date:	04-NOV-2013
Filing Date:	12-SEP-2012
Time Stamp:	19:51:59
Application Type:	inter partes reexam

Payment information:

Submitted with Payment	no
------------------------	----

File Listing:

Document Number	Document Description	File Name	File Size(Bytes)/ Message Digest	Multi Part /.zip	Pages (if appl.)
1	Trans Letter filing of a response in a reexam	RI1341006F-A08_Transmittal.pdf	158946 <small>600f69af95e5b5c2f667a4dad6aeb1f0a129atf</small>	no	1

Warnings:

Information:

2		RI1341006F-R1341006D-A08_Opposition-to-tprs-pet-to-strike-POs-Decs.pdf	174602 118de021e92607be6bcc5d6fcac5f5825a0bfb8a4	yes	7
---	--	--	---	-----	---

Multipart Description/PDF files in .zip description			
	Document Description	Start	End
	Reexam - Opposition filed in response to petition	1	4
	Reexam Certificate of Service	5	5
	Reexam - Opposition filed in response to petition	6	7

Warnings:

Information:

Total Files Size (in bytes):	333548
-------------------------------------	--------

This Acknowledgement Receipt evidences receipt on the noted date by the USPTO of the indicated documents, characterized by the applicant, and including page counts, where applicable. It serves as evidence of receipt similar to a Post Card, as described in MPEP 503.

New Applications Under 35 U.S.C. 111
If a new application is being filed and the application includes the necessary components for a filing date (see 37 CFR 1.53(b)-(d) and MPEP 506), a Filing Receipt (37 CFR 1.54) will be issued in due course and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the filing date of the application.

National Stage of an International Application under 35 U.S.C. 371
If a timely submission to enter the national stage of an international application is compliant with the conditions of 35 U.S.C. 371 and other applicable requirements a Form PCT/DO/EO/903 indicating acceptance of the application as a national stage submission under 35 U.S.C. 371 will be issued in addition to the Filing Receipt, in due course.

New International Application Filed with the USPTO as a Receiving Office
If a new international application is being filed and the international application includes the necessary components for an international filing date (see PCT Article 11 and MPEP 1810), a Notification of the International Application Number and of the International Filing Date (Form PCT/RO/105) will be issued in due course, subject to prescriptions concerning national security, and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the international filing date of the application.



HERSHKOVITZ & ASSOCIATES, PLLC

PATENT AGENCY

2845 DUKE STREET, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

TEL. 703-370-4800 ~ FACSIMILE 703-370-4809

patent@hershkovitz.net ~ www.hershkovitz.net

Inventor: Koichiro Ikudome et al.

Art Unit: 3992

Reexamination Proceeding: 95/002,035
(based on U.S. Patent No. 6,779,118)

Confirmation No.: 1745

Reexamination Filed: September 12, 2012

Examiner: Jalatee Worjloh

For: USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM

Mail Stop "inter partes Reexam"
Attn.: Central Reexamination Unit
Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 23313-1450

Honorable Commissioner:

Transmitted herewith are OPPOSITION TO PETITION TO STRIKE PATENT OWNER'S DECLARATIONS AND COLUMN COMPARISON OF TPR'S PETITION AND TPR'S COMMENTS and a Certificate of Service in the above-captioned Proceeding.

The fee has been calculated as shown below:

Claims After Amendment	No. of Claims Previously Paid	Present Extra	Small Entity		Large Entity	
			Rate	Fee	Rate	Fee
*Total Claims:			x 30=	\$	x 60=	\$
**Indep. Claims:			x125=	\$	x250=	\$
Extension Fee for	Months			\$		\$
Other:				\$		\$
Total:				\$	Total:	\$

Fee Payment made through EFS.

Payment is made herewith by Credit Card (see attached Form PTO-2038).

The Director is hereby authorized to charge all fees, including those under 37 CFR §§1.16 and 1.17, which are required for entry of the papers submitted herewith, and any fees which may be required to maintain pendency of this Proceeding, to Deposit Account No. 50-2929.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge all fees under 37 CFR § 1.18 which may be required to complete issuance of this application to Deposit Account No. 50-2929.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 4, 2013

/Abe Hershkovitz/
Abraham Hershkovitz
Registration No. 45,294

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor: Jerome D. JOHNSON

Art Unit 3992

Merged Reexam Proceeding No. 95/002,035 (Main)
and Reexam Proceeding No. 90/012,342
(Based on US 6,779,118 C1)

Conf. No. 1745
Conf. No. 5786

Examiner: Jalatee Worjloh

Filed: September 12, 2012 (Main) and June 8, 2012

For: USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM

NOTICE OF APPEAL UNDER 37 CFR §§1.959 AND 41.61

Attn: Director of Central Reexamination Unit
Central Reexamination Unit
Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 23313-1450

Dear Director:

This Notice of Appeal is directed to the Right of Appeal Notice ("RAN") dated September 9, 2013 in the above-identified merged *inter partes/ex parte* Reexamination Proceedings ("the present merged Proceedings") for U.S. Patent No. 6,779,118 ("the '118 Patent").

Patent Owner respectfully submits that, although the RAN is improper and should be vacated, and a corrected RAN issued, Patent Owner is timely filing this Notice to appeal the final rejection of all claims in the Proceedings, i.e., claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-24 and 26-90, including any improper final determination in the RAN which is unfavorable to patentability of the claims.

This Notice is being filed electronically through EFS, including the Notice of Appeal fee under §41.20(b)(1), and it is believed that no other fees are required for entry and processing of this Notice in the record. However, the Office is authorized to charge any fees necessary for entry of this Notice, or to preserve the pendency of these Reexamination Proceedings, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-2929, making reference to Att'y Dockets No. RI1341006F and No. R1341006D.

Evidence of service on third party requesters appears in the last page of this Notice.

The Office is invited to direct any questions regarding this matter to the practitioners identified below at the listed e-mail address, and telephone and facsimile numbers.

Respectfully submitted,
Linksmart Wireless Technology, L.L.C.

_____/Dinh X. Nguyen/
Abraham Hershkovitz
Reg. No. 45,294

Dinh X. Nguyen
Reg. No. 54,923

Date: October 8, 2013

HERSHKOVITZ & ASSOCIATES, PLLC
2845 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
TEL: (703) 370-4800
FAX: (703) 370-4809
E-MAIL: patent@hershkovitz.net

RI1341006F-R1341006D.A07; AH/DXN/pjj

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

It is hereby certified that the attached NOTICE OF APPEAL UNDER 37 CFR §§1.959 AND 41.61, along with this Certificate of Service, **are being served on October 8, 2013 by first class mail** on third party requesters at third party requesters' addresses as identified below for each merged Proceeding:

David L. McCombs
Haynes & Boone, LLP
90/013,342
2323 Victory Avenue, Suite 700
Dallas, TX 75219

[for *inter partes* Proceeding No. 95/002,035]

James J. Wong
2108 Gossamer Ave.
Redwood City, CA 94065

[for *ex parte* Proceeding No. 90/012,342]

 /Dinh X. Nguyen/
Dinh X. Nguyen

Electronic Patent Application Fee Transmittal

Application Number:	95002035
Filing Date:	12-Sep-2012
Title of Invention:	USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM
First Named Inventor/Applicant Name:	6779118
Filer:	Abraham Hershkovitz
Attorney Docket Number:	RI1341006F

Filed as Large Entity

inter partes reexam Filing Fees

Description	Fee Code	Quantity	Amount	Sub-Total in USD(\$)
Basic Filing:				
Pages:				
Claims:				
Miscellaneous-Filing:				
Petition:				
Patent-Appeals-and-Interference:				
Notice of Appeal	1401	1	800	800

Post-Allowance-and-Post-Issuance:

Extension-of-Time:

Description	Fee Code	Quantity	Amount	Sub-Total in USD(\$)
Miscellaneous:				
Total in USD (\$)				800

Electronic Acknowledgement Receipt

EFS ID:	17072617
Application Number:	95002035
International Application Number:	
Confirmation Number:	1745
Title of Invention:	USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM
First Named Inventor/Applicant Name:	6779118
Customer Number:	40401
Filer:	Abraham Hershkovitz/Dinh Nguyen
Filer Authorized By:	Abraham Hershkovitz
Attorney Docket Number:	RI1341006F
Receipt Date:	08-OCT-2013
Filing Date:	12-SEP-2012
Time Stamp:	16:47:14
Application Type:	inter partes reexam

Payment information:

Submitted with Payment	yes
Payment Type	Credit Card
Payment was successfully received in RAM	\$800
RAM confirmation Number	4337
Deposit Account	
Authorized User	

File Listing:

Document Number	Document Description	File Name	File Size(Bytes)/ Message Digest	Multi Panasonic	Pages 1014
-----------------	----------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	--------------------	---------------

1	Trans Letter filing of a response in a reexam	RI1341006F-A07_Transmittal.pdf	164718 6f4cbe37874e87f486cd25d6e3d0799bd416dee2	no	1
Warnings:					
Information:					
2		RI1341006FR1341006D-A07_Notice-of-Appeal-and-CertofSvc.pdf	131851 e8df96b97a356cbdde4d1f417cd15b18efb6ad4a	yes	3
	Multipart Description/PDF files in .zip description				
	Document Description		Start	End	
	Notice of Appeal Filed		1	2	
	Reexam Certificate of Service		3	3	
Warnings:					
Information:					
3	Fee Worksheet (SB06)	fee-info.pdf	30119 3155c462fd9643d3a26b55cecb09079fc35da9e8	no	2
Warnings:					
Information:					
Total Files Size (in bytes):				326688	
<p>This Acknowledgement Receipt evidences receipt on the noted date by the USPTO of the indicated documents, characterized by the applicant, and including page counts, where applicable. It serves as evidence of receipt similar to a Post Card, as described in MPEP 503.</p> <p><u>New Applications Under 35 U.S.C. 111</u> If a new application is being filed and the application includes the necessary components for a filing date (see 37 CFR 1.53(b)-(d) and MPEP 506), a Filing Receipt (37 CFR 1.54) will be issued in due course and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the filing date of the application.</p> <p><u>National Stage of an International Application under 35 U.S.C. 371</u> If a timely submission to enter the national stage of an international application is compliant with the conditions of 35 U.S.C. 371 and other applicable requirements a Form PCT/DO/EO/903 indicating acceptance of the application as a national stage submission under 35 U.S.C. 371 will be issued in addition to the Filing Receipt, in due course.</p> <p><u>New International Application Filed with the USPTO as a Receiving Office</u> If a new international application is being filed and the international application includes the necessary components for an international filing date (see PCT Article 11 and MPEP 1810), a Notification of the International Application Number and of the International Filing Date (Form PCT/RO/105) will be issued in due course, subject to prescriptions concerning national security, and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the international filing date of the application.</p>					



HERSHKOVITZ & ASSOCIATES, PLLC

PATENT AGENCY

2845 DUKE STREET, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

TEL. 703-370-4800 ~ FACSIMILE 703-370-4809

patent@hershkovitz.net ~ www.hershkovitz.net

Inventor: Koichiro Ikudome et al.

Art Unit: 3992

Reexamination Proceeding: 95/002,035
(based on U.S. Patent No. 6,779,118)

Confirmation No.: 1745

Reexamination Filed: September 12, 2012

Examiner: Jalatee Worjloh

For: USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM

Mail Stop "inter partes Reexam"

Attn.: Central Reexamination Unit

Commissioner for Patents

United States Patent & Trademark Office

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 23313-1450

Honorable Commissioner:

Transmitted herewith are NOTICE OF APPEAL UNDER 37 CFR §§1.959 AND 41.61 and a Certificate of Service in connection with the above-captioned Proceedings

The fee has been calculated as shown below:

Claims After Amendment	No. of Claims Previously Paid	Present Extra	Small Entity		Large Entity	
			Rate	Fee	Rate	Fee
*Total Claims:			x 30=	\$	x 60=	\$
**Indep. Claims:			x125=	\$	x250=	\$
Extension Fee for _____ Months				\$		\$
Other: Notice of Appeal				\$		\$800.00
Total:				\$	Total:	\$800.00

Fee Payment made through EFS.

Payment is made herewith by Credit Card (see attached Form PTO-2038).

The Director is hereby authorized to charge all fees, including those under 37 CFR §§1.16 and 1.17, which are required for entry of the papers submitted herewith, and any fees which may be required to maintain pendency of this Proceeding, to Deposit Account No. 50-2929.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge all fees under 37 CFR § 1.18 which may be required to complete issuance of this application to Deposit Account No. 50-2929.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 8, 2013

/Dinh X. Nguyen/

Abraham Hershkovitz
Registration No. 45,294

Dinh X. Nguyen
Registration No. 54,923

R1341006F.A07; AH/DXN/pjj

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Reexamination Merged Control Nos.: 95/002,035 and 90/012,342	§ § §	Attorney Docket No.: 43614.61
Patent No.: 6,779,118	§	Customer No.: 27683
Examiner: Jalatee Worjloh	§ §	Real Party In Interest: Cisco Systems, Inc.
For: USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM	§ § §	Conf. Nos.: 1745 and 5786
	§	Art Unit: 3992

Mail Stop: Petition
Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**PETITION UNDER 37 CFR § 1.181 TO STRIKE PATENT OWNER’S UNTIMELY
DECLARATIONS FROM THE RECORD**

I. Introductory Remarks

Following an Action Closing Prosecution (“ACP”) mailed April 29, 2013, Patent Owner Linksmart Wireless Technology, LLC submitted inventor declarations under 37 C.F.R. §1.131. While no explanation for the late presentation of these declarations was provided, the Examiner nevertheless considered them on the merits, effectively entering them into the record. Requester Cisco Systems, Inc. hereby petitions under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.181 for supervisory review of the Examiner’s decision to allow entry of the Patent Owner’s late-filed declarations and evidence.

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.20(c)(6), the petition fee of \$1940.00 is being paid with this filing. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment for this request to Deposit Account No. 08-1394.

II. Statement of Facts

- On December 7, 2012, the Office issued an Action in *ex parte* reexamination control no. 90/012342. The Action cited US 6,170,012 to Coss in rejecting certain claims.
- On February 7, 2013, the Patent Owner filed a Response to the Dec. 7, 2012 Action. The Response stated that “Patent Owner is prepared to file Affidavits under 37 CFR §

131 in support of prior conception and reduction to practice before the filing date of Coss.” (Response at 10, n.14.) The Response did not include any affidavits.

- On March 20, 2013, the Office *sua sponte* merged ex parte reexamination control no. 90/012342 with *inter partes* reexamination control no. 95/002035.
- The Office issued an ACP in the merged proceeding on April 29, 2013.
- Patent Owner filed a Response (“ACP Resp.”) to the ACP on June 28, 2013. Patent Owner submitted with the Response declarations and evidence from named inventors Moon Tai Yeung and Koichiro Ikudome to support an alleged conception and reduction to practice before Coss.
- In a Right of Appeal Notice (“RAN”) dated September 9, 2013, the Office considered the declarations and evidence submitted by Patent Owner after the ACP. *See* RAN at 17-19.
- On September 27, 2013 Patent Owner filed a petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.181 to vacate the RAN dated September 9, 2013.

III. Action Requested

Cisco hereby respectfully requests that the declarations by Moon Tai Yeung and Koichiro Ikudome, along with the evidence submitted as exhibits to those declarations, be stricken from the record and not considered on the merits because the Patent Owner has not complied with the required procedure for entry of such materials following an Action Closing Prosecution.

IV. Argument

The declarations by Moon Tai Yeung and Koichiro Ikudome from should be denied entry into the record of this proceeding. An affidavit or declaration filed after the issuance of an Action Closing Prosecution may be entered only “upon a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented.” 37 C.F.R. 1.116(e). Patent Owner has provided no reasons whatsoever for why the declarations and evidence were not earlier presented.

