

Filed on behalf of Petitioner by: _____ Paper No. _____

~~Michael N. Rader, Reg. No. 52,146
Adam R. Wichman, Reg. No. 43,988
Gregory S. Nieberg, Reg. No. 57,063
Marie McKiernan (*pro hac vice* application forthcoming)
WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
600 Atlantic Ave.
Boston, MA 02210-2206
Tel: 617-646-8000
Fax: 617-646-8646~~

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~~ THE DATA COMPANY
TECHNOLOGIES INC.,
Petitioners,

v.

BRIGHT DATA LTD.,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2022-01109TBD
Patent No. 10,257,319

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.1 *et seq.***

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MANDATORY NOTICES.....	xiv
A. Real Party-In-Interest – § 42.8(b)(1).....	xiv
B. Related Matters – § 42.8(b)(2)	xiv
1. United States Patent & Trademark Office	xiv
2. United States Patent Trial and Appeal Board	xiv
3. U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas.....	xv
C. Counsel and Service Information – §§ 42.8(b)(3) and (b)(4)	xvi
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. CERTIFICATION OF STANDING	2
III. UNPATENTABILITY GROUNDS.....	2
IV. OVERVIEW	<u>43</u>
A. Alleged Invention.....	<u>43</u>
B. Challenged Claims	<u>54</u>
C. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	<u>87</u>
D. Prosecution History	<u>98</u>
V. CLAIM INTERPRETATION	<u>98</u>
A. PO’s Litigation Argument Regarding “Client Device”	<u>98</u>
B. District Court Constructions.....	<u>98</u>
VI. GROUND 1: Claims 1, 12-14, 21-27—Anticipated by Plamondon.....	<u>1140</u>
A. Plamondon (Ex. 1010).....	<u>1140</u>
B. Claim 1	<u>1615</u>

1.	Preamble.....	<u>1615</u>
2.	Step 1B.....	<u>1918</u>
3.	Step 1C.....	<u>2019</u>
4.	Step 1D.....	<u>2221</u>
5.	Step 1E.....	<u>2423</u>
C.	Claim 12.....	<u>2625</u>
1.	Element 12A.....	<u>2625</u>
2.	Element 12B.....	<u>2827</u>
D.	Claim 13.....	<u>2827</u>
1.	Element 13A.....	<u>2827</u>
2.	Element 13B.....	<u>2928</u>
E.	Claim 14.....	<u>2928</u>
F.	Claim 21.....	<u>3029</u>
G.	Claim 22.....	<u>3130</u>
H.	Claim 23.....	<u>3130</u>
1.	Element 23A.....	<u>3130</u>
2.	Element 23B.....	<u>3231</u>
I.	Claim 24.....	<u>3231</u>
J.	Claim 25.....	<u>3433</u>
K.	Claim 26.....	<u>3433</u>
L.	Claim 27.....	<u>3433</u>
VII.	GROUND 2: Claims 28-29—Obvious Over Plamondon.....	<u>3635</u>
A.	Claim 28.....	<u>3635</u>
B.	Claim 29.....	<u>3635</u>

VIII.	GROUND 3: Claims 15-17—Obvious Over Plamondon in View of RFC	
	2616	<u>3736</u>
	A. Claim 15	<u>3736</u>
	B. Claim 16	<u>3938</u>
	1. Element 16A	<u>3938</u>
	2. Element 16B.....	<u>4039</u>
	C. Claim 17	<u>4140</u>
IX.	GROUND 4: Claims 17-18—Obvious Over Plamondon in View of RFC	
	1122	<u>4241</u>
	A. Claim 18	<u>4342</u>
	B. Claim 17	<u>4342</u>
X.	GROUND 5: Claim 2—Obvious Over Plamondon in View of IEEE	
	802.11-2007	<u>4443</u>
	A. IEEE 802.11-2007 (Ex. 1022).....	<u>4443</u>
	B. Claim 2	<u>4544</u>
	1. Element 2A	<u>4544</u>
	2. Element 2B.....	<u>4544</u>
XI.	GROUND 6: Claims 2-5, 19-20—Obvious Over Plamondon in View of	
	Price	<u>4645</u>
	A. Price (Ex. 1023).....	<u>4645</u>
	B. Plamondon-Price Combination	<u>4746</u>
	C. Claim 2	<u>4948</u>
	1. Element 2A	<u>4948</u>
	2. Element 2B.....	<u>5049</u>
	D. Claim 3	<u>5251</u>
	E. Claim 4	<u>5352</u>

F.	Claim 5	<u>5453</u>
G.	Claim 19	<u>5554</u>
	1. Element 19A	<u>5554</u>
	2. Element 19B.....	<u>5655</u>
	3. Element 19C.....	<u>5756</u>
H.	Claim 20	<u>5857</u>
XII.	GROUND 7: Claims 6-11—Obvious Over Plamondon in View of Kozat.....	<u>5857</u>
A.	Kozat (Ex. 1024)	<u>5857</u>
B.	Plamondon-Kozat Combination.....	<u>6059</u>
C.	Claim 6	<u>6362</u>
	1. Element 6A1	<u>6362</u>
	2. Element 6A2	<u>6362</u>
	3. Element 6B.....	<u>6463</u>
	4. Element 6C.....	<u>6463</u>
	5. Element 6D	<u>6564</u>
D.	Claim 7	<u>6665</u>
E.	Claim 8	<u>6766</u>
F.	Claim 9	<u>6766</u>
G.	Claim 10	<u>6867</u>
H.	Claim 11	<u>6968</u>
XIII.	NO BASIS EXISTS FOR DISCRETIONARY DENIAL	<u>7069</u>
	A.—Section 314(a): Litigation Involving Unrelated Parties and Different Prior Art Does Not Support Discretionary Denial	<u>7069</u>
	1.—Factors 5 and 4 Strongly Disfavor Discretionary Denial.....	<u>7169</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.