

1 Brian A.E. Smith (SBN 188147)
 Alden KW Lee (SBN 257973)
 2 Jeffrey D. Chen (SBN 267837)
 3 Joseph J. Fraresso (SBN 289228)
 BARTZO ZANKEL BUNZEL & MILLER
 4 One Embarcadero Center, Suite 800
 San Francisco, CA 94111
 5 Telephone: (415) 956-1900
 bsmith@bzbm.com
 6 alee@bzbm.com
 7 jchen@bzbm.com
 jfraresso@bzbm.com

8
 9 Attorneys for Plaintiff
 Packet Intelligence LLC

10 [Additional counsel listed on signature page]

11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 12 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
 13 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

14 PACKET INTELLIGENCE LLC,

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC.,

18 Defendant.

Case No. 3:19-cv-04741-WHO

**PLAINTIFF PACKET INTELLIGENCE
 LLC'S REPLY CONSTRUCTION BRIEF**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. DISPUTED TERMS FOR CONSTRUCTION 2

 A. *“conversational flow” / “conversational flow-sequence”* 2

 B. *“flow-entry database”* 5

 C. *“the flow” / “new flow” / “existing flow”* 7

 D. *“base protocol”* 8

 E. *“slicer”* 9

 F. *“a protocol/state identification mechanism coupled to the state patterns/operations memory and to the lookup engine, the protocol/state identification engine configured to determine the protocol and state of the conversational flow of the packet”* 10

 G. *“claim preambles”* 12

III. CONCLUSION 14

Table of Authorities

Cases

1

2

3 *Allen Eng'g Corp. v. Bartell Indus., Inc.*,
299 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2002)..... 13

4 *Amgen, Inc. v. F. Hoffmann-LaRoche Ltd.*,
494 F. Supp. 2d 54 (D. Mass. 2007) 7

5 *Applied Materials, Inc. v. Advanced Semiconductor Materials America, Inc.*,
98 F.3d 1563 (Fed. Cir. 1996)..... 12, 14

6 *Aspex Eyewear, Inc. v. Marchon Eyewear, Inc.*,
672 F.3d 1335 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 13

7 *Catalina Mktg. Int'l, Inc. v. Coolsav-ings.com, Inc.*,
289 F.3d 801 (Fed. Cir. 2002)..... 14

8 *Cochlear Bone Anchored Sols. AB v. Oticon Med. AB*,
958 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2020)..... 12, 13

9 *Deere & Co. v. Bush Hog, LLC*,
703 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 12, 14

10 *Innova/Pure Water, Inc. v. Safari Water Filtration Sys., Inc.*,
381 F.3d 1111 (Fed. Cir. 2004)..... 13, 14

11 *Key Pharm. v. Hercon Labs. Corp.*,
161 F.3d 709 (Fed. Cir. 1998)..... 7

12 *Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.*,
517 U.S. 370 (1996)..... 1, 6

13 *Packet Intelligence LLC v. NetScout Sys., Inc.*,
No. 2019-2041 (Fed. Cir. July 14, 2020)..... 1, 6, 7

14 *Pass & Seymour, Inc. v. Hubbell Inc.*,
2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1135 (N.D.N.Y. Jan 5, 2011)..... 7

15 *Rambus Inc. v. Hynix Semiconductor Inc.*,
569 F. Supp. 2d 946 (N.D. Cal. 2008) 7

16 *Rowe v. Dror*,
112 F.3d 473 (Fed. Cir. 1997)..... 14

17 *TomTom, Inc. v. Adolph*,
790 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... 13

18 *U.S. Surgical Corp. v. Ethicon, Inc.*,
103 F.3d 1554 (Fed. Cir. 1997)..... 8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Last week, the Federal Circuit issued its opinion in *Packet Intelligence LLC v. NetScout*
3 *Systems, Inc., et al.*, No. 2019-2041 (Fed. Cir. July 14, 2020), addressing these disputed terms. The
4 Court: (1) affirmed the jury verdict of willful infringement; (2) affirmed the validity of the asserted
5 claims under §§ 101, 102(a), and 102(f); and (3) affirmed all damages-related findings other than
6 pre-suit damages.