Patent Owner asserts that until the Action Closing Prosecution, “the inventors did not have a recollection of the evidence establishing an earlier reduction to practice.” (ACP Resp. at 18 (Jun. 28, 2013).) The record of this merged proceeding, however, suggests that the Patent Owner apparently knew of the alleged evidence and deliberately chose not to provide it earlier.

The file history of *Ex Parte* Reexamination No. 90/012342 (prior to its merger with this proceeding) indicates that Patent Owner knew of the alleged evidence but deliberately chose not to submit it after the first Office Action:

If necessary, Patent Owner is prepared to file Affidavits under 37 CFR § 131 in support of prior conception and reduction to practice before the filing date of Coss.

(Control No. 90/012342, Response at 10 n. 14 (Feb. 7, 2013).) Since Patent Owner was “*prepared to file Affidavits*” after the first Office Action but chose not to, the declarations submitted following the Action Closing Prosecution *could have been* provided earlier. Patent Owner has not explained why it chose to withhold the declarations. Since it consciously pursued a strategy of delaying the presentation of its allegedly antedating evidence, Patent Owner does not have “good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence ... was not earlier presented.” The evidence should have been refused entry.

Furthermore, all of the evidence and information presented was accessible to the Patent Owner at the time of the previous Office Action. The declaration of Ikudome does not state where he found the submitted receipts from various computer-related purchases (“Appendix A”) or why they would have been inaccessible to him until now. The other allegedly antedating exhibit (“Appendix B”) is a “Technical Innovation Report” that he previously discussed at his 2010 deposition in related litigation. (Ikudome Decl., ¶ 4.) Thus, the Patent Owner had access to all of the information that it belatedly submitted in an attempt to antedate prior art.

The Examiner should have denied entry of the Patent Owner's untimely declarations. The Examiner stated in the Right of Appeal Notice, however, that “The Declarations filed on June 28, 2013 from Moon Tai Yeung and Koichiro Ikudome have been considered.” (RAN at 17.) Cisco asks that the Director's supervisory authority be used to correct the situation. Striking the Patent Owner's untimely declarations and evidence will bring the record of this proceeding back into compliance with the procedure of 37 CFR § 1.116(e). As the issue is one of compliance with Patent Office procedure, it is not subject to appeal to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board and is instead properly corrected through this petition under 37 CFR 1.181.

IV. Conclusion

Patent Owner has not provided "showing of good and sufficient reasons" to enter the late-filed declarations and evidence in these merged proceedings. The Examiner's decision to allow them entry is contrary to the procedure required under 37 CFR 1.116(e) and should be corrected by striking the untimely Yeung and Ikudome declarations and evidence from the record.

As identified in the attached Certificate of Service, a copy of the present petition, in its entirety, is being served to the address of the attorney or agent of record.


Respectfully submitted,

/David L. McCombs/

David L. McCombs
Registration No. 32,271

Dated: October 4, 2013

HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
IP Section
2323 Victory Avenue, Suite 700
Dallas, Texas 75219
Telephone: 214/651-5533
Facsimile: 214/200-0853

<p>CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE I hereby certify that this correspondence, all attachments, and any corresponding filing fee is being transmitted via the Electronic Filing System (EFS) Web with the United States Patent and Trademark Office on October 4, 2013.</p> <p> _____ Theresa O'Connor</p>
--

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that a copy of the PETITION UNDER 37 CFR § 1.181 TO STRIKE PATENT OWNER'S UNTIMELY DECLARATIONS FROM THE RECORD was served on:

HERSHKOVITZ & ASSOCIATES, PLLC
2845 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

the attorney of record for the assignee of USP 6,779,118 and

JAMES J. WONG
2108 GOSSAMER AVE.
REDWOOD CITY, CA 94065

the attorney of record for the requester in Control No. 90/012342, in accordance with 37 CFR § 1.903, on October 4, 2013.

/David L. McCombs/

David L. McCombs,
Registration No. 32,271

Electronic Patent Application Fee Transmittal

Application Number:	95002035
Filing Date:	12-Sep-2012
Title of Invention:	USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM
First Named Inventor/Applicant Name:	6779118
Filer:	David L. McCombs/Theresa O'Connor
Attorney Docket Number:	RI1341006F

Filed as Large Entity

inter partes reexam Filing Fees

Description	Fee Code	Quantity	Amount	Sub-Total in USD(\$)
Basic Filing:				
Pages:				
Claims:				
Miscellaneous-Filing:				
Petition:				
PETITION IN REEXAM PROCEEDING	1824	1	1940	1940

Patent-Appeals-and-Interference:

Post-Allowance-and-Post-Issuance:

Extension-of-Time:

Description	Fee Code	Quantity	Amount	Sub-Total in USD(\$)
Miscellaneous:				
Total in USD (\$)				1940

Electronic Acknowledgement Receipt

EFS ID:	17039578
Application Number:	95002035
International Application Number:	
Confirmation Number:	1745
Title of Invention:	USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM
First Named Inventor/Applicant Name:	6779118
Customer Number:	40401
Filer:	David L. McCombs/Theresa O'Connor
Filer Authorized By:	David L. McCombs
Attorney Docket Number:	RI1341006F
Receipt Date:	04-OCT-2013
Filing Date:	12-SEP-2012
Time Stamp:	11:09:45
Application Type:	inter partes reexam

Payment information:

Submitted with Payment	yes
Payment Type	Credit Card
Payment was successfully received in RAM	\$1940
RAM confirmation Number	8933
Deposit Account	081394
Authorized User	MCCOMBS, DAVID L

The Director of the USPTO is hereby authorized to charge indicated fees and credit any overpayment as follows:

Charge any Additional Fees required under 37 C.F.R. Section 1.16 (National application filing, search, and examination fees)

Charge any Additional Fees required under 37 C.F.R. Section 1.17 (Patent application and reexamination processing fees)

Charge any Additional Fees required under 37 C.F.R. Section 1.19 (Document supply fees)

Charge any Additional Fees required under 37 C.F.R. Section 1.20 (Post Issuance fees)

Charge any Additional Fees required under 37 C.F.R. Section 1.21 (Miscellaneous fees and charges)

File Listing:

Document Number	Document Description	File Name	File Size(Bytes)/ Message Digest	Multi Part /.zip	Pages (if appl.)
1		3PR_Petition_to_Strike_POs_Untimely_Delcarations_from_Record.pdf	201983 e478c17c226e47266ce7c3232bc84660b4929541	yes	5

Multipart Description/PDF files in .zip description

Document Description	Start	End
Receipt of Petition in a Reexam	1	4
Reexam Certificate of Service	5	5

Warnings:

Information:

2	Fee Worksheet (SB06)	fee-info.pdf	30273 d90bf7657fcbd61cfacaa06a6f755caf171c19d2	no	2
---	----------------------	--------------	---	----	---

Warnings:

Information:

Total Files Size (in bytes): 232256

This Acknowledgement Receipt evidences receipt on the noted date by the USPTO of the indicated documents, characterized by the applicant, and including page counts, where applicable. It serves as evidence of receipt similar to a Post Card, as described in MPEP 503.

New Applications Under 35 U.S.C. 111

If a new application is being filed and the application includes the necessary components for a filing date (see 37 CFR 1.53(b)-(d) and MPEP 506), a Filing Receipt (37 CFR 1.54) will be issued in due course and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the filing date of the application.

National Stage of an International Application under 35 U.S.C. 371

If a timely submission to enter the national stage of an international application is compliant with the conditions of 35 U.S.C. 371 and other applicable requirements a Form PCT/DO/EO/903 indicating acceptance of the application as a national stage submission under 35 U.S.C. 371 will be issued in addition to the Filing Receipt, in due course.

New International Application Filed with the USPTO as a Receiving Office

If a new international application is being filed and the international application includes the necessary components for an international filing date (see PCT Article 11 and MPEP 1810), a Notification of the International Application Number and of the International Filing Date (Form PCT/RO/105) will be issued in due course, subject to prescriptions concerning national security, and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the international filing date of the application.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor: Jerome D. JOHNSON

Art Unit 3992

Merged Reexam Proceeding No. 95/002,035 (Main)
and Reexam Proceeding No. 90/012,342
(Based on US 6,779,118 C1)

Conf. No. 1745
Conf. No. 5786

Examiner: Jalatee Worjloh

Filed: September 12, 2012 (Main) and June 8, 2012

For: USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM

**PETITION UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.181 TO
VACATE IMPROPER RIGHT OF APPEAL NOTICE**

Attn: Director of Central Reexamination Unit
Central Reexamination Unit
Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 23313-1450

Dear Director:

This Petition is directed to the Right of Appeal Notice (“RAN”) dated September 9, 2013 in the above-identified merged *inter partes/ex parte* Reexamination Proceedings (“the present merged Proceedings”) for U.S. Patent No. 6,779,118 (“the ‘118 Patent”). Vacatur of the outstanding RAN is respectfully solicited for at least the reasons discussed below.

The Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees necessary for entry of this Petition or to preserve the pendency of these Reexamination Proceedings, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-2929, making reference to Att’y Dockets No. RI1341006F and No. R1341006D.

Basis for Seeking Relief

The Examiner refused to permit antedating of a reference used in rejecting the claims on the basis of (1) lack of showing of diligence between the dates of conception and reduction to practice; and (2) lack of showing of a nexus between the claimed subject matter and the reduced to practice document.

These are clear errors by the Examiner because (1) there is no requirement in the regulations for a showing of diligence where, as here, actual reduction to practice took place before the effective filing date of the reference to Coss et al., US Patent No. 6,170,012 (hereinafter “Coss”); and (2) the reduced to practice document is essentially identical to the disclosure of the provisional application which forms the basis of the '118 Patent.

REMARKS

I. INTRODUCTION

This Petition is filed to have the RAN dated September 9, 2013 vacated. A copy of this Petition is being served on third party requester pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§1.248 and 1.903. Section 1.903 is applicable because these merged Proceedings include an *inter partes* Reexamination that has been merged with an *ex parte* Reexamination, and the procedures attendant to *inter partes* Reexamination control in merged Proceedings.

II. SPECIFIC CLAIM REJECTIONS ADDRESSED IN THIS PETITION

Prior to the merging of the *ex parte* and *inter partes* Reexamination Proceedings, the claims described below were rejected in the *ex parte* Reexamination Proceeding. The present Petition is filed to specifically address the following two claim rejections in the merged Proceedings that rely on Coss:

- a. Claims 2-7, 9-14, 28-35 and 44-67 were rejected in the April 29, 2013 Action Closing Prosecution (“ACP”) as being obvious over Radia in view of Admitted Prior Art and further in view of the patent to Coss. These claims were also rejected on the same grounds in the RAN.
- b. Claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-43, and 68-90 were rejected in the ACP as being obvious over the patent to Coss in view of Admitted Prior Art. These claims were also rejected in the RAN on the same grounds.

III. THE RAN TREATS IMPROPERLY THE 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 DECLARATIONS FILED TO ADDRESS THE REJECTIONS BASED ON COSS

On June 28, 2013, Patent Owner filed a Response to the ACP. In that Response, at page 17, Patent Owner specifically discussed the two grounds of rejection that included Coss. Patent Owner included the following discussion, which bridges pages 17 and 18 of the Response to the ACP:

“Patent Owner submits herewith the Declarations of Inventors Koichiro Ikudome and Moon Tai Yeung under 37 C.F.R. §1.131 demonstrating that the invention recited in the '118 patent was conceived and reduced to practice before August 14, 1997, which is prior to the September 12, 1997 filing date of Coss et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,170,012. Coss is therefore not prior art as to the '118 patent. As set forth in the Ikudome Declaration, when the Examiner maintained the rejection in the 4/29/2013 ACP, Inventor Ikudome undertook a detailed investigation of his records and discovered not only receipts for the purchase of equipment acquired for the purpose of testing the invention concept, but also located a document dated August 14, 1997 which is being submitted with his 37 C.F.R. §1.131 Declaration which shows that the invention was actually reduced to practice before the Coss filing date. Patent Owner therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of all of the above rejections citing Coss. Rejections based on Radia in combination with APA without reliance on Coss have been addressed above. These Declarations should be entered because (1) they are necessary to eliminate Coss as “prior art” and (2) they could not have been presented earlier since the inventors did not have a recollection of the evidence establishing an earlier reduction to practice than Coss until after the Examiner’s mailing of the ACP.”

Notwithstanding the above discussion, which states that the invention of the '118 Patent **had actually been both conceived and reduced to practice prior to August 14, 1997**, the RAN nevertheless includes the two rejections that rely on Coss. The RAN also includes a discussion of conception and diligence in which the Examiner asserts that the Section 1.131 Declarations allegedly did not properly address conception and reduction to practice. The Examiner’s analysis of the Section 1.131 Declarations by the inventors is totally inaccurate, and appears at pages 17-19 of the RAN as follows:

Declaration under 37 CFR 1.131

The Declarations filed on June 28, 2013 from Moon Tai Yeung and Koichiro Ikudome have been considered, but are ineffective to overcome the Coss reference.

The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a conception of the invention prior to the effective date of Silverman* reference. While conception is the mental part of the inventive act, it must be capable of proof, such as by demonstrative evidence or by a complete disclosure to another. Conception is more than a vague idea of how to solve a problem. The requisite means themselves and their interaction must also be comprehended. See *Mergenthaler v. Scudder*, 1897 C.D. 724, 81 O.G. 1417 (D.C. Cir. 1897).

In this case, the claimed limitations are not discussed in the evidence provided. For instance, the claims recite "rule set" and "the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated the temporarily assigned network address," which is not described in the exhibits. The declaration "must establish possession of either the whole invention claimed or something falling within the claim (such as a species of a claimed genus) in the sense that the claim as a whole reads on it." MPEP 715.02. Further, the declaration does not provide a nexus between the evidence and the claims.

The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish diligence from a date prior to the date of reduction to practice of the Coss reference to either a constructive reduction to practice or an actual reduction to practice. "Evidence in the form of exhibits may accompany the affidavit or declaration. Each exhibit relied upon should be specially referred to in the affidavit or declaration, in terms of what it is relied upon to show." MPEP 715.05. In this case, the declaration fails to explain which facts are being relied on to prove diligence. Also, Patent owner has failed to provide evidence to fully account for the time period during which due diligence must be established.

An applicant must account for the entire period during which diligence is required GouM v. Schawlow, 363 F.2d 908, 919, 150 USPQ 634, 643 (CCPA 1966) (Merely stating that there were no

* There does not appear to be a reference named "Silverman" in the merged proceeding.

weeks or months that the invention was not worked on is not enough); In re Harry, 333 F.2d 920, 923, 142 USPQ 164, 166 (CCPA 1964)(statement that the subject matter "was diligently reduced to practice" is not a showing but a mere pleading). A 2-day period lacking activity has been held to be fatal. In re Mulder, 716 F.2d 1542, 1545, 219 USPQ 189, 193 (Fed Cir. 1983) (37 CFR 1.131 issue); Fitzgerald v. Arbib, 268 F.2d 763, 766, 122 USPQ 530, 532 (CCPA 1959) (Less than 1 month of inactivity during critical period Efforts to exploit an invention commercially do not constitute diligence in reducing it to practice. An actual reduction to practice in the case of a design for a three-dimensional article requires that it should be embodied in some structure other than a mere drawing.); Kendall v. Searles, 173 F.2d 986, 993, 81 USPQ 363, 369 (CCPA 1949) (Diligence requires that applicants must be specific as to dates and facts.)

The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a reduction to practice of the invention in this country or a NAFTA A or WTO member country prior to the effective date of the Coss reference. To establish actual reduction to practice, a showing of the invention in a physical or tangible form that shows every element of the count. *Wetmore v. Quick*, 536 F.2d 937, 942, 190 USPQ 223, 227 (CCPA 1976). For an actual reduction to practice, the invention must have been sufficiently tested to demonstrate that it will work for its intended purpose, but it need not be in a commercially satisfactory stage of development.> See, e.g., *Scott v. Finney*, 34 F.3d 1058, 1 062; 32 USPQ2d 1115, 1118-19 (Fed. Cir. 1994). MEPE (*sic*, MPEP) 2138.05. (Emphasis in bold added.)

