

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FLEX LOGIX TECHNOLOGIES INC.,

Petitioner

V.

VENKAT KONDA,

Patent Owner

Case IPR2020-00261

Patent 8,269,523 B2

PATENT OWNER'S CONTINGENT MOTION TO AMEND

UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.121

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUESTED.....	1
II.	BACKGROUND.....	4
A.	The '523 Patent.....	5
III.	PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO PETITIONER'S CHALLENGES.....	5
A.	Contingency.....	6
IV.	COMPLIANCE WITH STATUTORY AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS.....	7
A.	The Proposed Contingent Amendments Include A Reasonable Number Of Substitute Claims.....	7
B.	The Contingent Substitute Claims Do Not Enlarge The Scope Of The Claims Or Introduce New Subject Matter.....	8
C.	The Proposed Contingent Amendments Respond To A Ground Of Unpatentability Alleged By The Petitioner.....	8
D.	Explanation Of Contingent Substitute Claims And Support In The Original Disclosure And Earlier-Filed Disclosure.....	9
V.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	16
VI.	PATENTABILITY OF THE CONTINGENT SUBSTITUTE CLAIMS	17
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	18
	APPENDIX OF CONTINGENT SUBSTITUTE CLAIMS.....	1

I. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUESTED

Prior to filing this motion, Patent Owner Venkat Konda (“Patent Owner”) complied with 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(a) by sending an email requesting a conference call with the Board. In response, the Board issued an Order stating: “Based on the information provided by Patent Owner, we determine that a conference call is not necessary, and the conference requirement is deemed satisfied.” (Paper 33)

In the Order, the Board directed the parties to the Board's order in *Lectrosonics, Inc. v. Zaxcom, Inc.*, Case IPR2018-01129, Paper 15 (PTAB Feb. 25, 2019) (precedential), *Amazon.com Inc. v. Uniloc Luxembourg S.A.*, IPR2017-00948, Paper 34 (PTAB Jan. 18, 2019) (precedential), and the Office's November 2019 Consolidated Trial Practice Guide, which provide information and guidance on motions to amend, and to the *Notice Regarding a New Pilot Program Concerning Motion to Amend Practice and Procedures in Trial Proceedings under the America Invents Act before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board*, 84 Fed. Reg. 9497 (Mar. 15, 2019). Accordingly, Patent Owner is submitting this paper by following those directions.

Patent Owner respectfully files this Contingent Motion to Amend under 37 C.F.R. § 42.121 and requests that new claims 49-96 be treated as a contingent substitution for claims 1-48. See *Lectrosonics*, Paper 15 at 3. Consequently, this

Contingent Motion to Amend is contingent upon a finding in a final written decision by the Board that the challenged claims 1-48 are unpatentable. Therefore, this Motion to Amend under 37 C.F.R. § 42.121 is made on a contingent basis and is made in addition to Patent Owners' Response under 37 C.F.R. § 42.120, which is filed concurrently.

Patent Owner also respectfully requests preliminary guidance from the Board concerning this Motion, in accordance with the New Pilot Program Concerning Motion to Amend Practice. *See* 84 Fed. Reg. 9,497 (Mar. 15, 2019).

This Contingent Motion to Amend includes proposed substitute claims in place of the previously presented substitute claims and includes amendments and arguments. This Motion satisfies the requirements for a Contingent Motion to Amend. Claims 2-7, and 11 (the "Challenged Claims") are the challenged claims of U.S. Patent No. 8,269,523 (Ex. 1001, "the '523 Patent") in the Petition¹ filed by

¹ In addition to this IPR, the Board instituted another IPR2020-00260 filed by the same Petitioner concurrently on the '523 Patent. Patent Owner indicates to the Board that he intends to move for the same contingent amendments to the claims in both proceedings. Accordingly, the same contingent claims are submitted in both the proceedings, i.e. IPR2020-00260 and IPR2020-00261.

Flex Logix Technologies Inc. (“Flex Logix” or “Petitioner”) on December 16, 2019 Paper 1 (“Petition”). Claim 1 is the only independent claim in the ‘523 Patent and Claims 2–48 are either directly or indirectly dependent on Claim 1.

Patent Owner proposes forty eight substitute claims (numbered 49-96), which are set forth below in the Appendix. Substitute claims 49-96 correspond, respectively, to original claims 1-48 of the ‘523 Patent. Substitute claim 49 is the only independent claim (like original claim 1 of the patent). Remaining substitute claims 50-96 depend, directly or indirectly, from substitute independent claim 49 in the same respective manner that original claims 2-48 depend from claim 1 of the ‘523 Patent.

As a result of this Contingent Motion set forth below, acceptance of all forty-eight proposed substitute claims would result in the cancellation of the forty-eight original claims (claims 1-48). This constitutes a “reasonable number of substitute claims.” 35 U.S.C. § 326(d)(1)(B). Additionally, the substitute claims: (1) do not “enlarge the scope of the claims;” (2) do not “introduce new [subject] matter;” and (3) “respond to [the] ground[s] of unpatentability involved in the trial.” 35 U.S.C. § 326(d)(3); 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(a)(2)(i), (ii). Patent Owner has therefore satisfied his burden of production.

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.