

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

NETNUT LTD.,

Petitioner

v.

BRIGHT DATA LTD.,

Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2021-01492

Patent No. 10,257,319

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE  
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|      |  |    |
|------|--|----|
| I.   | INTRODUCTION .....   | 7  |
| II.  | FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....  | 10 |
|      | A. DISTRICT COURT PROCEEDINGS.....   | 11 |
|      | 1. TESO LITIGATION .....   | 11 |
|      | 2. TEFINCOM LITIGATION.....  | 12 |
|      | 3. NETNUT LITIGATION .....   | 14 |
|      | B. PATENT OFFICE PROCEEDINGS .....   | 15 |
|      | 1. CODE200/TESO IPRS .....   | 15 |
|      | 2. TESO LT, UAB REEXAMS .....  | 17 |
| III. | THE BOARD SHOULD EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION AND DENY<br>INSTITUTION PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).....   | 17 |
|      | A. ANALYSIS OF THE <i>FINTIV</i> FACTORS.....  | 18 |
|      | 1. <i>FINTIV</i> FACTOR 1 FAVORS DENIAL .....  | 19 |
|      | 2. <i>FINTIV</i> FACTOR 2 FAVORS DENIAL .....  | 20 |
|      | 3. <i>FINTIV</i> FACTOR 3 FAVORS DENIAL .....  | 22 |
|      | 4. <i>FINTIV</i> FACTOR 4 FAVORS DENIAL .....  | 29 |
|      | 5. <i>FINTIV</i> FACTOR 5 FAVORS DENIAL .....  | 30 |
|      | 6. <i>FINTIV</i> FACTOR 6 FAVORS DENIAL .....  | 33 |
|      | 7. BALANCING THE <i>FINTIV</i> FACTORS .....   | 40 |
|      | B. ANALYSIS OF THE GENERAL PLASTIC FACTORS .....   | 41 |
| IV.  | OVERVIEW – THE ‘319 PATENT DISCLOSES AND CLAIMS<br>METHODS THAT ARE NOT TAUGHT OR SUGGESTED BY ANY OF THE<br>PRIOR ART ADVANCED BY PETITIONER..... | 43 |
|      | A. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS .....   | 46 |
|      | B. PRIORITY DATE .....   | 46 |
|      | C. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....   | 46 |
|      | D. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....  | 48 |
| V.   | THE PRIMARY PRIOR ART REFERENCES .....   | 52 |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| A. CROWDS .....                                    | 53 |
| B. BORDER .....                                    | 55 |
| C. MORPHMIX .....                                  | 58 |
| VI. THE FAILED GROUNDS OF ALLEGED INVALIDITY ..... | 61 |
| A. FAILURE OF CROWDS (GROUNDS 1 AND 2) .....       | 61 |
| B. FAILURE OF BORDER (GROUNDS 3 AND 4) .....       | 64 |
| C. FAILURE OF MORPHMIX (GROUNDS 5 AND 6) .....     | 66 |
| VII. CONCLUSION .....                              | 68 |

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

|   |        |
|---|--------|
| <i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB March 20, 2020)(precedential).....                                     | passim |
| <i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 15 at 11 (PTAB May 13, 2020)(informative).....                                 | 21     |
| <i>Boxcast Inc., v. Resi Media LLC, et al.</i> , Case No. 2:21-cv-00217-JRG, Dkt. 55 at 2 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 1, 2021).....                 | 19     |
| <i>Canon Inc. v. Optimum Imaging Technologies LLC</i> , IPR2020-01321, Paper 10 at 6 (PTAB March 1, 2021) .....                         | 23     |
| <i>General Plastic Industrial Co., Ltd. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , IPR2016-01357, Paper 19 (PTAB Sept. 6, 2017)(precedential)..... | 41     |
| <i>Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech, Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1356, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....   | 17     |
| <i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398, 421, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 167 L. Ed. 2d 705 (2007).....                              | 34     |
| <i>NHK Spring Co. v. Intri-Plex Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00752, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2018)(precedential) .....                     | 31     |
| <i>Oyster Optics, LLC v. Infinera Corp., et al.</i> , Case No. 2:19-cv-00257-JRG, Dkt. 87 at 5 (E.D. Tex. July 17, 2020).....           | 20     |
| <i>Sotera Wireless, Inc. v. Masimo Corp.</i> , IPR2020-01019, Paper 12 (PTAB Dec. 1, 2020) .....  | 30     |
| <i>Supercell Oy, v. Gree, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00310, Paper 13 at 8-9 (PTAB June 18, 2020) .....  | 32     |

### Statutes

|                             |        |
|-----------------------------|--------|
| 35 U.S.C. § 314(a) .....    | 17     |
| 35 U.S.C. § 314(b)(1).....  | 19, 21 |
| 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11)..... | 21     |

### Other Authorities

|  |   |
|--|---|
| U.S.P.T.O. Trial Practice Guide, November 2019 Update..... | 7 |
|--|---|

### Rules

|                            |    |
|----------------------------|----|
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.108(a)..... | 17 |
|----------------------------|----|

## PATENT OWNER'S LIST OF EXHIBITS

| <b>Exhibit Number</b> | <b>Description</b>  |
|-----------------------|---|
| 2001                  | Jury Verdict (Dkt. 516) in the case of <i>Bright Data Ltd. f/k/a Luminati Networks Ltd. v. Teso LT, UAB a/k/a UAB Teso LT, et al.</i> , Case No. 2:19-cv-00395-JRG (E.D. Tex. Nov. 5, 2021)   |
| 2002                  | Plaintiff Bright Data Ltd.'s Disclosure of Proposed Claim Terms for Construction, dated December 8, 2021, in the case of <i>Bright Data Ltd. v. NetNut Ltd.</i> , Case No. 2:21-cv-00225-JRG (E.D. Tex.)  |
| 2003                  | Docket Control Order (Dkt. 56) in the case of <i>Bright Data Ltd. v. NetNut Ltd.</i> , Case No. 2:21-cv-00225-JRG (E.D. Tex. Oct. 22, 2021)   |
| 2004                  | Order on Pretrial Motions and Motions <i>in Limine</i> (Dkt. 476) in the case of <i>Bright Data Ltd. f/k/a Luminati Networks Ltd. v. Teso LT, UAB a/k/a UAB Teso LT, et al.</i> , Case No. 2:19-cv-00395-JRG (E.D. Tex. Sept. 9, 2021)            |
| 2005                  | Applicant Remarks, dated October 18, 2018, regarding Application No. 15/957,945 which issued as Patent No. 10,257,319 (previously submitted in IPR2020-01266 as EX. 2008)   |
| 2006                  | Declaration of Dr. V. Thomas Rhyne Declaration (previously submitted in IPR2020-01266 as EX. 2012)  |
| 2007                  | Plaintiff's Sur-reply in opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. 47) in the case of <i>Bright Data Ltd. f/k/a Luminati Networks Ltd. v. Teso LT, UAB a/k/a UAB Teso LT, et al.</i> , Case No. 2:19-cv-00395-JRG (E.D. Tex. May 5, 2020) |
| 2008                  | Order (Dkt. 55) in the case of <i>Boxcast Inc., v. Resi Media LLC, et al.</i> , Case No. 2:21-cv-00217-JRG (E.D. Tex. Dec. 1, 2021)   |

# 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.