In order to establish prior invention, which includes a conception and an actual reduction to practice of their invention, the joint inventors of the '118 Patent each submitted a proper and sufficient 37 C.F.R 1.131 Declaration in the merged Reexamination Proceedings. The individual Declaration of Moon Tai Yeung references copies of invoices showing hardware purchased throughout the month of May 1997, and a Technical Innovation Report dated August 14, 1997.

The Declaration of Koichiro Ikudome also references those documents, and further references pages 238-239 of a videotaped Deposition taken on March 4, 2010. **The documents attached to the respective 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 declarations of the joint inventors clearly establish both prior conception and prior actual reduction to practice of the invention disclosed and claimed in the '118 Patent.**

In addition, it should be noted that in the earlier *ex parte* Reexamination Proceeding 90/009,301 for the '118 Patent, the Primary Examiner held that Provisional Application No. 60/084,014 filed May 4, 1998 (hereinafter “the '014 Provisional Application”) clearly supported the disclosure in the '118 Patent. Exhibit A, attached hereto, includes page 2-6 of the Order Granting *Ex Parte* Reexamination in Control No. 90/009,301 in which the Examiner makes that statement. Note should be taken that the August 14, 1997 Technical Innovation Report that was attached to each of the two 37 C.F.R §1.131 Declarations referenced above is essentially identical to the disclosure of the '014 Provisional Application. Accordingly, it is clear that the August 14, 1997 Technical Innovation Report contains a description of the invention disclosed and claimed in the '118 Patent which is the subject of the present merged Reexamination Proceedings.

IV. CONCLUSION

During the course of reexamining Patent No. 6,779,118, the Central Reexamination Unit clearly established that the '014 Provisional Application supports the disclosure of the '118 Patent, which is now the subject of merged Reexamination Proceedings No. 95/002,035 and No. 90/012,342. In the September 9, 2013 RAN, the Examiner’s criticism of the 37 C.F.R § 1.131 Declarations filed by each one of the two joint inventors with respect to the lack of a showing of a conception date and the lack of a showing of diligence through a reduction to practice is simply incorrect, **because the joint inventors of the '118 Patent actually reduced their invention to practice as evidenced by the August 14, 1997 Technical Innovation Report.** Accordingly, the two grounds of rejection in which Coss is relied upon cannot be asserted by the Office in the '118 Patent merged Reexamination Proceedings because the Section 1.131 Declarations clearly establish an actual reduction to practice date (and a conception date) earlier than the earliest date to which Coss is entitled.

Accordingly, the Central Reexamination Unit Director is respectfully requested to vacate the September 9, 2013 RAN and to instruct the Examiner to issue a corrected Right of Appeal Notice that omits any ground of rejection based upon Coss.

The Office is invited to direct any questions or comments regarding this matter to the undersigned practitioner at the below-listed e-mail address, and telephone and facsimile numbers.

Respectfully submitted,
Linksmart Wireless Technology, L.L.C.

 /Abe Hershkovitz/
Abraham Hershkovitz
Reg. No. 45,294

Stephen Marcus
Reg. No. 64,075

Date: September 27, 2013

HERSHKOVITZ & ASSOCIATES, PLLC
2845 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
TEL: (703) 370-4800
FAX: (703) 370-4809
E-MAIL: patent@hershkovitz.net

RI1341006F-R1341006D; AH/SM/pjj

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

It is hereby certified that the attached PETITION UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.181 TO VACATE IMPROPER RIGHT OF APPEAL NOTICE AND EXHIBITS A-C, along with this Certificate of Service, **are being served on September 27, 2013 by first class mail** on third party requesters at third party requesters' addresses as identified below for each merged Proceeding:

David L. McCombs
Haynes & Boone, LLP
90/013,342
2323 Victory Avenue, Suite 700
Dallas, TX 75219

[for *inter partes* Proceeding No. 95/002,035]

James J. Wong
2108 Gossamer Ave.
Redwood City, CA 94065

[for *ex parte* Proceeding No. 90/012,342]

 /Abe Hershkovitz/
Abraham Hershkovitz

Electronic Acknowledgement Receipt

EFS ID:	16984832
Application Number:	95002035
International Application Number:	
Confirmation Number:	1745
Title of Invention:	USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM
First Named Inventor/Applicant Name:	6779118
Customer Number:	40401
Filer:	Abraham Hershkovitz
Filer Authorized By:	
Attorney Docket Number:	RI1341006F
Receipt Date:	27-SEP-2013
Filing Date:	12-SEP-2012
Time Stamp:	23:47:00
Application Type:	inter partes reexam

Payment information:

Submitted with Payment	no
------------------------	----

File Listing:

Document Number	Document Description	File Name	File Size(Bytes)/ Message Digest	Multi Part /.zip	Pages (if appl.)
1	Trans Letter filing of a response in a reexam	RI1341006F_Transmittal.pdf	159493 <small>8b311f2e638182910e0ec03e47db73eca9f9ca4</small>	no	1

Warnings:

Information:

2		RI1341006FR1341006D_181-Petition.pdf	232392 127a2f19b41ba0d6b58bc0f796ac226a6b946f0b	yes	8
Multipart Description/PDF files in .zip description					
		Document Description	Start	End	
		Receipt of Petition in a Reexam	1	7	
		Reexam Certificate of Service	8	8	
Warnings:					
Information:					
3	Receipt of Petition in a Reexam	RI1341006FR1341006D_181-Pet-Exhibit-A.pdf	198924 a0c84875a060957d178b893bacbe6867e67e15ea	no	6
Warnings:					
Information:					
4	Receipt of Petition in a Reexam	RI1341006FR1341006D_181-Pet-Exhibit-B.pdf	716604 c81629cbf1ade83512fc72a1377e24b7afc9d84	no	16
Warnings:					
Information:					
5	Receipt of Petition in a Reexam	RI1341006FR1341006D_181-Pet-Exhibit-C.pdf	85835 6c6a32bedaa1a78a9012a6cacf74da7d719a533a	no	4
Warnings:					
Information:					
Total Files Size (in bytes):			1393248		
<p>This Acknowledgement Receipt evidences receipt on the noted date by the USPTO of the indicated documents, characterized by the applicant, and including page counts, where applicable. It serves as evidence of receipt similar to a Post Card, as described in MPEP 503.</p> <p><u>New Applications Under 35 U.S.C. 111</u> If a new application is being filed and the application includes the necessary components for a filing date (see 37 CFR 1.53(b)-(d) and MPEP 506), a Filing Receipt (37 CFR 1.54) will be issued in due course and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the filing date of the application.</p> <p><u>National Stage of an International Application under 35 U.S.C. 371</u> If a timely submission to enter the national stage of an international application is compliant with the conditions of 35 U.S.C. 371 and other applicable requirements a Form PCT/DO/EO/903 indicating acceptance of the application as a national stage submission under 35 U.S.C. 371 will be issued in addition to the Filing Receipt, in due course.</p> <p><u>New International Application Filed with the USPTO as a Receiving Office</u> If a new international application is being filed and the international application includes the necessary components for an international filing date (see PCT Article 11 and MPEP 1810), a Notification of the International Application Number and of the International Filing Date (Form PCT/RO/105) will be issued in due course, subject to prescriptions concerning national security, and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the international filing date of the application.</p>					



HERSHKOVITZ & ASSOCIATES, PLLC

PATENT AGENCY

2845 DUKE STREET, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

TEL. 703-370-4800 ~ FACSIMILE 703-370-4809

patent@hershkovitz.net ~ www.hershkovitz.net

Inventor: Koichiro Ikudome et al.

Art Unit: 3992

Reexamination Proceeding: 95/002,035
(based on U.S. Patent No. 6,779,118)

Confirmation No.: 1745

Reexamination Filed: September 12, 2012

Examiner: Jalatee Worjloh

For: USER SPECIFIC AUTOMATIC DATA REDIRECTION SYSTEM

Mail Stop "inter partes Reexam"
Attn.: Central Reexamination Unit
Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 23313-1450

Honorable Commissioner:

Transmitted herewith are PETITION UNDER 37 CFR §1.181 TO VACATE IMPROPER RIGHT OF APPEAL NOTICE, EXHIBITS A-C and a Certificate of Service in connection with the above-captioned Proceedings

The fee has been calculated as shown below:

Claims After Amendment	No. of Claims Previously Paid	Present Extra	Small Entity		Large Entity	
			Rate	Fee	Rate	Fee
*Total Claims:			x 30=	\$	x 60=	\$
**Indep. Claims:			x125=	\$	x250=	\$
Extension Fee for	Months			\$		\$
Other:				\$		\$
Total:				\$	Total:	\$

Fee Payment made through EFS.

Payment is made herewith by Credit Card (see attached Form PTO-2038).

The Director is hereby authorized to charge all fees, including those under 37 CFR §§1.16 and 1.17, which are required for entry of the papers submitted herewith, and any fees which may be required to maintain pendency of this Proceeding, to Deposit Account No. 50-2929.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge all fees under 37 CFR § 1.18 which may be required to complete issuance of this application to Deposit Account No. 50-2929.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 27, 2013

/Abe Hershkovitz/
Abraham Hershkovitz
Registration No. 45,294

R1341006F.A06; AH/pjj



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
95/002,035 901019349	09/12/2012	6779118	RI1341006F	1745
40401	7590	09/09/2013	EXAMINER	
Hershkovitz & Associates, PLLC 2845 Duke Street Alexandria, VA 22314			WORLOH, JALATEE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3992	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/09/2013	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Transmittal of Communication to Third Party Requester <i>Inter Partes</i> Reexamination	Control No.	Patent Under Reexamination	
	95/001,234 and 95/002,035	6488508	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jalatee Worjloh	3992	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address. --

┌──┐
 (THIRD PARTY REQUESTER'S CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS)

David L. McCombs
 Haynes & Boone, LLP
 2323 Victory Avenue, Suite 700 Dallas, Texas 75219

Enclosed is a copy of the latest communication from the United States Patent and Trademark Office in the above-identified reexamination proceeding. 37 CFR 1.903.

Prior to the filing of a Notice of Appeal, each time the patent owner responds to this communication, the third party requester of the *inter partes* reexamination may once file written comments within a period of 30 days from the date of service of the patent owner's response. This 30-day time period is statutory (35 U.S.C. 314(b)(2)), and, as such, it cannot be extended. See also 37 CFR 1.947.

If an *ex parte* reexamination has been merged with the *inter partes* reexamination, no responsive submission by any *ex parte* third party requester is permitted.

All correspondence relating to this *inter partes* reexamination proceeding should be directed to the **Central Reexamination Unit** at the mail, FAX, or hand-carry addresses given at the end of the communication enclosed with this transmittal.

**Right of Appeal Notice
(37 CFR 1.953)**

Control No.	Patent Under Reexamination
95/002,035 and 90/012,342	6779118
Examiner	Art Unit
Jalatee Worjloh	3992

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address. --

Responsive to the communication(s) filed by:
Patent Owner on 28 June, 2013
Third Party(ies) on 26 July, 2013

Patent owner and/or third party requester(s) may file a notice of appeal with respect to any adverse decision with payment of the fee set forth in 37 CFR 41.20(b)(1) within **one-month or thirty-days (whichever is longer)**. See MPEP 2671. In addition, a party may file a notice of **cross** appeal and pay the 37 CFR 41.20(b)(1) fee **within fourteen days of service** of an opposing party's timely filed notice of appeal. See MPEP 2672.

All correspondence relating to this inter partes reexamination proceeding should be directed to the **Central Reexamination Unit** at the mail, FAX, or hand-carry addresses given at the end of this Office action.

If no party timely files a notice of appeal, prosecution on the merits of this reexamination proceeding will be concluded, and the Director of the USPTO will proceed to issue and publish a certificate under 37 CFR 1.997 in accordance with this Office action.

The proposed amendment filed _____ will be entered will not be entered*

*Reasons for non-entry are given in the body of this notice.

- 1a. Claims 2-7,9-14,16-24 and 26-90 are subject to reexamination.
- 1b. Claims _____ are not subject to reexamination.
2. Claims _____ have been cancelled.
3. Claims _____ are confirmed. [Unamended patent claims].
4. Claims _____ are patentable. [Amended or new claims].
5. Claims 2-7,9-14,16-24 and 26-90 are rejected.
6. Claims _____ are objected to.
7. The drawings filed on _____ are acceptable. are not acceptable.
8. The drawing correction request filed on _____ is approved. disapproved.
9. Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119 (a)-(d) or (f). The certified copy has:
 been received. not been received. been filed in Application/Control No. _____.
10. Other _____

Attachments

1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892
2. Information Disclosure Citation, PTO/SB/08
3. _____

Art Unit: 3992

RIGHT OF APPEAL NOTICE

Introduction

Claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-24, and 26-90 to U.S. Patent No. 6,779,118 to Ikudome, et al. ("Ikudome") are under *inter partes* reexamination. All claims are rejected.

Patent owner comments after ACP were filed June 28, 2013. Third party requester comments after ACP were filed July 26, 2013.

References cited in Request

- U.S. Patent No. 583727 to Wong et al. ("Wong '727");
- U.S. Patent No. 6073178 to Wong et al. ("Wong '178");
- U.S. Patent No. 5950195 to Stockwell et al. ("Stockwell");
- U.S. Patent No. 5889958 to Willens;
- U.S. Patent No. 5848233 to Radia et al. ("Radia");
- Request for Comments 2138, Internet Engineering Task Force, April 1997 (RFC 2138);
- U.S. Patent No. 6088451 to He et al. ("He");
- U.S. Patent No. 6233686 to Zenchelsky et al. ("Zenchelsky");
- U.S. Patent No. 5815574 to Fortinsky; and
- U.S. Patent No. 6170012 to Coss et al. ("Coss").

Art Unit: 3992

Response to Arguments

Withdrawal of Claim 27 Rejection over Willens in view of RFC 2138/Willens in view of RFC 2138 and the Admitted Prior Art

The Requester disagrees with the Examiner's decision to withdraw the rejection of claim 27 over Willens in view of RFC 2138 and Stockwell and Willens in view of RFC 2138 and the Admitted Prior Art. Requester states that the use of the word "necessarily" suggests that the prior art was evaluated for inherency, which is not required since the proposed rejection is for obviousness, not anticipation.

In response, the Examiner notes that the claim was properly evaluated. Willens teaches updating the permit list, but does not expressly disclose removal or reinstatement of a portion of the rule set as required by the claim. The reference does not define updating as reinstating or removing data. Thus, this rejection remains withdrawn.

Withdrawal of Claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-39, 68-82, 84, and 85 rejections over He, Zenchelsky and the Admitted Prior Art

Requester disagrees with the Examiner's decision to withdraw the rejection of claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-39, 68-82, 84, and 85 over He, Zenchelsky, and the Admitted Prior Art. It is noted that "while the Board found that He did not expressly teach the "time" limitation, "blocking a website based on these bases "would have been obvious." (Control No. 90/009301, Decision on Appeal at 10).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Requester. The Board decision states that "blocking" would be obvious; however, the claim requires modifying the rule set based on the

Art Unit: 3992

condition of time. Specifically, “modification of at least a portion of rule set as a function of some combination of time, data transmitted to or from the user, or location the user access” and the Decision does not indicate that modifying based on the condition of time would have been obvious. Thus, this rejection remains withdrawn.

User Session

PO: Patent owner states that the term "session" is used to describe the period during which a single temporality assigned network address is assigned to a user computer, and the redirection server processes packets communicated between the user and the network according to the programmed rule set.