7 The Court described the inventions of the patents-in-suit¹ as follows:

8 [The asserted patents] teach a method for monitoring packets exchanged over a
9 computer network. A stream of packets between two computers is called a
10 connection flow. '789 patent col. 2 ll. 43–45. Monitoring connection flows cannot
11 account for disjointed sequences of the same flow in a network. *Id.* col. 3 ll. 56–59.
12 The specifications explain that it is more useful to identify and classify
13 “conversational flows,” defined as “the sequence of packets that are exchanged in
14 any direction as a result of an activity.” *Id.* col. 2 ll. 45–47. Conversational flows
15 provide application-specific views of network traffic and can be used to generate
16 helpful analytics to understand network load and usage. *See* '751 patent col. 3 l. 2–
17 col. 4 l. 11.

18 *Packet Intelligence LLC v. NetScout Sys., Inc.*, No. 2019-2041, slip op. at 3 (Fed. Cir. July 14,
19 2020) [hereinafter *NetScout Appeal*]. In affirming the infringement verdict, the Court addressed the
20 following term from representative claim 19 of the '789 Patent: “a memory for storing a database
21 comprising none or more flow-entries for previously encountered conversational flows, each flow-
22 entry identified by identifying information stored in the flow entry.” *See id.* at 8. The Court held
23 that “the claims do not require the joining of connection flows into conversational flows.” *Id.* As
24 detailed below, in so holding, the Court rejected Juniper’s positions for the “flow-entry database”
25 terms as well as the “flow/existing flow/new flow” terms. The Federal Circuit’s holding is binding
26 in this proceeding. *Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.*, 517 U.S. 370, 390-91 (1996)
27 (“[T]reating interpretive issues as purely legal will promote (though it will not guarantee)
28 intrajurisdictional certainty through the application of *stare decisis* . . .”).

¹ The *NetScout* appeal related to the '725, '751, and '789 Patents. However, the parties in this case have not disputed that like terms across the patents warrant like constructions. Thus, the Federal Circuit’s analysis is binding as to terms at issue in this case.

1 **II. DISPUTED TERMS FOR CONSTRUCTION**

2 A. *“conversational flow” / “conversational flow-sequence”*

Claim Term	Packet Intelligence’s Construction	Juniper’s Construction
<p>3 “conversational flow”/ 4 “conversational flow- 5 sequence” 6 7 ’099 claims 1, 5 8 ’725 claims 10, 17 9 ’646 claims 1, 7, 16; 10 ’751 claims 1, 17; 11 ’789 claims 1, 19, 44</p>	<p>the sequence of packets that are exchanged in any direction as a result of an activity—for instance, the running of an application on a server as requested by a client—and where some conversational flows involved more than one connection, and some even involve more than one exchange of packets between a client and server</p>	<p>“The sequence of packets that are exchanged in any direction as a result of specific software program activity, where such packets form multiple connection flows that are linked based on that activity”</p>

12 Juniper argues the “Court should construe this term to differentiate ‘conversational flows’
13 from ‘only connection flows.’” ECF No. 62 at 3 (“Response”). But as Packet Intelligence explained
14 in its opening brief, the patent specification defines both terms. Juniper refuses to accept that “the
15 sequence of packets that are exchanged in any direction as a result of an activity” might include
16 only a single connection. ECF No. 57 at 9 (“Opening”). This is analogous to the idea that while
17 most English words consist of multiple letters, that does not prohibit some letters—alone—from
18 being identified as a word as well, for example: “A” and “I.” Juniper cannot rewrite the
19 specification definitions to its liking. The Court should adopt the express specification definition,
20 which another district court and the PTAB have already adopted.

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.