

Filed on behalf of Symantec Corporation

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

VEEAM SOFTWARE CORPORATION  
Petitioner

v.

SYMANTEC CORPORATION  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2013-00150  
U.S. Patent No. 7,093,086

---

**PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE  
TO PETITION PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. THE ‘086 PATENT AND ALLEGED PRIOR ART ..... 2

III. PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO SHOW THAT THE NON-PATENT REFERENCES ARE PRINTED PUBLICATIONS ..... 4

    A. Petitioner Fails To Show That The VMware Guide Is A Printed Publication ..... 7

    B. Petitioner Fails To Show That The VMware Manual Is A Printed Publication ..... 7

    C. Petitioner Fails To Show That The Suzuki Paper Is A Printed Publication ..... 9

    D. Petitioner Fails To Show That The Wang Paper Is A Printed Publication ..... 9

IV. THE PROPER CONSTRUCTIONS OF CRITICAL TERMS IN THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ..... 10

    A. The Proper Construction Of “file” ..... 11

    B. The Proper Construction Of “a state of [a] virtual machine” ..... 14

    C. The Proper Construction Of “copy[ing] at least a portion of the state to a destination separate from a storage device to which the first virtual machine is suspendable” ..... 16

V. THE REFERENCES RELIED ON BY PETITIONER DO NOT DISCLOSE MATERIAL LIMITATIONS REQUIRED BY THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ..... 23

    A. Lim Lacks Material Limitations And Does Not Anticipate Claims 1, 11, 12, Or 22 ..... 23

    B. The VMware Manual And VMware Guide Both Lack Material Limitations And Do Not Anticipate Claims 1, 11, 12, Or 22 ..... 27

    C. The Suzuki Paper Lacks Material Limitations And Does Not

Anticipate Claims 1 Or 12 .....	38
D. Hipp Lacks Material Limitations And Does Not Anticipate Claims 1, 11, 12, Or 22 .....	41
E. Hipp Lacks Material Limitations Required By Claims 1 And 12 .....	41
F. Hipp Lacks Material Limitations Required By Claims 11 And 22 ....	44
VI. PETITIONER’S PROPOSED COMBINATIONS DO NOT RENDER THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OBVIOUS .....	45
A. The Suzuki And Wang Papers May Not Be Properly Combined .....	46
B. The Alleged Suzuki Paper And Wang Paper Combination Still Lacks Material Limitations And Does Not Render Obvious Claims 11 Or 22.....	47
C. The Suzuki Paper And Hipp May Not Be Properly Combined .....	48
D. The Alleged Suzuki Paper And Hipp Combination Still Lacks Material Limitations And Does Not Render Obvious Claims 11 Or 22.....	49
VII. CONCLUSION.....	51

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### CASES

<i>CNET Networks, Inc. v. Etilize, Inc.</i> , 584 F. Supp. 2d 1260 (N.D. Cal. 2008).....	6
<i>Carella v. Starlight Archery and Pro Line Co.</i> , 804 F.2d 135 (Fed. Cir. 1986), <i>amended on reh'g</i> , 1 USPQ2d 1209 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	10
<i>Graham et al. v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	45
<i>In re Lister</i> , 583 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	5, 6
<i>Mannesmann Demag Corp. v. Engineered Metal Products Co., Inc.</i> , 605 F. Supp. 1362 (D. Del. 1985), <i>aff'd</i> , 793 F.2d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	6
<i>Neutrino Dev't Corp. v. Sonosite Inc.</i> , 337 F. Supp. 2d 942 (S.D. Tex. 2004), <i>aff'd</i> , 210 Fed. Appx. 991 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	6
<i>Synopsys, Inc. v. Mentor Graphics Corporation</i> , 2012-00042, Paper No. 16, at 36 (PTAB Feb. 22, 2013).....	4, 6, 11
<i>Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.</i> , 295 F.3d 1292 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	26

### FEDERAL STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 311(b).....	4, 8
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3).....	10

## LIST OF EXHIBITS

<u>Symantec Exhibit No.</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
Symantec 2001	Office Action, dated April 11, 2005
Symantec 2002	Appeal Brief, dated July 19, 2005
Symantec 2003	Response to Office Action, dated November 14, 2005
Symantec 2004	Supplemental Notice of Allowability, dated July 6, 2006
Symantec 2005	<i>Symantec Corp. v. Veeam Software Corp.</i> , Civil Action No. 3:12cv700 (Dkt. 105), Claim Construction Order, dated March 8, 2013

# 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.