Patentee asserts that all pending claims use language requiring that the rule set be “correlate” with the “temporarily assigned network address” which only occurs when the user ID and the temporarily assigned network address is assigned so the user can begin interacting with the Internet through the redirection server. It is noted that the claims therefore limit redirection to occurring only during a “session” – while the temporarily assigned network address is assigned to the user.

TPR: Requester notes the patent owner's interpretation would improperly import limitations from the specification into the claims. However, it is well accepted that limitations from the specification are not read into the claims.

Examiner: During reexamination, claims are given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification and limitations in the specification are not read into the claims (*In re Yamamoto*, 740 F.2d 1569, 222 USPQ 934 (Fed. Cir. 1984)).

Art Unit: 3992

As indicated at ACP, the claims do not recite the term "session" and the limitations in the specification are not read into the claims. As per the claims limiting redirection to occur only while the temporarily assigned network address is assigned to the user, the Examiner agrees that the claims recite correlating either a user ID or a rule set to the temporarily assigned network. However, at least Willens teaches "the rule set being correlated to the temporarily assigned network address" as recited in the claim. The reference discloses a communication server (redirection server) that stores recently used portions of a PTA list in a temporary cache (see col. 5, lines 64-col. 6, line 9); so, the rule set (PTA list) is correlated to a temporarily assigned network address (cache).

Correlation of the rule set to a temporarily assigned network address

PO: Patent owner argues that neither Willens nor Stockwell teaches or suggests a rule set "correlated to" a temporarily assigned network address as a condition of redirection." Patentee notes that the ordinary meaning of correlation according to Webster's Dictionary is "a relation existing between phenomena or things or between mathematical or statistical variables which tend to vary, be associated, or occur together in a way not expected on the basis of chance alone." In the '118 patent, the rule set used in the redirection server and temporary network address assignment are associated together in the redirection server and occur together at the time of user log in.

Additionally, Patent owner asserts that combining Willens and Stockwell would not teach or suggest the rule set and the temporarily assigned network address be associated and occur together in the redirection server while data from the user is being processed, and such a

Art Unit: 3992

relationship would only be obvious in the combination of Willens and Stockwell using impermissible hindsight based on the teaching of the '118 patent.

Patentee states that Willens fails to teach the redirection server and Stockwell does not teach redirection by a redirection server when the rule set specifying a redirection rule is correlated with a temporarily assigned network address and which occurs in response to a condition other than a destination address.

TPR: Requester submits none of the claims recite that the correlation is "a condition of redirection." Also, it is noted that Willens teaches correlating a user's rule set to a temporarily assigned network address as part of a user login process. Specifically, Willens teaches checking a user's password, locating his user profile and filter ("individual rule set"), and providing them to client software 44 ("redirection server") to control the user's access to the Internet. See col. 5, lines 5-17. Willens then shows that the user's individualized rule set is identified and applied to communications to or from the user's temporarily assigned network address (see col. 6, lines 35-46).

Requester notes that Patent Owner is arguing against the references individually. Also, Willens teaches a variety of criteria that may be used for filtering traffic (see 6:16-22) and Stockwell teaches that traffic may be filtered through a redirection action (see 2:29-31). Thus, the combination renders obvious applying a redirection filter based on a variety of criteria.

Examiner: The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Patent owner. In response to Patent owner arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re*

Art Unit: 3992

Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

The Examiner agrees with the Requester that the claims do not expressly recite correlation is a "condition of redirection." Also, the claims do not expressly state that this occurs together at the time of user log in. Instead, the claims require the user ID or the rule set to be correlated the temporarily assigned network address, and redirecting the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individual rule set (see claim 5). Another example of correlation recited in the claims is in recited in claim 16, which reads "a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set correlated to a temporarily assigned network address".. "the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated to the temporarily assigned network address."

Generally, correlation is the relationship between things. Giving the claims the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification, without reading limitations in the specification into the claims, Willens' rule set (PTA list), which is stored at the redirection server (communication server) is associated with the temporary assigned network address (cache). See col. 5, lines 64-col. 6, line 9.

In response to Patent owner's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the

Art Unit: 3992

Patent owner's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Modification of a portion of the rule set

PO: Patent owner argues that Willens is not modified during a user session. Willens not only does not teach modification of the rule set programmed and in use in the redirection server, but actually teaches that there is no modification while the filter is in use.

Rather, the '118 patent requires that the rule set be modified be the one actually programmed in the redirection server (not a rule set stored in the authentication server 204). This necessarily means that the modification occurs after the rule set is programmed into the redirection server (when the user logs in and before the rule set program is removed (when the user logs off) – in short, during a user session. See e.g., '118 patent Claim 16, second paragraph.

Therefore, contrary to the Examiner's analysis, Willens describes a system where the rule set downloaded-programmed-into the communications server software and used to process data from the user to the Internet is static and does not change during the user's session.

TPR: Requester submits that the teachings of Willens and Stockwell teach disclose modification of at least a portion of the rule set. That is, Willens teaches that the communication server 14 ("redirection server" loads and caches the PTA list from ChoiceNet server 18 (see col. 5, lines 64-67). The communication server 14 does not permanently store the entire PTA List as the Patent Owner argues, but rather stores recently used portions of it in a temporary cache. Willens teaches that a portion of the rule set on communication server 14 (i.e. the cached portion of the PTA List) may be automatically modified. See col. 5, lines 41-43 and col. 4, lines 43-44.

Art Unit: 3992

As for Stockwell, the reference teaches that cache entries should only be relied on before their expiration, thus avoiding the use of stale data (see col. 8, lines 30-33). It would have been obvious to apply a similar expiration timer to the cache entries in Willens' communications server 14, thus ensuring that automatic updates received by ChoiceNet server 18 will propagate down to the communications server 14 in a timely fashion.

Examiner: The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Patent owner. For instance, claim 16 recites "a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set"... "wherein the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set." Willens discloses a redirection server (communication server 14) programmed with a user's rule set (PTA list). Specifically, Willens recites:

The server 14 looks at each filter rule found in "F(Timmy)" starting from the top. When it reaches the rule permit "PTA List," the server 14 looks into its local cache 50 to see if www.playboy.com is on the PTA List. If not, the server 14 sends a filter look-up request to the server.

The communication server of Willens stores the PTA list at least in its local cache.

Thus, Willens teaches "a redirection server programmed with a user's rule set."

Regarding Patent owner's argument that Willens fails to teach modification occurring after the rule set is programmed into the redirection server (when the user logs in and before the rule set program is removed (user logged off)), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The claims require the redirection server to allow modification of the rule, which is taught by Willens.

In Willens, while a user is logged in, the client software can send a lookup request to the network access server to download filters. The server software automatically maintains the

Art Unit: 3992

permit list by downloading updated versions of the list over the Internet and compiling the list for use by the client software. See col. 5, lines 9-46. Also, Willens teaches updating the list daily or hourly (see col. 4, lines 40-45). Since the client software 44, which is part of the communications server 14 (see fig. 3) receives the updated versions of the list, the communications server allows modification of the rule set. Hence, the redirection server of Willens is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set as required by the claim.

Elements or Conditions

PO: Patent owner argues that the claims incorporating modification of a rule set (occurring with a temporarily assigned network address) programmed in the redirection server is not shown in either Willens or Stockwell, and a combination of the two references would not render claims with rule set modification obvious without impermissible hindsight.

TPR: Requester submits that the references teach modifying a rule set based on time, data transmitted to or from a user, and a location accessed. (see Ex. AA at 21-23, Willens, 4:40-45, 5:8-18, and 6:2-7).

Examiner: The Examiner agrees with the Requester. Also, as expressed above, Willens teaches modification of a rule set programmed in the redirection server (see pages 7-8).

In response to Patent owner arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Art Unit: 3992

Radia/Wong '727/Wong '178 combined with Stockwell/APA

Configured to allow modification

PO: Patent owner argued that nothing in Radia teaches or discloses a system where the filter configured (programmed) in a router or modem causes the programmed filter to change. The redirection being "configured to allow modification" requires the redirection server to be able to do the modification when the conditions of the rule set calling for modification to occur.

The specification requires that the redirection server actually perform whatever action is prescribed by the programmed rule set. See '118 at 3:15-30, 4:52-66, and 5:31-44. Also, "allow" means that the redirection server automatically modifies the rules set only when the specified condition arises.

The ordinary meaning of "configured" from the Merriam Webster dictionary is "to set up for operation especially in a particular way." The "redirection server programmed with a user's rule set" sets the redirection server up for operation to process data from the user.

TPR: Requester submits that the claims do not recite that the redirection server itself performs the modification. Rather, the claim limitation at issue requires the redirection server be "configured to allow modification" of the rule set. The '118 Patent includes examples where the redirection server allow" an outside server to modify the rule set (see 8:6-10 - modification an outsider server can make to a rule set on the redirection server is not limited to deleting a redirection rule).

Patent Owner's argued claim interpretation is inconsistent with the broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification, as it would exclude embodiments where the rule set is modified by an outside server.

Examiner: The Examiner agrees with the Requester. During reexamination, claims are given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification and limitations in the specification are not read into the claims (In re Yamamoto, 740 F.2d 1569, 222 USPQ 934 (Fed. Cir. 1984)).

The claims recited "redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set," which does not limit the modification to the redirection server. As expressed by the Requester, at least one embodiment of the system permits an outsider server to make modification to the rule set. Specifically, col. 8, lines 3-11 recites:

The web site then sends an authorization to the redirection server that deletes the redirection to the questionnaire web site from the rule set for the user who successfully completed the questionnaire. Of course, the type of modification an outside server can make to a rule set on the redirection server is not limited to deleting a redirection rule, but can include any other type of modification to the rule set that is supported by the redirection server as discussed above.

Router and ANCS function as the redirection server

PO: Patent owner argues that the claims require that the redirection server programmed with the rule set correlated with the temporarily assigned network address to do the modification of the programmed rule set. Radia does not reach this. Rather, Radia teaches only that filtering rules

Art Unit: 3992

be changed in response to an "event" not part of the filter itself and not part of the filter programmed in the route such as "log on," "log out" or "connecting."

TPR: Requester submits that the claims do not require the rule set to include instructions for its own modification.

Examiner: The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Patent owner. The claims do not require redirection server to do the modification, but to "allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set."

Combining Radia and Stockwell

PO: Patent owner argues that combining Radia and Stockwell and any combination of the two references would not incorporate the limitations of the claims without using the disclosure of the '118 patent and impermissible hindsight.

TPR: Requester submits that Patent owner asserts that the claims are distinguished but fails to reference specific claim language and fails to show how the claim language distinguishes the prior art relied on in the Examiner's rejections. A rejection cannot be overcome by a generalized assertion that the claim is patentable, and as such, the Patent owner's arguments fail. See 37 C.F.R. §1.111(b).

Examiner: The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Patent owner. In response to Patent owner arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Art Unit: 3992

He, Zenchelsky, APA, Fortinsky, Admitted Prior Art

Admitted Prior Art

PO: Patent owner argues that Applicant's admission that redirection servers are known is not an admission that redirection servers that respond or are configured in the manner recited in the claims are known.

TPR: Requester submits that the Examiner's rejections do not rely solely on the Admitted Prior Art to a "redirection server." Rather, the Examiner's rejections rely on the Admitted Prior Art to show that the redirection was a known technique for controlling access to resources on a public network. See Ex. CC at 5.

Examiner: The Examiner agrees with the Requester. In response to Patent owner arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Modifying the rule set during a session

PO: Patent owner argues that claims 28, 33, 52, and 64 do recite modifying the rule set. Each of these claims recites "...the redirection server is configured to utilize the temporary rule set during an initial period of time and thereafter to utilize the standard rule set.

TPR: Requester submits that these claims do not require modifying a rule set, but rather only changing form using one portion of an individualized rule set to using another portion. The

Art Unit: 3992

Examiner's rejection show this changing between temporary and standard rule sets, for example, through Zenchelsky's 1) pre-rule base of general rules applied before authentication and 2) local rule base of rules that are loaded after authentication. (See Ex. CC at 27-28; Zenchelsky 5:66-6:8; 6:35-39.)

Examiner: The Examiner agrees with the Requester. During reexamination, claims are given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification and limitations in the specification are not read into the claims (*In re Yamamoto*, 740 F.2d 1569, 222 USPQ 934 (Fed. Cir. 1984)).

Redirection server to control access to the network itself and redirection server between the user and the network

PO: Patent owner asserts that processing in its broadest reasonable interpretation means controlling passage of the data and hence access to the public network.

The claims recite "a redirection server connected between the dial up network server and a public network."

TPR: Requester submits that even if the proposed interpretation was applied, Patent owner fails to explain how it would distinguish the claim over the prior art. That is, Zenchelsky teaches controlling access via a filter positioned between the user and the Internet. (See Ex. CC at 34-36.) The filter "regulate[s] the flow of information between users 51 and 53 and the hosts P, U, V, and W on the Internet." (Zenchelsky, 3:41-51.)

Examiner: The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the patent owner that processing is the broadest reasonable interpretation of controlling passage. Controlling is the act of regulating and

Art Unit: 3992

Zenchelsky teaches a filter that regulates data between users and the hosts (see col. 3, lines 41-51).

Claims 40-42

PO: Patent owner submits that claims 40-42 are dependent from claim 25 and claim 25 recites that the rule set programmed into the redirection server is "used to control data passing between the user and a public network;" therefore, the ground for rejecting claims 40-42 should be withdrawn.

TPR: Requester notes that the rejection showed that He taught a "credential sever 204 responsible for controlling network user credentials or privileges, which is essential for effective network access control." (He, 12:66-13:1; Ex. CC at 4-5).

Examiner: The Examiner agrees with the Requester.

Claims 83 and 86-90

PO: Patent owner submits that claim 83 requires "a redirection server connected between a user computer and the public network, the redirection server containing a user's rule set... wherein the user's rule set contains at least one of a plurality of functions used to control data passing between the user and a public network."

Also, Patentee states that Zenchelsky does not teach the redirection server, in response to instructions such as from the programmed rule set, modifies at least a portion of the user's rule set.

TPR: Requester notes that claim 83 does not recite modifying a user's rule set in response to instructions *from the programmed rule set*. Instead, the claim recites "step of receiving

Art Unit: 3992

instructions by the redirection server to modify at least a portion of the user's rule set," but the claim is silent regarding the source of those instructions. The claim rejection showed how He teaches that an administrator can modify the user's rule set (see Ex. CC at 45, 25).

Examiner: The Examiner now agrees with patent owner. Claim 83 recites "the step of receiving instructions by the redirection server to modify at least a portion of the user's rule set through one or more of user side of the redirection server and the network side of the redirection server." The rejection relied upon He Fig. 10 and col. 17, lines 19-27 for teaching this limitation. Although He teaches automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set, the reference does not expressly teach "receiving instructions by the redirection server to modify at least a portion of the user's rule set." Instead, at column 17, lines 19-27, He discloses providing a database tool "for the system security administrator to create, delete, disable and modify a user account," but does not indicate that instructions to modify the user's rule set are received. Thus, the rejection for claims 83 and 86-90 in view of He, Zenchelsky, and the Admitted Prior Art is withdrawn.

Declaration under 37 CFR 1.131

The Declarations filed on June 28, 2013 from Moon Tai Yeung and Koichiro Ikudome have been considered, but are ineffective to overcome the Coss reference.

The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a conception of the invention prior to the effective date of Silverman reference. While conception is the mental part of the inventive act, it must be capable of proof, such as by demonstrative evidence or by a complete disclosure to another. Conception is more than a vague idea of how to solve a problem. The requisite

Art Unit: 3992

means themselves and their interaction must also be comprehended. See *Mergenthaler v. Scudder*, 1897 C.D. 724, 81 O.G. 1417 (D.C. Cir. 1897).

