
**In the
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

**CODE200, UAB; TESO LT, UAB; METACLUSTER LT, UAB;
OXYSALES, UAB; AND CORETECH LT, UAB ~~NetNut Ltd.~~**

Petitioners, v.

Bright Data Ltd.

Patent Owner.

Case ~~IPR2021-01492~~ IPR2022-00861

U.S. Patent No. 10,257,319

PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW

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

Contents

1	INTRODUCTION	1
2	STATUTORY PREDICATES	<u>23</u>
2.1	Mandatory Notices (37 CFR § 42.8)	<u>23</u>
2.1.1	Real Parties-In-Interest	<u>23</u>
2.1.2	Related Matters	<u>23</u>
2.1.3	Lead and Backup Counsel	<u>810</u>
2.1.4	Service Information	<u>910</u>
2.2	Other	<u>910</u>
3	DISCRETIONARY CONSIDERATIONS	<u>1012</u>
3.1	<i>Fintiv</i> Factors	11
3.1.1	Factor 1—Existence or likelihood of a stay	11
3.1.2	Factor 2—Proximity of trial date to final written decision	11
3.1.3	Factor 3—Investment in parallel proceedings	11
3.1.4	Factor 4—Overlap in issues raised	11
3.1.5	Factor 5—Whether the parties are the same	12
3.1.6	Factor 6—Other circumstances including the merits	12
3.2	<i>General Plastic</i> Factors	12
3.2.1	Factor 1—Prior petition by same petitioner	12
3.2.2	Factor 2—Petitioner’s prior knowledge of asserted art	13
3.2.3	Factor 3—Petitioner’s prior receipt of preliminary response or	13

	institution decision	13
	3.2.4—Factor 4—Elapsed time since the petitioner learned of the asserted art	14
	3.2.5—Factor 5—Explanation of time elapsed since prior petition	14
	3.2.6—Factor 6—The finite resources of the Board.....	15
	3.2.7—Factor 7—The requirement for a final written decision within a year	15
4	OVERVIEW OF THE '319 PATENT	<u>1512</u>
4.1	Claims	<u>1512</u>
4.2	Specification.....	<u>1714</u>
4.3	Priority Date	<u>2017</u>
5	LEVEL OF SKILL IN THE ART	<u>2017</u>
6	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	<u>2118</u>
7	OVERVIEW OF CITED ART	<u>2623</u>
7.1	Crowds	<u>2623</u>
7.2	MorphMix	<u>2623</u>
7.3	Border.....	<u>2724</u>
7.4	RFCs.....	<u>2724</u>
8	GROUNDS FOR INVALIDITY	<u>2825</u>
8.1	GROUND 1: ANTICIPATION OF CLAIMS 1, 19, and 21-29 BY CROWDS	<u>2825</u>

8.1.1	Claim 1	<u>2926</u>
8.1.2	Claims 19, and 28-29 (corresponding recorded media, downloading, and device)	<u>3735</u>
8.1.3	Claims 21-22 and 24-25 (communications via TCP) .	<u>3735</u>
8.1.4	Claim 23 (running a browser)	<u>3836</u>
8.1.5	Claim 26 (client O/S)	<u>3836</u>
8.1.6	Claim 27 (sequential execution).....	<u>3937</u>
8.2	GROUND 2: OBVIOUSNESS OF CLAIMS 1-2, 14-15, 17- 19, and 21-29 OVER CROWDS + RFC 2616 + GENERAL KNOWLEDGE	<u>3937</u>
8.2.1	Claim 1	<u>4038</u>
8.2.2	Claim 2 (client device identifies itself on startup)	<u>4140</u>
8.2.3	Claims 14-15 (validity check)	<u>4240</u>
8.2.4	Claims 17-18 (periodically communicating)	<u>4341</u>
8.2.5	Claims 19 and 21-29	<u>4342</u>
8.3	GROUND 3: ANTICIPATION OF CLAIMS 1, 12, 14, 21-22, 24-25, AND 27-29 BY BORDER	<u>4442</u>
8.3.1	Claim 1	<u>4645</u>
8.3.2	Claim 12 (storing the received content).....	<u>5251</u>
8.3.3	Claim 14 (validity check).....	<u>5251</u>
8.3.4	Claims 21-22 and 24-25 (communications via TCP) .	<u>5352</u>
8.3.5	Claim 27 (sequential execution).....	<u>5352</u>
8.3.6	Claims 28-29 (corresponding recorded media and device)	<u>5453</u>

8.4	GROUND 4: OBVIOUSNESS OF CLAIMS 1, 12, 14-15, 17-19, 21-22, 24-25, and 27-29 OVER BORDER + RFC 2616 + GENERAL KNOWLEDGE	<u>5554</u>
8.4.1	Claim 1	<u>5655</u>
8.4.2	Claim 15 (validity check, RFC 2616)	<u>5756</u>
8.4.3	Claims 17-18 (periodically communicating)	57
8.4.4	Claim 19 (downloading software application).....	58
8.4.5	Claims 12, 14, 21-22, 24-25, and 27-29.....	<u>5958</u>
8.5	GROUND 5: ANTICIPATION OF CLAIMS 1, 17, 19, and 21-29 BY MORPHMIX.....	<u>5958</u>
8.5.1	Claim 1	61
8.5.2	Claim 17 (periodically communicating)	67
8.5.3	Claims 19 and 28-29 (corresponding recorded media, downloading, and device)	69
8.5.4	Claim 23 (web-page and browser)	69
8.5.5	Claims 21-22 and 24-25 (communications via TCP) . . .	69
8.5.6	Claim 26 (client O/S)	70
8.5.7	Claim 27 (sequential execution).....	<u>7071</u>
8.6	GROUND 6: OBVIOUSNESS OF CLAIMS 1-2, 14-15, 17- 19, 21-29 OVER MORPHMIX + RFC 2616 + GENERAL KNOWLEDGE	71
8.6.1	Claim 1	<u>7172</u>
8.6.2	Claim 2 (client device identifies itself at startup)	<u>7373</u>

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.