

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 RESPONSE  
TO PETITION PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.120**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION.....1

    A. Procedural Background.....1

    B. Summary of Patent Owner’s Arguments .....1

II. THE ‘086 PATENT .....4

    A. Background Of The Technology At The Time Of The ‘086 Patent.....5

    B. The Inventions Described And Claimed In The ‘086 Patent.....7

III. The Proper Constructions of Critical Terms in the Challenged Claims .....14

    A. State Of A Virtual Machine .....15

    B. Backup Program.....18

IV. The VMWARE REFERENCES AND THE SUZAKI REFERENCE DO NOT ANTICIPATE THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS .....20

    A. The VMware References .....20

        1. The VMware References Do Not Disclose A Backup Program.....22

        2. The VMware References Do Not Disclose Capturing “The State Of A Virtual Machine” .....26

        3. The VM References Do Not Disclose Capturing The State While The Virtual Machine Is “Executing” .....30

        4. The VM References Do Not Disclose Creating “A New Log Of Uncommitted Updates” And “A Memory Area” Such That The “Virtual Machine Can Continue Executing” During The Copy Step.....34

        5. VMware GSG Reference Does Not Disclose “copy[ing] at least a portion of the state” To A Separate Destination .....42

    B. Suzaki Does Not Anticipate Claims 1 or 12 .....44

        1. Suzaki Does Not Disclose A Backup Program .....45

- 2. Suzaki Does Not Disclose Capturing “The State of [a] Virtual Machine” .....46
- 3. Suzaki Does Not Disclose Capturing State While A Virtual Machine Is Executing .....50
- V. Petitioner’s Proposed Combination DoES Not Render the Challenged Claims Obvious .....52
  - A. The Suzaki And Wang Papers May Not Be Properly Combined.....52
    - 1. Suzaki’s Disclosure Concerning Check Points is Sufficient.....52
    - 2. One Of Ordinary Skill In The Art Would Not Have Combined Suzaki’s Non-Transactional Operating System With Wang’s Transactional Log  
54
    - 3. Combining Suzaki With Wang Is Improper Because It Would Require A Substantial Modification of Suzaki’s OS.....55
  - B. The Proposed Combination Lacks Material Limitations.....57
- VI. CONCLUSION .....60

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**CASES**

	<b>Page</b>
<i>Becton, Dickinson &amp; Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Group, LP</i> , 616 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	44
<i>In re Dembiczak</i> , 175 F.3d 994, 998-1001 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....	53
<i>In re Fine</i> , 837 F.2d 1071, 1075 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	53
<i>Gaus v. Conair Corp.</i> , 363 F.3d 1284 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	44
<i>In re Ratti</i> , 46 C.C.P.A. 976, 270 F.2d 810 (CCPA 1959).....	56

**STATUTES AND RULES**

M.P.E.P. §2143.01 .....	57
-------------------------	----

**LIST OF EXHIBITS**

Symantec Exhibit No.	Document Description
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, 2016
Symantec 2005	Symantec Corp. v. Veeam Software Corp., Civil Action No. 3:12cv700 (Dkt. 105), Claim Construction Order, dated March 8, 2013
Symantec 2006	Patent Owner's Objections to Petitioner's Evidence Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1)
Symantec 2007	Declaration of Daniel Block, dated September 5, 2013
Symantec 2008	Patent Owner's Objections to Petitioner's Supplemental Evidence Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1)
Symantec 2009	Email requesting permission to file motion to amend, dated October 21, 2013
Symantec 2010	Internet Archive webpage titled "Download VMware Products" captured from VMware website, dated June 23, 2001
Symantec 2011	Internet Archive webpage titled "Download VMware Products" captured from VMware website, dated June 23, 2001
Symantec 2012	Internet Archive webpage titled "VMware Server Products Ordering Information" captured from VMware website, dated October 7, 2001
Symantec 2013	Internet Archive webpage titled "Evaluate VMware ESX Servicer" captured from VMware website, dated June 8, 2001
Symantec 2014	Garmin Int'l, Inc. et al. v. Cuozzo Speed Tech. LLC, IPR2012-00001, No. 26 (Mar. 5, 2013), Decision

# 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.