In this case, the claimed limitations are not discussed in the evidence provided. For instance, the claims recite "rule set" and "the redirection server is configured to allow automated modification of at least a portion of the rule set correlated the temporarily assigned network address," which is not described in the exhibits. The declaration "must establish possession of either the whole invention claimed or something falling within the claim (such as a species of a claimed genus) in the sense that the claim as a whole reads on it." MPEP 715.02. Further, the declaration does not provide a nexus between the evidence and the claims.

The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish diligence from a date prior to the date of reduction to practice of the Coss reference to either a constructive reduction to practice or an actual reduction to practice. "Evidence in the form of exhibits may accompany the affidavit or declaration. Each exhibit relied upon should be specially referred to in the affidavit or declaration, in terms of what it is relied upon to show." MPEP 715.05. In this case, the declaration fails to explain which facts are being relied on to prove diligence. Also, Patent owner has failed to provide evidence to fully account for the time period during which due diligence must be established.

An applicant must account for the entire period during which diligence is required. GouM v. Schawlow, 363 F.2d 908, 919, 150 USPQ 634, 643 (CCPA 1966) (Merely stating that there were no weeks or months that the invention was not worked on is not enough.); In re Harry, 333 F.2d 920, 923, 142 USPQ 164, 166 (CCPA 1964)(statement that the subject matter "was diligently reduced to practice" is not a showing but a mere pleading). A 2-day period lacking activity has been held to be fatal. In re Mulder, 716 F.2d 1542, 1545, 219 USPQ 189, 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (37 CFR 1.131 issue); Fitzgerald v. Arbib, 268 F.2d 763, 766, 122 USPQ 530, 532 (CCPA 1959) (Less than 1 month of inactivity during critical period. Efforts to exploit an invention commercially do not

Art Unit: 3992

constitute diligence in reducing it to practice. An actual reduction to practice in the case of a design for a three-dimensional article requires that it should be embodied in some structure other than a mere drawing.); Kendall v. Searles, 173 F.2d 986, 993, 81 USPQ 363, 369 (CCPA 1949) (Diligence requires that applicants must be specific as to dates and facts.)

The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a reduction to practice of the invention in this country or a NAFTA or WTO member country prior to the effective date of the Coss reference. To establish actual reduction to practice, a showing of the invention in a physical or tangible form that shows every element of the count. *Wetmore v. Quick*, 536 F.2d 937, 942, 190 USPQ 223, 227 (CCPA 1976). For an actual reduction to practice, the invention must have been sufficiently tested to demonstrate that it will work for its intended purpose, but it need not be in a commercially satisfactory stage of development. > See, e.g., *Scott v. Finney*, 34 F.3d 1058, 1062; 32 USPQ2d 1115, 1118-19 (Fed. Cir. 1994). MEPE 2138.05

Summary of Rejections

- Claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-18, 23, 24, 26, 28-71, 76-84, and 86-90 as being obvious over Willens in view of RFC 2138 and Stockwell;
- Claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-18, 23, 24, 26, 28-71, 76-84, and 86-90 as being obvious over Willens in view of RFC2138 and Admitted Prior Art;
- Claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 16-24, 26-44, 49-56, and 61-90 as being obvious over Radia in view of Wong '727 and further in view of Stockwell;
- Claims 2-5, 9-12, 45-48, and 57-60 as being obvious over Radia in view of Wong '727 and Stockwell and further in view of Wong '178;

Art Unit: 3992

- Claims 7, 14, 16-24, 50-56, and 62-90 as being obvious over Radia in view of Wong '727 and further in view of Admitted Prior Art;
- Claims 2-5, 9-12, 45-48, and 57-60 as being obvious over Radia in view of Wong '727 and Admitted Prior Art and in further view of Wong '178;
- Claims 2-7, 9-14, 28-35, 40-54, 56, 60-66 as being obvious over He, Zenchelsky, and Admitted Prior Art;
- Claims 2-7, 9-14, 28-35, 40-67, 83, and 86-90 as being obvious over He, Zenchelsky, Fortinsky and the Admitted Prior Art;
- Claims 2-7, 9-14, 28-35, and 44-67 as being obvious over Radia in view of Admitted Prior Art and in further view of Coss; and
- Claims 16-24, 26, 27, 36-43, and 68-90 as being obvious over Coss in view of Admitted Prior Art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-18, 23, 24, 26, 28-71, 76-84, and 86-90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willens in view of RFC 2138 and Stockwell.

The proposed rejection of claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-18, 23, 24, 26, 28-71, 76-84, and 86-90 (see Exhibit AA, pages 2-55) of the request is hereby incorporated by reference.

Art Unit: 3992

Claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-18, 23, 24, 26, 28-71, 76-84 and 86-90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willens in view of RFC 2138 and Admitted Prior Art.

The proposed rejection of claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-18, 23, 24, 26, 28-71, 76-84 and 86-90 (see Exhibit AA, pages 56-112) of the request is hereby incorporated by reference.

Claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 16-24, 26-44, 49-56, and 61-90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Radia in view of Wong '727 and further in view of Stockwell.

The proposed rejection of claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 16-24, 26-44, 49-56, and 61-90 (see Exhibit BB, pages 2-47) of the request is hereby incorporated by reference.

Claims 2-5, 9-12, 45-48, and 57-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Radia in of Wong '727 and Stockwell and further in view of Wong '178.

The proposed rejection of claims 2-5, 9-12, 45-48, and 57-60 (see Exhibit BB, pages 48-53) of the request is hereby incorporated by reference.

Claims 7, 14, 16-24, 50-56, and 62-90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Radia in view of Wong '727 and further in view of Admitted Prior Art,

The proposed rejection of claims 7, 14, 16-24, 50-56, and 62-90 (see Exhibit BB, pages 55-102) of the request is hereby incorporated by reference.

Art Unit: 3992

Claims 2-5, 9-12, 45-48, and 57-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Radia in view of Wong '727 and Admitted Prior art and further in view of Wong '178.

The proposed rejection of claims 2-5, 9-12, 45-48, and 57-60 (see Exhibit BB, pages 103-109) of the request is hereby incorporated by reference.

Claims 2-7, 9-14, 28-35, 40-54, 56, and 60-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over He, Zenchelsky, and the Admitted Prior Art .

The proposed rejection of claims 2-7, 9-14, 28-35, 40-54, 56, and 60-66 (see Exhibit CC) of the request is hereby incorporated by reference with modifications.

The modification is to include an additional motivation to combine the references. The Examiner notes, as illustrated by the Board (see page 10 of previous reexamination proceeding – 90/009,301), “since redirection would have been an obvious extension of blocking, it follows that the combination of He and Zenchelsky in view of Ikudome’s admission would have made redirection based on the same bases obvious as well.”

Claims 2-7, 9-14, 28-35, 40-67, 83, and 86-90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over He, Zenchelsky, Fortinsky and the Admitted Prior Art .

The proposed rejection of claims 2-7, 9-14, 28-35, 40-67, 83, and 86-90 (see Exhibit CC) of the request is hereby incorporated by reference.

Art Unit: 3992

Claims 2-7, 9-14, 28-35, and 44-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Radia in view of the Admitted Prior Art (APA) and in further in view of Coss.

2. The system of claim 1, wherein the redirection server further provides control over a plurality of data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

Radia et al disclose that router 106 in FIG. 1 further provides control over a plurality of data from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set (FIG. 6, step 606, "filter IP packets in accordance with filtering profile" and col. 10, lines 6-14).

Radia et al. do not explicitly disclose the *redirection server* further provides control over a plurality of data *to and from* the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

However, Coss et al. disclose that firewall 211 further provides control over a plurality of data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

For instance, Coss et al. disclose:

"The latter embodiment can allow the firewall techniques of the invention to provide, for example, parental control of Internet and video access in the home." [2:57-60]

See FIG. 3, rule No. 10 controlling FTP data **to host B**, and rule No. 30 controlling Telnet data **from host B**.

Coss et al. also disclose rule set categories such as "Source host group identifier or IP address", "Destination host group identifier or IP address", and "Rule action, e.g., 'pass', 'drop', or 'proxy'" [4:39-43] allowing the firewall 211 to control data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

Since each individual element and its function are shown in the prior art, albeit shown in separate references, the difference between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rests not on any individual element or function but in the very combination itself-that is in the substitution of the firewall 211 of Coss for the router 106 in Fig. 1 of Radia. Thus, the simple substitution of one known element (i.e. firewall 211 for the router 106) for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

Art Unit: 3992

3. The system of claim 1, wherein the redirection server further blocks the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

Radia et al disclose that router 106 in FIG. 1 further blocks data from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set (FIG. 6, step 606, "filter IP packets in accordance with filtering profile" and col. 10, lines 6-14).

Radia et al. do not explicitly disclose *the redirection server* further blocks the data *to and from* the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

However, Coss et al. disclose that firewall 211 further blocks the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

For instance, Coss et al. disclose:

FIG. 3, rule No. 20 blocking data **from host A**; and FIG. 4, fifth session key rule (D, A, Telnet) blocking data **to host A**.

Coss et al. also disclose rule set categories such as "Source host group identifier or IP address", "Destination host group identifier or IP address", and "Rule action, e.g., 'pass', '**drop**', or 'proxy'" [4:39-43, emphasis added] allowing the firewall 211 to block (i.e., drop) data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

Since each individual element and its function are shown in the prior art, albeit shown in separate references, the difference between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rests not on any individual element or function but in the very combination itself—that is in the substitution of the firewall 211 of Coss for the router 106 in Fig. 1 of Radia. Thus, the simple substitution of one known element (i.e. firewall 211 for the router 106) for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

4. The system of claim 1, wherein the redirection server further allows the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

Radia et al disclose that router 106 in FIG. 1 further allows the data from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set (FIG. 6, step 606, "filter IP packets in accordance with filtering profile" and col. 10, lines 6-14).

Radia et al. do not explicitly disclose *the redirection server* further allows the data *to and from* the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

However, Coss et al. disclose firewall 211 further allows the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

For instance, Coss et al. disclose:

Art Unit: 3992

FIG. 4, first session key rule (A, B, TELNET) allowing data to host B, and second session key rule (B, A, TELNET) allowing data from host B.

Coss et al. also disclose rule set categories such as "Source host group identifier or IP address", "Destination host group identifier or IP address", and "Rule action, e.g., 'pass', 'drop', or 'proxy'" [4:39-43, emphasis added] allowing the firewall 211 to allow (i.e., pass) data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

Since each individual element and its function are shown in the prior art, albeit shown in separate references, the difference between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rests not on any individual element or function but in the very combination itself—that is in the substitution of the firewall 211 of Coss for the router 106 in Fig. 1 of Radia. Thus, the simple substitution of one known element (i.e. firewall 211 for the router 106) for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

5. The system of claim 1, wherein the redirection server further redirects the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

Radia et al. do not explicitly disclose *the redirection server further redirects the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.*

However, Coss et al. disclose firewall 211 further redirects the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

For instance, Coss et al. disclose:

"For some users and proxy applications, the connection should appear at the destination to be coming from the original source rather than the remote system. This applies, e.g., to services which check the source IP address to ensure that it matches the user who signed up for the requested service. **This capability is provided by "dual reflection" (or "two-way reflection"), with the source address of the outgoing connection changed back from the remote proxy to the original user's source address. This change is effected at the firewall, as each packet is received from the proxy and sent to the destination.**" [9:6-16, emphasis added]

Coss et al. also disclose rule set categories such as "Source host group identifier or IP address", "Destination host group identifier or IP address", and "Rule action, e.g., 'pass', 'drop', or 'proxy'" [4:39-43, emphasis added] allowing the firewall 211 to redirect (i.e., proxy) data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

Since each individual element and its function are shown in the prior art, albeit shown in separate references, the difference between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rests not on any individual element or function but in the very combination itself—that is in the substitution of the firewall 211 of Coss for the router 106 in Fig. 1 of Radia. Thus, the simple substitution of one

Art Unit: 3992

known element (i.e. firewall 211 for the router 106) for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

6. The system of claim 1, wherein the redirection server further redirects the data from the users' computers to multiple destinations as a function of the individualized rule set.

Radia et al. do not explicitly disclose *the redirection server* further redirects the data from the users' computers *to multiple destinations* as a function of the individualized rule set.

However, Coss et al. disclose that firewall 211 further redirects the data from the users' computers to multiple destinations as a function of the individualized rule set.

For instance, Coss et al. disclose:

"1004: if the action indicates a remote proxy, the packet's destination address is replaced with the address of the remote proxy" [9:39-42]

"Proxy processes have also been developed for other special-purpose applications, e.g., to perform services such as **authentication, mail handling, and virus scanning.**" [1:45-49, emphasis added]

Coss et al. also gives examples of redirecting data to both a Telnet proxy and an FTP proxy. For example, Figure 3, rule No. 30 redirects TELNET data to a Telnet proxy server. Coss et al. further state, "For example, an FTP proxy **application** could use a dynamic rule to authorize establishment of an FTP data channel in response to a data request." It is inherent that data was also redirected to the FTP proxy application as a function of the individualized rule set.

Coss et al. also disclose rule set categories such as "Source host group identifier or IP address", "Destination host group identifier or IP address", and "Rule action, e.g., 'pass', 'drop', or 'proxy'" [4:39-43, emphasis added] allowing the firewall 211 to redirect (i.e., proxy) data from the users' computers to multiple destinations as a function of the individualized rule set.

Additionally, Coss teaches "a computer network firewall can be instructed to redirect network session to a separate server for processing, so as to unburden the firewall application proxies. The server processes the redirected network session, and then passes the session back through the firewall to the intended original destination." See col. 2, lines 42-48.

Since each individual element and its function are shown in the prior art, albeit shown in separate references, the difference between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rests not on any individual element or function but in the very combination itself—that is in the substitution of the firewall 211 of Coss for the router 106 in Fig. 1 of Radia. Thus, the simple substitution of one known element (i.e. firewall 211 for the router 106) for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

Art Unit: 3992

7. The system of claim 1, wherein the database entries for a plurality of the plurality of users' IDs are correlated with a common individualized rule set.

Radia et al. disclose that the database entries for a plurality of the plurality of the users' IDs are correlated with a common individualized rule set.

For instance, "In the above description, we have set a default profile called the default login profile. The default login profile is a static profile that **applies to ALL newly connected client systems**. This way the SMS does not need to be aware as new client systems are connected.

"One may also consider setting the default profile to a null profile and for each client system as the client system connects; for example, since a client system that connects may do a DHCP operation, this event can trigger the SMS to set the login profile for the newly connected computer." [3:23-33, emphasis added]

9. The method of claim 8, further including the step of controlling a plurality of data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

Radia et al disclose that router 106 in FIG. 1 further provides control over a plurality of data from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set (FIG. 6, step 606, "filter IP packets in accordance with filtering profile" and col. 10, lines 6-14).

Radia et al. do not explicitly disclose the step of controlling a plurality of data *to and from* the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

However, Coss et al. disclose firewall 211 further provides control over a plurality of data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

For instance, Coss et al. disclose:

"The latter embodiment can allow the firewall techniques of the invention to provide, for example, parental control of Internet and video access in the home." [2:57-60]

See FIG. 3, rule No. 10 controlling FTP data **to host B**, and rule No. 30 controlling Telnet data **from host B**.

Coss et al. also disclose rule set categories such as "Source host group identifier or IP address", "Destination host group identifier or IP address", and "Rule action, e.g., 'pass', 'drop', or 'proxy'" [4:39-43] allowing the firewall 211 to control data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

Since each individual element and its function are shown in the prior art, albeit shown in separate references, the difference between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rests not on any

Art Unit: 3992

individual element or function but in the very combination itself-that is in the substitution of the firewall 211 of Coss for the router 106 in Fig. 1 of Radia. Thus, the simple substitution of one known element (i.e. firewall 211 for the router 106) for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

10. The method of claim 8, further including the step of blocking the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

Radia et al disclose that router 106 in FIG. 1 further blocks data from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set (FIG. 6, step 606, "filter IP packets in accordance with filtering profile" and col. 10, lines 6-14).

