

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN
DISTRICT OF TEXAS WACO DIVISION**

**SABLE NETWORKS, INC. AND
SABLE IP, LLC,**

Plaintiffs,

v.

RIVERBED TECHNOLOGY, INC.,

Defendant.

**Civil Action No.
6:21-cv-00175-ADA**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**Sable Networks, Inc. and
Sable IP, LLC,**

Plaintiffs,

v.

Cloudflare, Inc.,

Defendant.

**Civil Action No.
6:21-cv-00261-ADA**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

CLOUDFLARE, INC'S OPENING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF

**CHARHON CALLAHAN
ROBSON & GARZA, PLLC**

STEVEN CALLAHAN
CHRISTOPHER T. BOVENKAMP
ANTHONY M. GARZA
C. LUKE NELSON
JOHN HEUTON

Counsel for Defendant Cloudflare, Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

BACKGROUND 1

 I. The Asserted Patents and Related Proceedings..... 1

 A. U.S. Patent No. 6,954,431 (the “’431 patent”) (Exhibit 1)1

 B. U.S. Patent 6,977,932 (the “’932 patent”) (Exhibit 2)2

 C. U.S. Patent No. 7,012,919 (the “’919 patent”) (Exhibit 3)2

 D. U.S. Patent 8,243,593 (the “’593 patent”) (Exhibit 4)2

 E. Related Proceedings: IPRs and the *Cisco* Action.....3

AGREED CONSTRUCTIONS 3

ARGUMENT..... 4

 II. The ’431 Patent 4

 1. Preamble (19) [CF Term]4

 2. Microflow (1, 10, 11, 16, 18-29) [Sable Term].....5

 3. Based on a characteristic (1, 10) [CF Term]8

 4. Packet discard time (8, 17, 19-22, 24) [Sable Term]9

 5. Means for determining a capacity of a buffer containing a microflow based on a characteristic (10) [CF Term].....11

 6. Weighting factor (16, 19-22, 25, 26) [Sable Term].....13

 7. A delay variation substructure configured to provide a buffer value to dampen jitter in a transmission of the microflow (19) [CF Term]14

 8. Wherein at least of the wherein the packet discard time substructure, the microflow timeout period substructure, the weighting factor substructure, and the delay variation substructure is used to determine a behavior of a microflow (22) [CF Term]15

 9. The predetermined value for the microflow timeout period substructure comprises is less than 32 seconds (29) [CF Term].....16

 III. The ’932 Patent 17

 1. Flow state information (1, 9, 24, 32) [Sable Term].....17

 2. Micro-flow (1, 24, 32) [Sable Term].....20

 3. Tunnel identifier (1, 32) [Sable Term] & Aggregate flow block (1, 6, 9, 10, 24, 25, 26, 29, 32) [CF Term]21

 4. Preamble (9, 24) [CF Term]23

 IV. The ’919 Patent 25

 1. Aggregate flow (25, 26) [CF Term]25

2. Micro-flow (25, 27) [Sable Term].....	27
3. Label switched path(s) (26, 27) [Sable Term].....	27
V. The '593 Patent	28
1. “Undesirable behavior” (1-5, 9, 25, 29) & “Badness factor” (9, 29) [CF Term].....	28
2. Based at least partially upon the set of behavioral statistics (4, 5, 9, 25, 29) [CF Term]	32
CONCLUSION	34

INTRODUCTION

Sable Networks asserts a series of patents that grow out of its predecessor Caspian Network's efforts to improve existing quality of service (QoS) and "flow-based" router technology. Complaint (Dkt. 1) ¶¶ 5-8. According to Sable, Caspian's founder, Larry Roberts, sought to "buil[d] flow-based routers that advanced quality of service and load balancing performance." *See id.* Caspian's patents state that its flow-based routers provide "a previously unavailable degree of quality of service." *See, e.g.*, '431 patent at Abstract. Nonetheless, Caspian's router, the Apeiro, was unsuccessful in the marketplace and by 2008, Caspian sold its assets to Sable Networks. Complaint ¶¶ 6-9.

Sable now asserts patents related to its approaches to QoS and flow-based router technology against companies like Cloudflare that do not manufacture routers and use very different techniques and products in their networks. To do so, Sable stretches the asserted claims well beyond the scope of the technology it purports to have invented including flip-flopping on the meaning of terms from one litigation or proceeding to the next. Accordingly, Cloudflare respectfully requests that the Court reject Sable's proposals and instead adopt Cloudflare's proposed constructions, which match the alleged inventions described in Sable's patents.

BACKGROUND

I. The Asserted Patents and Related Proceedings

A. U.S. Patent No. 6,954,431 (the "'431 patent") (Exhibit 1¹)

The '431 patent, entitled "Micro-Flow Management," describes one aspect of Caspian's flow-based routing technology. It is directed to providing the ability to give quality of service (QoS) guarantees for data transmissions through the use of "microflows" and "QoS associated

¹ All numbered exhibits hereto are attached to the Declaration of C. Luke Nelson.

with each microflow that is characterized by a set of descriptors.” *See* ’431 patent at Abstract. “These descriptors are communicated to each switch by the first packet of the micro-flow associated with the descriptors.” *Id.* The claims of the ’431 patent do not match its specification, and Cloudflare has moved to invalidate the ’431 patent based on its lack of written description.

B. U.S. Patent 6,977,932 (the “’932 patent”) (Exhibit 2)

The ’932 patent is directed to solving QoS-related problems in conventional MPLS networks and describes “network tunneling . . . utilizing flow state information.” *See* ’932 patent at Abstract. The ’932 patent further describes “an aggregate flow block that includes tunnel specific information for the selected network tunnel” and “the aggregate flow block further include[ing]statistics for the selected network tunnel.” *Id.*

C. U.S. Patent No. 7,012,919 (the “’919 patent”) (Exhibit 3)

The ’919 patent, which is related to and builds on the concepts described in the ’431 Patent,² describes another aspect of Caspian’s flow-based routing technology—aggregating microflows using “intelligent load balancing” in MPLS networks. *See* ’919 patent at Abstract. More specifically, the ’919 Patent describes a method of routing micro-flows among “a set of label switched paths (LSPs) [that] is defined for a [MPLS] network domain.” *See id.*

D. U.S. Patent 8,243,593 (the “’593 patent”) (Exhibit 4)

The ’593 Patent describes a Caspian solution to a problem of its time—the “advent of file sharing applications such as KaZaA, Gnutella, BearShare, and Winny” and peer-to-peer (P2P) traffic. *See* ’593 patent at 1:7-10. Because P2P protocols were increasing in sophistication, the

² Both the ’919 Patent and the ’431 Patent claim priority to Application No. 09/552,278 (the “’278 application”), which issued as U.S. Pat. No. 6,574,195 (the “’195 Patent”). The ’919 patent issued from a continuation-in-part of the ’278 application, which added new subject matter and four additional named co-inventors.

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.