

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CLOUDFLARE, INC. and
SPLUNK INC.,
Petitioners,

v.

SABLE NETWORKS, INC.
Patent Owner.

IPR2021-00909¹
Patent 8,243,593 B2

PETITIONERS' REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

¹ Splunk, Inc., which filed a petition in IPR2022-00228, has been joined as a petitioner in this proceeding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. COPELAND’S “CONCERN INDEX” CONSTITUTES A
“BADNESS FACTOR” AS RECITED IN THE ’593 PATENT.....2

A. Petitioners’ Unrebutted Evidence Establishes That Copeland’s
“Concern Index” Constitutes a “Badness Factor”2

B. There Is No Indefiniteness Argument Before the Board4

C. Copeland’s “Concern Index” Indicates “Undesirable Behavior”7

D. The Claims Do Not Require Calculating a “Badness Factor” for
“Each” Flow8

III. PETITIONERS’ UNREBUTTED EVIDENCE ESTABLISHES
MOTIVATION TO COMBINE YUNG AND COPELAND9

IV. THE FOUR-STEPS WHITEPAPER WAS PUBLICLY
ACCESSIBLE 14

A. Petitioners’ Supplemental Evidence Further Confirms That the
Four-Steps Whitepaper Was Publicly Available18

1. The Four-Steps Whitepaper Was Publicly Accessible Via
the Packeteer Website19

2. The Four-Steps Whitepaper and the Packeteer Website
Were Cited in Prior Art Patents and Publications22

3. The Board Should Not Ignore Petitioners’ Supplemental
Evidence24

B. Patent Owner’s Attorney Declaration Does Not Dispute
Petitioners’ Evidence of Public Accessibility25

V. CLAIMS 17, 18, 37, AND 38 ARE PART OF GROUND 2.....26

VI. CONCLUSION.....29

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Page(s)****Federal Court Cases**

<i>AstraZeneca AB v. Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc.</i> , 19 F.4th 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	7
<i>Blue Calypso, LLC v. Groupon, Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	23
<i>Cochlear Bone Anchored Sols. AB v. Oticon Medical LLC</i> , 958 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	4
<i>Enzo Biochem Inc. v. Applera Corp.</i> , 599 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	5
<i>Everstar Merch. Co. Ltd. v. Willis Elec. Co. Ltd.</i> , No. 2021-1882, 2022 WL 1089909 (Fed. Cir. Apr. 12, 2022).....	16
<i>GoPro, Inc. v. Contour IP Holding LLC</i> , 908 F.3d 690 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	15, 17
<i>Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Mustek Sys., Inc.</i> , 340 F.3d. 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	9
<i>Intel Corp. v. Qualcomm Incorp.</i> , 21 F.4th 801 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	4
<i>Jazz Pharm., Inc. v. Amneal Pharm., LLC</i> , 895 F.3d 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	17, 26
<i>In re Carol. F. Klopfenstein</i> , 380 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	26
<i>KSR Int’l. Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	13
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd.</i> 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	27

<i>Meiresonne v. Google, Inc.</i> , 849 F.3d 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	13
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.</i> , 572 U.S. 898 (2014).....	5
<i>Samsung Elecs. Am., Inc. v. Prisia Eng’g. Corp.</i> , 948 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	4
<i>Sirona Dental Sys. GMBH v. Institut Straumann AG</i> , 892 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2018)	27
<i>SRI Int’l. Inc. v. Internet Sec. Sys., Inc.</i> , 511 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	15
<i>Suffolk Techs., LLC v. AOL Inc.</i> , 752 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	16
<i>Valve Corp. v. Ironburg Inventions Ltd.</i> , 8 F.4th 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	16, 17, 22, 24
<i>VidStream LLC v. Twitter, Inc.</i> , 981 F.3d 1060 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	24

Patent Trial and Appeal Board Decisions

<i>Align Technology v. 3Shape</i> , IPR2020-01087, Paper 38 (PTAB Jan. 19, 2022)	5
<i>Amperex Technology v. LG Chem.</i> , IPR2018-00783, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 19, 2018).....	28
<i>Axonics v. Medtronic</i> , IPR2020-00713, Paper 42 (PTAB Sept. 22, 2021).....	28
<i>Coalition for Affordable Drugs VIII v. Univ. Penn.</i> , IPR2015-01836, Paper 58 (PTAB Mar. 6, 2017)	21, 22
<i>DJI Europe v. Daedalus Blue</i> , IPR2020-01472, Paper 31 (PTAB Feb. 14, 2022).....	5
<i>Dr. Reddy’s Laboratories v. Horizon Pharma USA</i> , IPR2018-00272, Paper 35 (PTAB Mar. 28, 2019)	7

Dr. Reddy’s Laboratories v. Horizon Pharma USA,
IPR2018-00272, Paper 74 (PTAB Sept. 6, 2019).....5

Facebook v. Sound View Innovations,
IPR2017-00985, Paper 17 (PTAB Sept. 5, 2017).....6

Fanduel v. Cg Tech. Dev.,
IPR2017-00902, Paper 45 (PTAB Oct. 4, 2018).....24

Grüenthal v. Antecip Bioventures II,
PGR2018-00092, Paper 24 (PTAB Feb. 24, 2020).....17

IBM v. Rigetti & Co.,
IPR2020-00494, Paper 13 (PTAB Aug. 11, 2020).....28

IBM v. Trusted Knight,
IPR2020-00323, Paper 37 (June 30, 2021).....28

Japan Radio v. Broadcom,
IPR2019-00816, Paper 34 (PTAB Aug. 28, 2020).....22

Netapp v. KOM Software,
IPR2019-00606, Paper 37 (PTAB Sept. 23, 2020).....28

Nippon Suisan Kaisha v. Pronova Biopharma Norge,
PGR2017-00033, Paper 37, and 12 (PTAB Jan. 16, 2019).....28

Schlumberger Technology v. Integrated Drive Systems,
IPR2018-00603, Paper 40 (PTAB Sept. 3, 2019).....22

Target v. Proxicom Wireless,
IPR2020-00904, Paper 11 (PTAB Nov. 10, 2020).....5

Veeam Software v. Symantec,
IPR2013-00142, Paper 11 (PTAB Aug. 7, 2013).....15

Zillow Group v. IBM,
IPR2020-01655, Paper 8 (PTAB Mar. 15, 2021).....5

Federal Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102.....5, 17, 20

35 U.S.C. § 112.....6

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.