Radia et al. do not explicitly disclose *the redirection server* further blocks the data *to and from* the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

However, Coss et al. disclose that firewall 211 further blocks the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

For instance, Coss et al. disclose:

FIG. 3, rule No. 20 blocking data from host A; and FIG. 4, fifth session key rule (D, A, Telnet) blocking data to host A.

Coss et al. also disclose rule set categories such as "Source host group identifier or IP address", "Destination host group identifier or IP address", and "Rule action, e.g., 'pass', 'drop', or 'proxy'" [4:39-43, emphasis added] allowing the firewall 211 to block (i.e., drop) data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

Since each individual element and its function are shown in the prior art, albeit shown in separate references, the difference between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rests not on any individual element or function but in the very combination itself-that is in the substitution of the firewall 211 of Coss for the router 106 in Fig. 1 of Radia. Thus, the simple substitution of one known element (i.e. firewall 211 for the router 106) for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

11. The method of claim 8, further including the step of allowing the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

Radia et al disclose that router 106 in FIG. 1 further allows the data from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set (FIG. 6, step 606, "filter IP packets in accordance with filtering profile" and col. 10, lines 6-14).

Radia et al. do not explicitly disclose *the redirection server* further allows the data *to and from* the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

Art Unit: 3992

However, Coss et al. disclose firewall 211 further allows the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

For instance, Coss et al. disclose:

FIG. 4, first session key rule (A, B, TELNET) allowing data to host B, and second session key rule (B, A, TELNET) allowing data from host B.

Coss et al. also disclose rule set categories such as "Source host group identifier or IP address", "Destination host group identifier or IP address", and "Rule action, e.g., 'pass', 'drop', or 'proxy'" [4:39-43, emphasis added] allowing the firewall 211 to allow (i.e., pass) data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

Since each individual element and its function are shown in the prior art, albeit shown in separate references, the difference between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rests not on any individual element or function but in the very combination itself—that is in the substitution of the firewall 211 of Coss for the router 106 in Fig. 1 of Radia. Thus, the simple substitution of one known element (i.e. firewall 211 for the router 106) for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

12. The method of claim 8, further including the step of redirecting the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

Radia et al. do not explicitly disclose *the redirection server further redirects the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.*

However, Coss et al. disclose firewall 211 further redirects the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

For instance, Coss et al. disclose:

"For some users and proxy applications, the connection should appear at the destination to be coming from the original source rather than the remote system. This applies, e.g., to services which check the source IP address to ensure that it matches the user who signed up for the requested service. **This capability is provided by "dual reflection" (or "two-way reflection"), with the source address of the outgoing connection changed back from the remote proxy to the original user's source address. This change is effected at the firewall, as each packet is received from the proxy and sent to the destination.**" [9:6-16, emphasis added]

Coss et al. also disclose rule set categories such as "Source host group identifier or IP address", "Destination host group identifier or IP address", and "Rule action, e.g., 'pass', 'drop', or 'proxy'" [4:39-43, emphasis added] allowing the firewall 211 to redirect (i.e., proxy) data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

Art Unit: 3992

Since each individual element and its function are shown in the prior art, albeit shown in separate references, the difference between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rests not on any individual element or function but in the very combination itself—that is in the substitution of the firewall 211 of Coss for the router 106 in Fig. 1 of Radia. Thus, the simple substitution of one known element (i.e. firewall 211 for the router 106) for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

13. The method of claim 8, further including the step of redirecting the data from the users' computers to multiple destinations as a function of the individualized rule set.

Radia et al. do not explicitly disclose *the redirection server* further redirects the data from the users' computers *to multiple destinations* as a function of the individualized rule set.

However, Coss et al. disclose that firewall 211 further redirects the data from the users' computers to multiple destinations as a function of the individualized rule set.

For instance, Coss et al. disclose:

"1004: if the action indicates a remote proxy, the packet's destination address is replaced with the address of the remote proxy" [9:39-42]

"Proxy processes have also been developed for other special-purpose applications, e.g., to perform services such as **authentication, mail handling, and virus scanning.**" [1:45-49, emphasis added]

Coss et al. also gives examples of redirecting data to both a Telnet proxy and an FTP proxy. For example, Figure 3, rule No. 30 redirects TELNET data to a Telnet proxy server. Coss et al. further state, "For example, an FTP proxy **application** could use a dynamic rule to authorize establishment of an FTP data channel in response to a data request." It is inherent that data was also redirected to the FTP proxy application as a function of the individualized rule set.

Coss et al. also disclose rule set categories such as "Source host group identifier or IP address", "Destination host group identifier or IP address", and "Rule action, e.g., 'pass', 'drop', or 'proxy'" [4:39-43, emphasis added] allowing the firewall 211 to redirect (i.e., proxy) data from the users' computers to multiple destinations as a function of the individualized rule set.

Additionally, Coss teaches "a computer network firewall can be instructed to redirect network session to a separate server for processing, so as to unburden the firewall application proxies. The server processes the redirected network session, and then passes the session back through the firewall to the intended original destination." See col. 2, lines 42-48.

Since each individual element and its function are shown in the prior art, albeit shown in separate references, the difference between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rests not on any

Art Unit: 3992

individual element or function but in the very combination itself-that is in the substitution of the firewall 211 of Coss for the router 106 in Fig. 1 of Radia. Thus, the simple substitution of one known element (i.e. firewall 211 for the router 106) for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

14. The method of claim 8, further including the step of creating database entries for a plurality of the plurality of users' IDs are correlated with a common individualized rule set.

Radia et al. disclose that the database entries for a plurality of the plurality of the users' IDs are correlated with a common individualized rule set.

For instance, "In the above description, we have set a default profile called the default login profile. The default login profile is a static profile that **applies to ALL newly connected client systems**. This way the SMS does not need to be aware as new client systems are connected.

"One may also consider setting the default profile to a null profile and for each client system as the client system connects; for example, since a client system that connects may do a DHCP operation, this event can trigger the SMS to set the login profile for the newly connected computer." [3:23-33, emphasis added]

28. The system of claim 1, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP (Internet Protocol) service.

Radia et al. disclose that the individualized rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP (Internet Protocol) packet.

For instance, Radia et al. disclose:

"Filtering rule 404 also includes a protocol type 506. Protocol type 506 corresponds to the protocol type of an IP packet. Thus, the protocol type 506 of each filtering rule 404 has a value that corresponds to an IP packet type, such as TCP,UDP, ICMP, etc. To match a particular filtering rule 404, an IP packet must have a protocol type that matches the protocol type 506 included in the filtering rule 404" [6:30-36, emphasis added]

Radia et al. also disclose that at least one rule forwards packets associated with a DNS (domain name service):

"The second of the login filtering profiles 400 forwards packets associated with DNS (domain name service) address resolution." [8:6-8,emphasis added]

However, Radia et al. do not explicitly disclose at least one rule as a function of *a type of IP service*.

Art Unit: 3992

Coss et al. disclose that the individual rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP service.

For instance, Coss et al. disclose:

"Service" column in rule table of Figure 3 providing rules as a function of types of IP services such as "FTP", "TELNET", and "MALL".

"As illustrated in FIG. 3, such a table can provide for categories including rule number, designations of source and destination hosts, a **designation of a special service which can be called for in a packet, and a specification of an action to be taken on a packet.** Special services can include proxy services, network address translation, and encryption, for example. In FIG. 3, the categories "Source Host," "Destination Host" and "Service" **impose conditions which must be satisfied by data included in a packet for the specified action to be taken on that packet.**" [4:2-11, emphasis added]

Since each individual element and its function are shown in the prior art, albeit shown in separate references, the difference between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rests not on any individual element or function but in the very combination itself—that is in the substitution of the firewall 211 of Coss for the router 106 in Fig. 1 of Radia. Thus, the simple substitution of one known element (i.e. firewall 211 for the router 106) for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

29. The system of claim 1, wherein the individualized rule set includes an initial temporary rule set and a standard rule set, and wherein the redirection server is configured to utilize the temporary rule set for an initial period of time and to thereafter utilize the standard rule set.

Radia et al. disclose the individualized rule set includes a default filter sequence for a newly connected client system that allows the newly connected client system to perform login. Radia et al. also disclose that after a user of the newly connected client logs in, the filter sequence associated with the client device is changed to another sequence. For example:

"The SMS maintains a series of filtering profiles, each of which includes one or more of filtering rules. **The SMS sets a default filter sequence for the newly connected client system** by downloading the sequence by the SMS to the ANCS Subsequently, the packet filter uses the rules of the login filtering profile sequence to selectively forward or discard IP packets originating from the client system. **This filtering sequence will allow newly connected client systems to perform login but nothing else.**" [3:5- 22, emphasis added]

"A preferred embodiment of the present invention also generates or selects filtering profiles for users. With the login filtering profile sequence in place, a user can use the newly connected

Art Unit: 3992

client system to login to the network. The user login is monitored by the SMS. **If the user login is successful, the SMS selects or generates a user filtering profile sequence.** The user filtering profile sequence is then downloaded by the SMS to the ANCS**Subsequently, the new packet filter uses the rules of the user filtering profile sequence to selectively forward or discard IP packets originating from the client system.**" [3:34-50, emphasis added]

However, Radia et al. do not explicitly disclose utilizing the login filtering *sequence for an initial period of time*. (Instead Radia et al. only disclose utilizing the login filtering sequence until the user logs in.)

Coss et al. disclose that the individualized rule set includes an initial temporary rule set and a standard rule set, and wherein the firewall 211 is configured to utilize the temporary rule set for an initial period of time and to thereafter utilize the standard rule set.

For instance, Coss et al. discloses:

"Exemplary dynamic rules include a 'one-time' rule which is only used for a single session, a **time-limited rule which is used only for a specified time period**, and a threshold rule which is used only when certain conditions are satisfied." [8:37-40, emphasis added]

Accordingly, Coss et al. disclose utilizing an initial rule set being a set of rules including the time-limited rule before the specified time period has expired, and utilizing a standard rule set being the set of rules not including the time-limited rule after the specified time period has expired.

Since each individual element and its function are shown in the prior art, albeit shown in separate references, the difference between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rests not on any individual element or function but in the very combination itself—that is in the substitution of the firewall 211 of Coss for the router 106 in Fig. 1 of Radia. Thus, the simple substitution of one known element (i.e. firewall 211 for the router 106) for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

30. The system of claim 1, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a request type and a destination address.

Radia et al. disclose that the individualized rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a type of IP (Internet Protocol) packet and destination address.

For instance, Radia et al. disclose:

"In FIG. 5, it may be seen that each filtering rule 404 includes an action 500. Action 500 specifies the disposition of IP packets that match by a particular filtering rule 404. In particular, **action 500 may indicate that a matched IP packet will be forwarded, or that a matched IP packet will be discarded.**" [6:14-18]

Art Unit: 3992

"Filtering rule 404 also includes a **protocol type 506. Protocol type 506 corresponds to the protocol type of an IP packet.** Thus, the protocol type 506 of each filtering rule 404 has a value that corresponds to an IP packet type, such as TCP, UDP, ICMP, etc. To match a particular filtering rule 404, an IP packet must have a protocol type that matches the protocol type 506 included in the filtering rule 404" [6:30-36, emphasis added]

"Filtering rule 404 also includes a destination IP address 502 and a destination IP mask 504. Destination IP address 502 corresponds to the destination address included in the header of an IP packet. Destination IP mask 504 is similar to destination IP address 502 but corresponds to a range of destination addresses. To match a particular filtering rule 404, an IP packet must either have a destination address that matches the destination address 502 included in the filtering rule 404 or have a destination address that is covered by the destination address mask 504 of the filtering rule 404." [6:18-29, emphasis added]

However, Radia et al. do not explicitly disclose the individualized rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a request type and a destination address.

Coss et al. disclose that the individualized rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a request type and a destination address.

For instance, Coss et al. disclose:

Rule No. 40 in Figure 3 allowing access (i.e., action= "PASS") based on a request type of "MAIL" and a destination host of "D".

"In FIG. 3, the categories "Source Host," "Destination Host" and "Service" impose conditions which must be satisfied by data included in a packet for the specified action to be taken on that packet." [4:2-11, emphasis added]

Since each individual element and its function are shown in the prior art, albeit shown in separate references, the difference between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rests not on any individual element or function but in the very combination itself—that is in the substitution of the firewall 211 of Coss for the router 106 in Fig. 1 of Radia. Thus, the simple substitution of one known element (i.e. firewall 211 for the router 106) for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

31. The system of claim 1, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule redirecting the data to a new destination address based on a request type and an attempted destination address.

Radia et al. do not explicitly disclose that the individualized rule set includes at least one rule redirecting the data to a new destination address based on a request type and an attempted destination address.

Art Unit: 3992

However, Coss et al. disclose that the individualized rule set includes at least one rule redirecting the data to a new destination address based on a request type and an attempted destination address.

For instance, Coss et al. disclose:

Rule No. 30 in Figure 3 redirecting data (i.e., action = "PROXY") based on a request type of "TELNET" and attempted destination host of "C".

"In FIG. 3, the categories "Source Host," "Destination Host" and "Service" impose conditions which must be satisfied by data included in a packet for the specified action to be taken on that packet." [4:2-11, emphasis added]

Since each individual element and its function are shown in the prior art, albeit shown in separate references, the difference between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rests not on any individual element or function but in the very combination itself—that is in the substitution of the firewall 211 of Coss for the router 106 in Fig. 1 of Radia. Thus, the simple substitution of one known element (i.e. firewall 211 for the router 106) for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

32. The method of claim 8, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule as a function of type of IP (Internet Protocol) service.

Radia et al. disclose that the individualized rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP (Internet Protocol) packet.

For instance, Radia et al. disclose:

"Filtering rule 404 also includes a **protocol type 506. Protocol type 506 corresponds to the protocol type of an IP packet.** Thus, the protocol type 506 of each filtering rule 404 has a value that corresponds to an IP packet type, such as TCP,UDP, ICMP, etc. To match a particular filtering rule 404, an IP packet must have a protocol type that matches the protocol type 506 included in the filtering rule 404" [6:30-36, emphasis added]

Radia et al. also disclose that at least one rule forwards packets associated with a DNS (domain name service):

"The second of the login filtering profiles 400 forwards packets **associated with DNS (domain name service)** address resolution." [8:6-8, emphasis added]

However, Radia et al. do not explicitly disclose at least one rule as a function of *a type of IP service*.

Art Unit: 3992

Coss et al. disclose that the individual rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP service.

For instance, Coss et al. disclose:

"Service" column in rule table of Figure 3 providing rules as a function of types of IP services such as "FTP", "TELNET", and "MALL".

"As illustrated in FIG. 3, such a table can provide for categories including rule number, designations of source and destination hosts, a **designation of a special service which can be called for in a packet, and a specification of an action to be taken on a packet.** Special services can include proxy services, network address translation, and encryption, for example. In FIG. 3, the categories "Source Host," "Destination Host" and "Service" **impose conditions which must be satisfied by data included in a packet for the specified action to be taken on that packet.**" [4:2-11, emphasis added]

Since each individual element and its function are shown in the prior art, albeit shown in separate references, the difference between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rests not on any individual element or function but in the very combination itself—that is in the substitution of the firewall 211 of Coss for the router 106 in Fig. 1 of Radia. Thus, the simple substitution of one known element (i.e. firewall 211 for the router 106) for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

33. The method of claim 8, wherein the individualized rule set includes an initial temporary rule set and a standard rule set, and wherein the redirection server is configured to utilize the temporary rule set for an initial period of time and to thereafter utilize the standard rule set.

