

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CLOUDFLARE, INC. AND SONICWALL INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

SABLE NETWORKS, INC.,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2021-00909
Patent 8,243,593

**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE
TO PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND	4
A. The '593 Patent.....	4
B. References Cited In The Petition.....	8
1. Yung	8
2. Copeland.....	9
3. Four-Steps Whitepaper.....	10
III. DISCLAIMED CLAIMS ARE NOT PART OF THIS PROCEEDING.	11
IV. PETITIONER FAILS TO SHOW BY A PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE THAT THE CLAIMS CHALLENGED IN GROUND 1 ARE OBVIOUS OVER YUNG (CLAIMS 17, 18, 37, 38, GROUND 1).....	12
V. PETITIONER FAILS TO SHOW BY A PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE THAT YUNG IN VIEW OF COPELAND DISCLOSES OR RENDERS OBVIOUS THE CALCULATION OF A BADNESS FACTOR AS CLAIMED (CLAIMS 9-13, 19-24, 29-33, 39-44, GROUND 2).	16
A. Copeland Does Not Disclose The Claimed “Badness Factor” For Each Flow.	16
B. The Petition Does Not Sufficiently Establish A Reason For The POSITA To Have Combined Yung And Copeland As Proposed.....	24
VI. PETITIONER FAILS TO SHOW BY A PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE THAT THE FOUR-STEPS WHITEPAPER WAS PUBLICLY ACCESSIBLE QUALIFIED PRIOR ART (CLAIM 3, GROUND 3).....	28
VII. CONCLUSION.....	45

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

COURT DECISIONS

Blue Calypso, LLC v. Groupon, Inc.,
815 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....30

Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Applera Corp.,
599 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....18

In re Cronyn,
890 F.2d 1158 (Fed. Cir. 1989)..... 30, 31

In re Klopfenstein,
380 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....30

In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd.,
829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....15

PGS Geophysical AS v. Iancu,
891 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....15

Sirona Dental Sys. GMBH v. Institut Straumann AG,
892 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....15

Suffolk Techs., LLC v. AOL Inc.,
752 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....30

Voter Verified, Inc. v. Premier Election Sols., Inc.,
698 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....30

AGENCY DECISIONS

Adobe Sys. Inc. v. Grecia,
IPR2018-00418, Paper 7 (June 21, 2018).....33

<i>Adobe Sys. Inc. v. Grecia</i> , IPR2018-00418, Paper 9 (Sept. 7, 2018)	33
<i>Adobe Sys. Inc. v. Grecia</i> , IPR2018-00419, Paper 9 (Sept. 7, 2018)	31
<i>Asetek Danmark A/S v. CoolIT Sys., Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00747, Paper 42 (PTAB Sept. 30, 2021)	12
<i>Baker Hughes v. LiquidPower Specialty Prods., Inc.</i> , IPR2016-01903, Paper 74 (PTAB Mar. 8, 2019)	12
<i>Celltrion, LLC v. Biogen, Inc.</i> , IPR2017-01230, Paper 10 (Oct 12, 2017)	31
<i>Coal. for Affordable Drugs VIII, LLC v. Trustees of the Univ. of Pa.</i> , IPR2015-01836, Paper 58 (PTAB Mar. 6, 2017)	35
<i>Elec. Frontier Found. v. Pers. Audio, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00070, Paper 21 (April 18, 2014)	41
<i>Facebook, Inc. v. Sound View Innovations, LLC</i> , IPR2017-00985, Paper 17 (Sep. 5, 2017), <i>reh'g denied</i> , Paper 30, 10 (PTAB Oct. 19, 2017)	18
<i>Google LLC v. IPA Techs. Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00384, Paper 11 (July 3, 2018)	31, 32, 33, 40
<i>Gracernote, Inc. v. Iceberg Indus. LLC</i> , IPR2013-00551, Paper 6 (Feb. 28, 2014)	29
<i>IBM Corp. v. Rigetti & Co., Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00494, Paper 13 (Aug. 11, 2020)	15
<i>Intel Corp. v. Parkervision, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-01302, Paper 35 (PTAB Jan. 21, 2022)	12
<i>Intel Corp. v. VLSI Tech. LLC</i> , IPR2018-01040, Paper 36 (PTAB Feb. 12, 2020)	12
<i>Kinetic Techs., Inc. v. Skyworks Sols., Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00529, Paper 8 (Sept. 23, 2014)	20

Kingston Tech. Co., Inc. v. Memory Techs., LLC,
IPR2019-00654, Paper 9 (Aug. 13, 2019) 31, 32

Laird Techs., Inc. v. A.K. Stamping Co. Inc.,
IPR2017-02038, Paper 6 (Mar. 14, 2018)..... 34, 35

OpenSky Indus., LLC v. VLSI Techn. LLC,
IPR2021-01064, Paper 17 (Dec. 23, 2021).....36

Power Integrations, Inc. v. Semiconductor Components Indus., LLC,
IPR2017-01975, Paper 9 (Mar. 12, 2018).....42

Schlumberger Tech. Corp. v. Integrated Drive Sys. LLC,
IPR2018-00603, Paper 40 (PTAB Sept. 3, 2019)..... 29, 41

Shenzhen Zhiyi Tech. Co. v. iRobot Corp.,
IPR2017-02133, Paper 8 (Mar. 28, 2018)..... 34, 39

Unified Patents Inc. v. Uniloc 2017 LLC,
IPR2019-00480, Paper 10 (Aug. 16, 2019)20

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 102(e)11

35 U.S.C. § 253(a)11

35 U.S.C. § 311(b)29

35 U.S.C. § 316(e)29

REGULATIONS

37 C.F.R. § 1.321(a).....11

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4).....19

37 C.F.R. § 42.107(e).....11

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.