

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MICROSOFT CORPORATION and HP INC.,
Petitioners

v.

SYNKLOUD TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2021-00175
U.S. Patent 7,870,225

SynKloud Technologies, LLC's Patent Owner Preliminary Response Pursuant
To 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND 4

A. Prior Art Storage Systems..... 4

B. The '225 Patent: Mr. Han-Gyoo Kim Invents A Disk System Directly Attached to a Network And Recognized As A Local Disk To A Host. 5

III. PETITIONERS' PROPOSED GROUNDS FOR REVIEW 7

IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION. 8

a. virtual host bus adapter (independent claim 1). 10

b. enumerating NAD that are available over the network (independent claim 1). 12

V. THE PETITIONERS FAILED TO DEMONSTRATE THEY ARE REASONABLY LIKELY TO PREVAIL ON ANY OF THEIR PROPOSED UNPATENABILITY GROUNDS AGAINST ANY CLAIM. 15

A. The Petitioners Failed To Show That Any Claim Of The '225 Patent Is Anticipated By Jewett. 16

1. Jewett Does Not Disclose A “virtual host bus adapter,” As Recited in Independent Claim 1. 16

i. Jewett’s Host Drivers..... 17

2. Jewett Does Not Disclose A “device driver ... creating a virtual host bus adapter,” As Recited in Independent Claim 1..... 19

3. Jewett Does Not Disclose “the virtual host bus adapter controlling the NAD in a way indistinguishable from the way as a physical host bus adapter device controls device so that the host recognizes the NAD,” As Recited in Independent Claim 1..... 21

4. Jewett Does Not Disclose A “device driver enumerating NAD that are available over the network, not directly attached to the host internal system bus,” As Recited in Independent Claim 1..... 22

B. The Petitioners Failed To Show That Any Claim Of The '225 Patent Would Have Been Obvious..... 24

1. Petitioners Failed To Show That Any Claim Of The '225 Patent Would Have Been Obvious Over Jewett Alone. 27

2.	Petitioners Failed To Show That Claim 1 Of The '225 Patent Would Have Been Obvious Over Jewett In Combination With The Secondary References.....	29
3.	Petitioners Failed To Show That Dependent Claims 2-4 and 13-22 Of The '225 Patent Would Have Been Obvious Over Jewett In Combination With The Secondary References.....	34
4.	Petitioners Failed To Show That Dependent Claim 14 Would Have Been Obvious.....	35
C.	The Petitioners Failed To Set Forth A Proper Obviousness Analysis	36
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	38

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
<u>CASES</u>	
<i>Catalina Mktg. Int’l, Inc. v. Coolsavings.com, Inc.</i> 289 F.3d 801 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	9
<i>CCS Fitness Inc. v. Brunswick Corp</i> 288 F.3d 1366, 62 USPQ2d at 1662	8
<i>Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l Graphics, Inc.</i> 809 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	29
<i>Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Applera Corp.</i> 780 F.3d 1149 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	11
<i>Epistar, et al. v. Trustees Of Boston University</i> IPR2013-00298, Paper No. 18 (P.T.A.B. November 15, 2103)	38, 39
<i>In re Geisler</i> 116 F.3d 1465 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	37
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> 383 U.S. 1 (1966)	2, 28, 40
<i>Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.</i> 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	30, 31, 35
<i>Johnson Worldwide Assocs., Inc. v. Zebco Corp.</i> 9 175 F.3d 985 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	9
<i>K-2 Corp. v. Salomon S.A.</i> 191 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	8
<i>Kolbe & Kolbe Millwork Co., Inc. v. Sierra Pacific Industries</i> 2019 WL 5070454 *20 (PTAB 2019)	4, 34

<i>K/S Himpp v. Hear-Wear Techs., LLC</i> 751 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	34, 35, 36
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	2, 28, 36, 37, 40
<i>Liberty Mutual v. Progressive Casualty</i> CBM-2012-00003, Paper No. 7 (P.T.A.B. 2012)	3, 32, 41
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.</i> 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	31, 37
<i>Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. v. Boehringer Ingelheim International GMBH</i> 2017 WL 1052517*1 (PTAB 2017)	29, 34
<i>Nautilus Hyosung Inc. v. Diebold Nixdorf, Inc.</i> 2017 WL 3447870 *8 (PTAB 2017)	30
<i>In re NuVasive</i> 842 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	35
<i>OSRAM Sylvania, Inc. v. Am Induction Techs., Inc.</i> 39 701 F.3d 698, 706 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	2, 29,
<i>In re Paulsen</i> 30 F.3d 1475 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	9
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	8
<i>Pitney Bowes, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> 182 F.3d 1298, 1305 (Fed. Cir. 1999).	9
<i>Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.</i> 868 F.2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1989)	16
<i>SAS Institute v. Iancu</i> 138 S.Ct 1348 (2018)	29

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.