Radia et al. disclose the individualized rule set includes a default filter sequence for a newly connected client system that allows the newly connected client system to perform login. Radia et al. also disclose that after a user of the newly connected client logs in, the filter sequence associated with the client device is changed to another sequence. For example:

"The SMS maintains a series of filtering profiles, each of which includes one or more of filtering rules. **The SMS sets a default filter sequence for the newly connected client system** by downloading the sequence by the SMS to the ANCS Subsequently, the packet filter uses the rules of the login filtering profile sequence to selectively forward or discard IP packets originating from the client system. **This filtering sequence will allow newly connected client systems to perform login but nothing else.**" [3:5- 22, emphasis added]

"A preferred embodiment of the present invention also generates or selects filtering profiles for users. With the login filtering profile sequence in place, a user can use the newly connected

Art Unit: 3992

client system to login to the network. The user login is monitored by the SMS. **If the user login is successful, the SMS selects or generates a user filtering profile sequence.** The user filtering profile sequence is then downloaded by the SMS to the ANCS**Subsequently, the new packet filter uses the rules of the user filtering profile sequence to selectively forward or discard IP packets originating from the client system.**" [3:34-50, emphasis added]

However, Radia et al. do not explicitly disclose utilizing the login filtering *sequence for an initial period of time*. (Instead Radia et al. only disclose utilizing the login filtering sequence until the user logs in.)

Coss et al. disclose that the individualized rule set includes an initial temporary rule set and a standard rule set, and wherein the firewall 211 is configured to utilize the temporary rule set for an initial period of time and to thereafter utilize the standard rule set.

For instance, Coss et al. disclose:

"Exemplary dynamic rules include a 'one-time' rule which is only used for a single session, **a time-limited rule which is used only for a specified time period**, and a threshold rule which is used only when certain conditions are satisfied." [8:37-40, emphasis added]

Accordingly, Coss et al. disclose utilizing an initial rule set being a set of rules including the time-limited rule before the specified time period has expired, and utilizing a standard rule set being the set of rules not including the time-limited rule after the specified time period has expired.

Since each individual element and its function are shown in the prior art, albeit shown in separate references, the difference between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rests not on any individual element or function but in the very combination itself-that is in the substitution of the firewall 211 of Coss for the router 106 in Fig. 1 of Radia. Thus, the simple substitution of one known element (i.e. firewall 211 for the router 106) for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

34. The method of claim 8, wherein the individual rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a request type and a destination address.

Radia et al. disclose that the individualized rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a type of IP (Internet Protocol) packet and destination address.

For instance, Radia et al. disclose:

"In FIG. 5, it may be seen that each filtering rule 404 includes an action 500. Action 500 specifies the disposition of IP packets that match by a particular filtering rule 404. In particular, **action 500 may indicate that a matched IP packet will be forwarded, or that a matched IP packet will be discarded.**" [6:14-18]

Art Unit: 3992

"Filtering rule 404 also includes a **protocol type 506. Protocol type 506 corresponds to the protocol type of an IP packet.** Thus, the protocol type 506 of each filtering rule 404 has a value that corresponds to an IP packet type, such as TCP, UDP, ICMP, etc. To match a particular filtering rule 404, an IP packet must have a protocol type that matches the protocol type 506 included in the filtering rule 404" [6:30-36, emphasis added]

"Filtering rule 404 also includes a destination IP address 502 and a destination IP mask 504. Destination IP address 502 corresponds to the destination address included in the header of an IP packet. Destination IP mask 504 is similar to destination IP address 502 but corresponds to a range of destination addresses. To match a particular filtering rule 404, an IP packet must either have a destination address that matches the destination address 502 included in the filtering rule 404 or have a destination address that is covered by the destination address mask 504 of the filtering rule 404." [6:18-29, emphasis added]

However, Radia et al. do not explicitly disclose the individualized rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a *request type* and a destination address.

Coss et al. disclose that the individualized rule set includes at least one rule allowing access based on a request type and a destination address.

For instance, Coss et al. disclose:

Rule No. 40 in Figure 3 allowing access (i.e., action= "PASS") based on a request type of "MAIL" and a destination host of "D".

"In FIG. 3, the categories "Source Host," "Destination Host" and "Service" impose conditions which must be satisfied by data included in a packet for the specified action to be taken on that packet." [4:2-11, emphasis added]

Since each individual element and its function are shown in the prior art, albeit shown in separate references, the difference between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rests not on any individual element or function but in the very combination itself—that is in the substitution of the firewall 211 of Coss for the router 106 in Fig. 1 of Radia. Thus, the simple substitution of one known element (i.e. firewall 211 for the router 106) for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

35. The method of claim 8, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule redirecting the data to a new destination address based on a request type and an attempted destination address.

Radia et al. do not explicitly disclose that the individualized rule set includes at least one rule redirecting the data to a new destination address based on a request type and an attempted destination address.

Art Unit: 3992

However, Coss et al. disclose that the individualized rule set includes at least one rule redirecting the data to a new destination address based on a request type and an attempted destination address.

For instance, Coss et al. disclose:

Rule No. 30 in Figure 3 redirecting data (i.e., action = "PROXY") based on a request type of "TELNET" and attempted destination host of "C".

"In FIG. 3, the categories "Source Host," "Destination Host" and "Service" impose conditions which must be satisfied by data included in a packet for the specified action to be taken on that packet." [4:2-11, emphasis added]

Since each individual element and its function are shown in the prior art, albeit shown in separate references, the difference between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rests not on any individual element or function but in the very combination itself—that is in the substitution of the firewall 211 of Coss for the router 106 in Fig. 1 of Radia. Thus, the simple substitution of one known element (i.e. firewall 211 for the router 106) for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

44. A system comprising:

Radia et al. Figure 1: computer network 100 is a system

a database with entries correlating each of a plurality of user IDs with an individualized rule set;

Radia et al. Figure 3: filtering profiles 316 are a database with entries correlating each of a plurality of user IDs with an individualized rule set

For instance, Radia et al. disclose:

"In step 908, which follows, a sequence of **filtering profiles 400 associated with the user** are retrieved, by SMS 114, from **filtering profile database 316**. In general, it may be appreciated that various users of network 100 will have varying types of allowed access. As a result, **different network users will require different filtering profiles 400. Generally, these filtering profiles 400 are defined separately for each user** using either automatic or manual generation techniques. For the present invention, **these filtering profiles 400 are preferably maintained in filtering profile database 316 and retrieved using the identity of the particular user.**" [9:46-56, emphasis added]

a dial-up network server that receives user IDs from users' computers;

Art Unit: 3992

Radia et al. disclose in Figure 1 that modems 104 (which may be telephone - i.e., dial-up) and DHCP server 110 establish a communications link with the user's PC. A login applet on the user's computer (one of PCs 102) communicates with a login server and allows users to login to the network 100.

For instance, Radia et al. disclose:

"A **cable modem** 104 is connected to each client system 102." [1:11-12, emphasis added]

"For example, an internet service provider (ISP) may have users who connect, login, logoff and disconnect to its network over time **using telephone or cable modems.**" [2:45-48, emphasis added]

"The client systems, which are typically personal computers using cable modems, connect to the router. **As part of the connection process, each client system receives a dynamically allocated IP address**"

For a preferred embodiment of network 100, user logins are handled by downloading small, specifically tailored applications, known as "login applets," to client systems 102. The login applets are downloaded from a server system, such as server system 108, or in some cases, from SMS 114." [8:30-34, emphasis added]

"More specifically, as discussed with regard to method 700, for a preferred embodiment of network 100, **users login to network 100 using a login applet that communicates with a login server, such as SMS 114.**" [9:39-42, emphasis added]

However, Radia et al. do not explicitly disclose a *dial-up network server* that receives user IDs from users' computers.

Admitted prior art (APA) systems in Figure 1 of the '118 patent include a dial-up networking server 102 that receives user IDs from users' computers 100.

The APA systems are described as follows:

"In prior art systems as shown in FIG. 1 when an Internet user establishes a connection with an Internet Service Provider (ISP), the user first makes a physical connection between their computer 100 and a dial-up networking server 102, the user provides to the dial-up networking server their user ID and password. The dial-up networking server then passes the user ID and password, along with a temporary Internet Protocol (IP) address for use by the user to the ISP's authentication and accounting server 104. A detailed description of the IP communications protocol is discussed in *Internetworking with TCP/IP*, 3rd ed., Douglas Comer, Prentice Hall, 1995, which is fully incorporated herein by reference. The authentication and accounting server, upon verification of the user ID and password using a database 106 would send an authorization message to the dial-up networking server 102 **to allow the user to use the temporary IP**

Art Unit: 3992

address assigned to that user by the dial-up networking server and then logs the connection and assigned IP address." [" 118 patent, col. 1, lines 15-37, emphasis added]

It would have been obvious to substitute the DHCP server 110 and login applet disclosed by Radia et al. with the dial-up networking server 102 included in the APA systems to thereby obtain the predictable results of: 1) allowing dial-up users to login through the dial-up networking server rather than through an applet running on the user's computer, and 2) assigning a temporary IP address to the user's computer by the dial-up networking server 102 rather than by the DHCP server 110.

a redirection server connected between the dial-up network server and a public network, and

Radia et al. Figure 1 : router 106 is connected between the dial-up network server (substituted for DHCP server 110 and login applet) and server systems 108 of the network 100. Router 106 is similar to a redirection server because router 106 is connected between the user's computer (PC 102) and the network's server systems 108, and control the user's access to the network's server systems 108.

Radia et al. further disclose that the network is a public network such as the Internet:

"For example, assume that a company uses a router to link its internal intranet with an external network **such as the Internet.**" [2:5-7, emphasis added]

However, Radia et al. do not explicitly disclose the router 106 controls the user's access to the public network *by utilizing redirection functionality.*

Coss et al. disclose a firewall that is connected between a user's computer and a public network that controls the user's access to the network by utilizing redirection functionality:

"FIG. 2 shows a user site 201 connected to the Internet 105 via a firewall processor 211." [3:53-54]

"This invention relates to the **prevention of unauthorized access in computer networks** and, more particularly, to firewall protection within computer networks." [1:6-8, emphasis]

"Dynamic rules are rules which are included with the access rules as a need arises, for processing along with the access rules, e.g., by a rule processing engine. Dynamic rules can include unique, current information such as, for example, specific source and destination port numbers. They **can be loaded at any time by trusted parties, e.g., a trusted application, remote proxy or firewall administrator, to authorize specific network sessions.**" [8:24-31, emphasis added]

"To unburden the firewall of application proxies, the firewall can be enabled to redirect a network session to a separate server for processing." [Abstract, emphasis added]

Art Unit: 3992

"Proxy reflection in accordance with the present invention involves redirecting a network session to another, "remote" proxy server for processing, and then later passing it back via the firewall to the intended destination. When a new session enters the firewall, a decision is made to determine whether service by a proxy server is required. If so, **the firewall replaces the destination address in the packet with the host address of the proxy application and, if necessary, it can also change the service port.**" [Coss et al., col. 8, lines 56-65, emphasis added]

It would have been obvious to replace the router 106 of Radia et al. with the firewall 211 of Coss et al. to not only allow discarding and forwarding traffic as taught by Radia et al., but to also allow controlling the user's access to the network by redirecting traffic at the firewall 211 to thereby prevent the router 106 from having to utilize application proxies, as suggested by Coss et al.

Radia et al. further disclose that other networking technologies may be used instead of router 106, stating:

"The use of cable router 106 and cable modems 104 is also intended to be exemplary and it should be appreciated **that other networking technologies and topologies are equally practical.**" [1:13-16, emphasis added]

Therefore, it would have been further obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the firewall 211 of Coss et al. could substitute the router 106 because the firewall 211 disclosed by Coss et al. is another type of networking technology and Radia et al. suggest other types of network technology is equally practical.

It would have been further obvious that simple substitution of the known firewall 211 for the router 106 obtains predictable results that the network 100 of Radia et al. may now benefit from the redirection functionality included in firewall 211.

an authentication accounting server connected to the database, the dial-up network server and the redirection server;

In Radia et al. Figure 1, access network control server ANCS 112 and services management system SMS 114 together are an authentication accounting server because ANCS 112 and SMS 114 are connected to the database (filtering profiles 316 within SMS 114 - see Figure 3), the dial-up network server (substituted for DHCP server 110 and login applet), and the redirection server (Coss' firewall 211 in the position of router 106 in Radia's FIG. 1).

Radia et al. further disclose that the ANCS 112 and SMS 114 determine whether a user ID is authorized to access the network.

For instance, Radia et al. disclose:

Art Unit: 3992

"FIG. 9 is a flowchart showing the steps associated with a preferred embodiment of a method for **allocation of privileges to a user in a computer network.**" [4:59-61, emphasis added]

"Method 900 includes step performed by SMS 114 **and** ANCS 112." [9:35-36, emphasis added]

"In step 908, which follows, a sequence of filtering profiles 400 associated with **the user** are retrieved by SMS 114, from filtering profile database 316. In general, it may be appreciated that **various users of network 100 will have varying types of allowed access.**" [9:46-50, emphasis added]

"In FIG. 1, ANCS 112 and SMS 114 are shown as separate entities. It should be appreciated, however that the present invention specifically anticipates **that ANCS 112 and SMS 114 may be implemented using a single computer system** that includes ANCS process 214, SMS process 314 and filtering profile database 316." [5:65-6:4, emphasis added]

wherein the dial-up network server communicates a first user ID for one of the users' computers and a temporarily assigned network address for the first user ID to the authentication accounting server;

Radia et al. disclose a login applet on a PC 102 and the DHCP server 110 respectively communicate a first user ID (entered using the login applet) for one of the users' computers (one of PCs 102) and a temporarily assigned network address (dynamically assigned IP address) for the first user ID to the authentication accounting server (SMS 114).

For instance, Radia et al. disclose the login applet communicates from PC 102 to SMS 114:

"Method 900 begins with step 906 where SMS 114 **waits for a user login.** More specifically, as discussed with regard to method 700, for a preferred embodiment of network 100, **users login to network 100 using a login applet that communicates with a login server, such as SMS 114**" [9:37-42, emphasis added]

Radia et al. also disclose the DHCP server 110 passes the temporarily assigned network address for the first user ID to the SMS 114:

"Method 700 begins with step 706 where **SMS 114 waits for the allocation of an IP address to a client system 102.** More specifically, for a preferred embodiment of network 100, power-on or reset of a client system 102 is followed by connection of the client system 102 to router 106. As part of this connection, the connecting client system 102 requests and receives a dynamically allocated IP address from DHCP server 110. This allocation requires that a number of messages pass between DHCP server 110 and the client system 102 requesting a new IP address. The last of these messages is a DHCPACK message sent by the DHCP server 110 to the client system 102. **To monitor the allocation of IP addresses, SMS 114 monitors DHCP messages within network 100.** Step 706 corresponds, in a general sense, to the methods and procedures that are

Art Unit: 3992

executed by SMS 114 to wait for and detect DHCPACK messages within network 100." [7:21-34, emphasis added]

With reference to FIG. 9, it is inherent that the SMS 114 also receives the IP address of the client system 102 from the dial-up network server because Radia et al. disclose "At the same time, **the IP address of the client system 102 acting as a host for the user is passed by the SMS 114 to the ANCS 112.**" [9:62-64, emphasis added]

Radia et al. further disclose that the IP address of the client system (one of PCs 102) is temporarily assigned:

"More specifically, in systems that use the DHCP protocol for allocation of IP addresses, each IP address is allocated for a finite period of time. Systems that do not renew their IP address leases may lose their allocated IP addresses." [7:51-55, emphasis added]

However, Radia et al. do not explicitly disclose that *the dial-up network server* communicates a first user ID for one of the users' computers and a temporarily assigned network address for the first user ID to the authentication accounting server.

In the admitted prior art (APA) system of FIG. 1, the dial-up network server 102 communicates a first user ID for one of the users' computers 100 and a temporarily assigned network address for the first user ID to the authentication accounting server 104.

