

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
\_\_\_\_\_  
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD  
\_\_\_\_\_

AVOCENT HUNTSVILLE CORPORATION and  
LIEBERT CORPORATION,  
Petitioner,

v.

CYBER SWITCHING PATENTS, LLC,  
Patent Owner.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Case IPR2015-00690  
Case IPR2015-00725<sup>1</sup>  
Patent 7,550,870 B2  
\_\_\_\_\_

Before MICHAEL R. ZECHER, GLENN J. PERRY, and  
NEIL T. POWELL, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

PERRY, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON MOTIONS  
Denying Avocent's Motion to Submit Supplemental Information  
Denying Avocent's Motion to Compel Testimony  
*37 C.F.R. § 42.123(a); 37 C.F.R. § 42.52(a)*

\_\_\_\_\_  
<sup>1</sup> This Decision applies to both captioned *inter partes* reviews. We exercise our discretion to issue one Decision to be filed in each case. The parties are not authorized to use this style heading for any subsequent papers. For convenience, only the Motions filed in IPR2015-00690 are discussed.

## I. INTRODUCTION

On February 4, 2015, Avocent Huntsville Corporation and Liebert Corporation (“Avocent”) filed a Petition for *inter partes* review of the ’870 patent. Paper 1. Patent Owner Cyber Switching Patents, LLC (“Cyber”) filed a waiver of Preliminary Response on May 20, 2015 (Paper 14, “Waiver”). We instituted trial on August 11, 2015 (Paper 16) including challenges based on the Sentry reference (Ex. 1006). Cyber objected to Avocent’s Exhibits 1006, 1008, 1011, and 1013 as inadmissible hearsay, and it objected to Avocent’s Exhibit 1017 as inadmissible under Federal Rule of Evidence 702. Paper 19, “Objection.” Avocent moved to file supplemental information by submitting the Declaration of Office Manager at Internet Archive relating to Sentry reference (Ex. 1006), Rabbit 2000 (Ex. 1008), and PIC17C75X (Ex. 1011). Paper 23, “Mot. SI.” Avocent also moved to compel discovery from a third party – Server Technology, Inc. (“ServerTech”), the author and custodian of the Sentry reference. Paper 26, “Mot. Compel.” Cyber opposes Avocent’s Motion to Submit Supplemental Information. Paper 27 (“Opp. SI”).

For reasons stated below, Avocent’s Motion to Submit Supplemental Information is *denied* and Avocent’s Motion to Compel Testimony is *denied*.

## II. DISCUSSION

### A. *Legal Principles*

#### a. *What Constitutes a Printed Publication*

Whether a document qualifies as a prior art printed publication is a legal conclusion based on underlying factual determinations. *SRI Int’l, Inc. v.*

Case IPR2015-00690; IPR2015-00725  
Patent 7,550,870

*Internet Sec. Sys., Inc.*, 511 F.3d 1186, 1192 (Fed.Cir.2008) (citation omitted). “Public accessibility” has been called the touchstone in determining whether a reference constitutes a prior art printed publication. *Id.* at 1194. A reference is publicly accessible upon a satisfactory showing that it has been disseminated or otherwise made available to the extent that persons interested and ordinarily skilled in the subject matter or art exercising reasonable diligence, can locate it. *Bruckelmyer v. Ground Heaters, Inc.*, 445 F.3d 1374, 1378 (Fed. Cir.2006).; *see also In re Cronyn*, 890 F.2d 1158, 1160 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (“The statutory phrase ‘printed publication’ has been interpreted to mean that before the critical date the reference must have been sufficiently accessible to the public interested in the art; dissemination and public accessibility are the keys to the legal determination whether a prior art reference was ‘published.’”) (quoting *Constant v. Advanced Micro-Devices, Inc.*, 848 F.2d 1560, 1568 (Fed.Cir.1988)).

In *In re Klopfenstein*, 380 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2004), our reviewing court rejected an argument that “distribution and/or indexing” are the key components to a “printed publication” inquiry because that argument “fails to properly reflect what our [Federal Circuit] precedent stands for,” explaining that “printed publication” means reasonably accessible through generally available media that serves to disseminate information. *Id.* at 1348. A printed publication need not be easily searchable after publication if it was sufficiently disseminated at the time of its publication. *Suffolk Techs., LLC v. AOL Inc.*, 752 F.3d 1358, 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2014).<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> As explained in *Klopfenstein*, the word “disseminate” is not used in its literal sense, i.e. “make widespread” or “to foster general knowledge of” and does not require distribution of reproductions or photocopies. 380 F.2d. at 1352, n. 3.

## 2. *Showing of Publication*

In order to institute trial, we require a petitioner to provide a showing of publication of an asserted reference only to the extent necessary to demonstrate a reasonable likelihood of prevailing on its patentability challenge(s). *See* 35 U.S.C. § 314(a). When a petitioner does not present sufficient or credible evidence establishing a key aspect of public availability in support of its Petition, we have denied institution. *See id.* at 5–6 (no evidence thesis was indexed, cataloged, and shelved); *Actavis, Inc. v. Research Corp. Techs., Inc.*, Case IPR2014-01126, slip op. at 10–13 (PTAB Jan. 9, 2015) (Paper 21) (same); *Cisco Systems, Inc. v. Constellation Techs., LLC*, Case IPR2014-01085, slip op. at 7–9 (PTAB Jan. 9, 2015) (Paper 11) (noting “naked assertion,” unsupported by record, that reference was published).

The fact that we institute an *inter partes* review on a not fully developed record is not dispositive of the ultimate legal conclusion as to whether a particular reference document qualifies as a publication reference. That legal conclusion is based on a preponderance of the fully developed record evidence.

## 3. *Supplemental Information*

Section 42.123 of Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the filing of supplemental information after a decision to institute an *inter partes* review.

## 4. *Objections to Evidence*

Section 42.64 of Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs objections to evidence and the appropriate follow up. For evidence other than a deposition, it provides a process by which an objection to evidence

may be obviated. This regulatory provision states, in relevant part (emphasis added):

(2) Supplemental evidence. The party relying on evidence to which an objection is timely served may respond to the objection by *serving supplemental evidence* within ten business days of service of the objection.

### *5. Compelling Testimony and Production*

Section 42.52 of Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations controls compelling testimony and production.

#### *B. Cyber's Objections to Evidence*

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.64, a party objecting to evidence serves those objections on the party proffering and relying on that evidence. Per a recent rule change, the objecting party also must file those objections with the Board. In these proceedings, Cyber has done so. Thus, noting an objection triggers the ability of the party relying on the objected to evidence to serve supplemental evidence on the objecting party in an effort to obviate the objection. In the event the objecting party is not satisfied that the supplemental evidence overcomes the objection, the objecting party may preserve its objection by filing a motion to exclude the objected to evidence.

Paper 19 recites service of Cyber's objections to Exhibits 1006 (Sentry), 1008 (Rabbit 2000), 1011 (PIC17C75X), and 1017 (Denning Declaration) as of August 25, 2015. The record reflects (*infra.*) that Avocent served supplemental evidence on Cyber following objections filed in Paper 19. Supplemental evidence, served in response to an evidentiary objection, is offered solely to support admissibility of the originally filed evidence and to defeat a motion to exclude that evidence, and not to support any argument

# 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.