For instance, the APA systems are described as follows:

"The dial-up networking server then passes the user ID and password, along with a temporary Internet Protocol (IP) address for use by the user to the ISP's authentication and accounting server 104." [".118 patent, Col. 1, lines 15-37, emphasis added]

Since each individual element and its function are shown in the prior art, albeit shown in separate references, the difference between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rests not on any individual element or function but in the very combination itself—that is in the substitution of the APA dial-up networking server 102 for the DHCP 110 and login applet in Fig. 1 of Radia. Thus, the simple substitution of one known element (i.e. dial-up networking server 102) for another (DHCP server and login applet) producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

It would further have been obvious that the dial-up network server should continue to behave in this way because, rather than the SMS 114 receiving the user ID and IP address respectively from the login applet and DHCP server 110, the SMS 114 would receive this information from the dial-up networking server, as suggested by the APA.

wherein the authentication accounting server accesses the database and communicates the individualized rule set that correlates with the first set that correlates with the first user ID and the temporary assigned network address to the redirection server; and

Art Unit: 3992

Radia et al. disclose the ANCS 112 and SMS 114 access the database 316 and communicate the individualized rule set (sequence of filtering profiles 400) that correlates with the first user ID (identity of the user) and the temporarily assigned network address (dynamic IP address) to the router 106.

For instance, Radia et al. disclose:

FIG. 9: step 906 "wait for user login", step 908 "retrieve user filter profile from database", step 910 "download user profile to ancs", and step 920 "reconfigure network components"

"In step 908, which follows, a sequence of filtering profiles 400 associated with the user are retrieved, by SMS 114, from filtering profile database 316".
[9:46-48, emphasis added]

"For the present invention, these filtering profiles 400 are preferably maintained in filtering profile database 316 and **retrieved using the identity of the particular user.**" [9:53 -56, emphasis added]

"Step 908 is followed by step 910 where the sequence of user filtering profiles 400 is downloaded by SMS 114 to ANCS 112. At the same time, the IP address of the client system 102 acting as a host for the user is passed by the SMS 114 to the ANCS 112." [9:60-64, emphasis added]

"In the following step, the ANCS 112 uses each of the filtering rules 404 included in the sequence of user filtering profiles 400 **to establish a packet filter for IP packets originating from the client system 102 acting as a host for the user.**" [9:64-10:1, emphasis added]

"The packet filter is established by reconfiguring one or more of the components of the network 100 that forward packets originating at the client system 102 acting as a host for the user. For example, in some cases, the packet filter may be established by reconfiguring the modem 104 connected to the client system 102. Alternatively, the packet filter may be established by reconfiguring router 106." [10:1-7, emphasis added]

It is inherent that the "packet filter for IP packets originating from the client system 102" communicated to the router 106 includes the temporarily assigned (i.e., dynamic) IP address of the client system 102 in order to identify the IP packets originating from the client system 102.

However, Radia et al. do not explicitly disclose the ANCS 112 and SMS 114 access the database 316 and communicate the individualized rule set that correlates with the first user ID and the temporarily assigned network address *to the redirection server.*

It would have been obvious to have the ANCS 112 and SMS 114 access the database 316 and communicate the individualized rule set that correlates with the first user ID and the temporarily assigned network address to the firewall 211 of Coss et al. A first reason is Radia et al. teach

Art Unit: 3992

reconfiguring one or more network components that forward packets originating at the client system 102, and the firewall 211 of Coss et al. is a network component that forwards packets originating at a client system. As such, Radia et al. suggest reconfiguring the firewall 211.

It would have further been obvious to use a known technique (i.e., communicating an individualized rule set to thereby reconfiguring a router 106) to improve a similar device (firewall 211) in the same way.

Additionally, Coss et al. disclose dynamic rules can be loaded into the firewall 211 at any time by trusted applications to thereby authorize specific network sessions. For instance, Coss et al. teach:

"Dynamic rules can include unique, current information such as, for example, specific source and destination port numbers. They can be loaded at any time by trusted parties, e.g., a trusted application, remote proxy or firewall administrator, to authorize specific network sessions." [8:26-31, emphasis added]

It therefore would have further been obvious to have the ANCS 112 communicate the individualized rule set to the firewall 211 of Coss et al. because the ANCS 112 is a trusted application that authorizes specific network sessions, as suggested by Coss et al.

wherein data directed toward the public network from the one of the users' computers are processed by the redirection server according to the individualized rule set.

Radia et al. disclose that data directed toward the public network from the one of the users' computers (one of PCs 102) are processed by the router 106 according to the individualized rule set.

For instance, Radia et al. disclose:

"Subsequently, the packet filter established by the ANCS 112 is used to filter IP packets that originate from the client system 102 acting as a host for the user, allowing the packets that are associated with the network privileges of the user." [10:11-14,emphasis added]

However, Radia et al. do not explicitly disclose that data directed toward the public network from the one of the user's computers is processed *by the redirection server* according to the individualized rule set.

Coss et al. disclose data directed toward the public network from the one of the users' computers are processed by firewall 211 according to the individualized rule set.

For instance, Coss et al. disclose:

Art Unit: 3992

"In accordance with a fourth aspect of the invention, a computer network firewall may make use of dynamic rules which are added to a set of access rules for processing packets." [2:29-32, emphasis added]

"With a capability for supporting multiple security domains, **a single firewall can support multiple users, each with a separate security policy.**" [3:31-34, emphasis added]

"The particular rule set that is applied for any packet can be determined based on information such as the **incoming and outgoing network interfaces** as well as the **network source and destination addresses.**" [1:67-2:4, emphasis added]

It would have been obvious that when substituting router 106 in the network of Radia et al. with the firewall 211 of Coss et al., subsequent to the firewall 211 of Coss et al. being reconfigured by the ANCS 112, data directed toward the public network from the one of the user's computers would be processed by the firewall 211 according to the individualized rule set.

A first reason is the ANCS 112 is disclosed to reconfigure the router 106 to process data in this way, and the firewall 211 is simply another type of networking component. In other words, simple substitution of the known firewall 211 for the router 106 obtains predictable results that the firewall 211 is reconfigured to process data directed toward the public network in the same way.

Another reason is it would have been obvious to use a known technique (reconfiguring a router 106 to process outgoing data according to the individualized rule set) to improve a similar device (firewall 211) in the same way.

45. The system of claim 44, wherein the redirection server further provides control over a plurality of data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

Radia et al disclose that router 106 in FIG. 1 further provides control over a plurality of data from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set (FIG. 6, step 606, "filter IP packets in accordance with filtering profile" and col. 10, lines 6-14).

Radia et al. do not explicitly disclose the *redirection server* further provides control over a plurality of data *to and from* the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

However, Coss et al. disclose that firewall 211 further provides control over a plurality of data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

For instance, Coss et al. disclose:

"The latter embodiment can allow the firewall techniques of the invention to provide, for example, parental control of Internet and video access in the home." [2:57-60]

Art Unit: 3992

See FIG. 3, rule No. 10 controlling FTP data to host B, and rule No. 30 controlling Telnet data from host B.

Coss et al. also disclose rule set categories such as "Source host group identifier or IP address", "Destination host group identifier or IP address", and "Rule action, e.g., 'pass', 'drop', or 'proxy'" [4:39-43] allowing the firewall 211 to control data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

Since each individual element and its function are shown in the prior art, albeit shown in separate references, the difference between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rests not on any individual element or function but in the very combination itself-that is in the substitution of the firewall 211 of Coss for the router 106 in Fig. 1 of Radia. Thus, the simple substitution of one known element (i.e. firewall 211 for the router 106) for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

46. The system of claim 44, wherein the redirection server further blocks the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

Radia et al disclose that router 106 in FIG. 1 further blocks data from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set (FIG. 6, step 606, "filter IP packets in accordance with filtering profile" and col. 10, lines 6-14).

Radia et al. do not explicitly disclose *the redirection server* further blocks the data *to and from* the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

However, Coss et al. disclose that firewall 211 further blocks the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

For instance, Coss et al. disclose:

FIG. 3, rule No. 20 blocking data from host A; and FIG. 4, fifth session key rule (D, A, Telnet) blocking data to host A.

Coss et al. also disclose rule set categories such as "Source host group identifier or IP address", "Destination host group identifier or IP address", and "Rule action, e.g., 'pass', '**drop**', or 'proxy'" [4:39-43, emphasis added] allowing the firewall 211 to block (i.e., drop) data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

Since each individual element and its function are shown in the prior art, albeit shown in separate references, the difference between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rests not on any individual element or function but in the very combination itself-that is in the substitution of the firewall 211 of Coss for the router 106 in Fig. 1 of Radia. Thus, the simple substitution of one

Art Unit: 3992

known element (i.e. firewall 211 for the router 106) for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

47. The system of claim 44, wherein the redirection server further allows the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

Radia et al disclose that router 106 in FIG. 1 further allows the data from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set (FIG. 6, step 606, "filter IP packets in accordance with filtering profile" and col. 10, lines 6-14).

Radia et al. do not explicitly disclose *the redirection server further allows the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.*

However, Coss et al. disclose firewall 211 further allows the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

For instance, Coss et al. disclose:

FIG. 4, first session key rule (A, B, TELNET) allowing data to host B, and second session key rule (B, A, TELNET) allowing data from host B.

Coss et al. also disclose rule set categories such as "Source host group identifier or IP address", "Destination host group identifier or IP address", and "Rule action, e.g., 'pass', 'drop', or 'proxy'" [4:39-43, emphasis added] allowing the firewall 211 to allow (i.e., pass) data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

Since each individual element and its function are shown in the prior art, albeit shown in separate references, the difference between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rests not on any individual element or function but in the very combination itself-that is in the substitution of the firewall 211 of Coss for the router 106 in Fig. 1 of Radia. Thus, the simple substitution of one known element (i.e. firewall 211 for the router 106) for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

48. The system of claim 44, wherein the redirection server further redirects the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

Radia et al. do not explicitly disclose *the redirection server further redirects the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.*

However, Coss et al. disclose firewall 211 further redirects the data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

For instance, Coss et al. disclose:

Art Unit: 3992

"For some users and proxy applications, the connection should appear at the destination to be coming from the original source rather than the remote system. This applies, e.g., to services which check the source IP address to ensure that it matches the user who signed up for the requested service. **This capability is provided by "dual reflection" (or "two-way reflection"), with the source address of the outgoing connection changed back from the remote proxy to the original user's source address. This change is effected at the firewall, as each packet is received from the proxy and sent to the destination.**" [9:6-16, emphasis added]

Coss et al. also disclose rule set categories such as "Source host group identifier or IP address", "Destination host group identifier or IP address", and "Rule action, e.g., 'pass', 'drop', or 'proxy'" [4:39-43, emphasis added] allowing the firewall 211 to redirect (i.e., proxy) data to and from the users' computers as a function of the individualized rule set.

Since each individual element and its function are shown in the prior art, albeit shown in separate references, the difference between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rests not on any individual element or function but in the very combination itself—that is in the substitution of the firewall 211 of Coss for the router 106 in Fig. 1 of Radia. Thus, the simple substitution of one known element (i.e. firewall 211 for the router 106) for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

49. The system of claim 44, wherein the redirection server further redirects the data from the users' computers to multiple destinations as a function of the individualized rule set.

Radia et al. do not explicitly disclose *the redirection server* further redirects the data from the users' computers *to multiple destinations* as a function of the individualized rule set.

However, Coss et al. disclose that firewall 211 further redirects the data from the users' computers to multiple destinations as a function of the individualized rule set.

For instance, Coss et al. disclose:

"1004: if the action indicates a remote proxy, the packet's destination address is replaced with the address of the remote proxy" [9:39-42]

"Proxy processes have also been developed for other special-purpose applications, e.g., to perform services such as **authentication, mail handling, and virus scanning.**" [1:45-49, emphasis added]

Coss et al. also gives examples of redirecting data to both a Telnet proxy and an FTP proxy. For example, Figure 3, rule No. 30 redirects TELNET data to a Telnet proxy server. Coss et al. further state, "For example, an FTP proxy **application** could use a dynamic rule to authorize establishment of an FTP data channel in response to a data request." It is inherent that data was also redirected to the FTP proxy application as a function of the individualized rule set.

Art Unit: 3992

Coss et al. also disclose rule set categories such as "Source host group identifier or IP address", "Destination host group identifier or IP address", and "Rule action, e.g., 'pass', 'drop', or 'proxy'" [4:39-43, emphasis added] allowing the firewall 211 to redirect (i.e., proxy) data from the users' computers to multiple destinations as a function of the individualized rule set.

Additionally, Coss teaches "a computer network firewall can be instructed to redirect network session to a separate server for processing, so as to unburden the firewall application proxies. The server processes the redirected network session, and then passes the session back through the firewall to the intended original destination." See col. 2, lines 42-48.

Since each individual element and its function are shown in the prior art, albeit shown in separate references, the difference between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rests not on any individual element or function but in the very combination itself—that is in the substitution of the firewall 211 of Coss for the router 106 in Fig. 1 of Radia. Thus, the simple substitution of one known element (i.e. firewall 211 for the router 106) for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

50. The system of claim 44, wherein the database entries for a plurality of the plurality of users' IDs are correlated with a common individualized rule set.

Radia et al. disclose that the database entries for a plurality of the plurality of the users' IDs are correlated with a common individualized rule set.

For instance, "In the above description, we have set a default profile called the default login profile. The default login profile is a static profile that **applies to ALL newly connected client systems**. This way the SMS does not need to be aware as new client systems are connected.

"One may also consider setting the default profile to a null profile and for each client system as the client system connects; for example, since a client system that connects may do a DHCP operation, this event can trigger the SMS to set the login profile for the newly connected computer." [3:23-33, emphasis added]

51. The system or claim 44, wherein the individualized rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP (Internet Protocol) service.

Radia et al. disclose that the individualized rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP (Internet Protocol) packet.

For instance, Radia et al. disclose:

"Filtering rule 404 also includes a **protocol type 506**. **Protocol type 506 corresponds to the protocol type of an IP packet**. Thus, the protocol type 506 of each filtering rule 404 has a value

Art Unit: 3992

that corresponds to an IP packet type, such as TCP,UDP, ICMP, etc. To match a particular filtering rule 404, an IP packet must have a protocol type that matches the protocol type 506 included in the filtering rule 404" [6:30-36, emphasis added]

Radia et al. also disclose that at least one rule forwards packets associated with a DNS (domain name service):

"The second of the login filtering profiles 400 forwards packets **associated with DNS (domain name service)** address resolution." [8:6-8,emphasis added]

However, Radia et al. do not explicitly disclose at least one rule as a function of *a type of IP service*.

Coss et al. disclose that the individual rule set includes at least one rule as a function of a type of IP service.

For instance, Coss et al. disclose:

"Service" column in rule table of Figure 3 providing rules as a function of types of IP services such as "FTP", "TELNET", and "MALL".

"As illustrated in FIG. 3, such a table can provide for categories including rule number, designations of source and destination hosts, a **designation of a special service which can be called for in a packet, and a specification of an action to be taken on a packet**. Special services can include proxy services, network address translation, and encryption, for example. In FIG. 3, the categories "Source Host," "Destination Host" and "Service" **impose conditions which must be satisfied by data included in a packet for the specified action to be taken on that packet.**" [4:2-11, emphasis added]

Since each individual element and its function are shown in the prior art, albeit shown in separate references, the difference between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rests not on any individual element or function but in the very combination itself-that is in the substitution of the firewall 211 of Coss for the router 106 in Fig. 1 of Radia. Thus, the simple substitution of one known element (i.e. firewall 211 for the router 106) for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

52. The system of claim 44, wherein the individualized rule set includes an initial temporary rule set and a standard rule set, and wherein the redirection server is configured to utilize the temporary rule set for an initial period of time and to thereafter utilize the standard rule set.

Radia et al. disclose the individualized rule set includes a default filter sequence for a newly connected client system that allows the newly connected client system to perform login. Radia et