

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

HCC INSURANCE HOLDINGS, INC.
Petitioner

v.

INTELLECTUAL VENTURES I LLC
Patent Owner

Case IPR2016-01431
Patent 7,949,752

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	The '752 patent enables efficient customization of technology-driven services for individual users.....	3
A.	The significant disadvantages of the prior art techniques for providing technological services.	3
B.	The '752 patent overcame the issues of the prior art by providing a network system extensible by user.....	4
III.	Claim construction.	8
A.	“event handler” (Claims 7, 25, 26, 27).	9
B.	“exhausted” (Claims 1, 7, 9, 24).	11
C.	Means-plus-function elements.	12
IV.	The Board should reject Petitioner’s Grounds 1 and 2 because Petitioner has not met its burden of establishing a reasonable likelihood that the challenged claims are unpatentable.	14
A.	Chow operates differently than the claimed invention of the '752 patent.	14
B.	Petitioner has not established that Chow renders independent claims 1, 7, 9, and 24 and their corresponding dependent claims obvious [Ground 1].....	18
1.	Petitioner fails to establish that Chow teaches or suggests the “invoking” elements of independent claims 1, 7, 9, and 24.	18
2.	Petitioner fails to meet its burden establishing that Chow teaches or suggests “ <i>wherein an amount of the service resource is exhausted upon being consumed by the network-based agent.</i> ”	27
C.	Petitioner fails to establish that the combination of Chow and Bauer renders claims 6, 8, and 23 obvious [Ground 2].	30

V.	The Board should reject Petitioner’s Grounds 3 and 4 based on Goddard because Petitioner has not met its burden of establishing a reasonable likelihood that the challenged claims are unpatentable.	31
A.	Petitioner has not established that Goddard is a prior art printed publication.	31
B.	Goddard provides simple execution of programs on remote hosts.	33
C.	Petitioner has not established that Goddard renders independent claims 1, 7, 9, and 24 and their corresponding dependent claims obvious [Ground 3].	36
1.	Petitioner has not established that Goddard teaches or suggests the “ <i>invoking</i> ” elements of independent claims 1, 7, 9, and 24.	36
2.	Petitioner did not meet its burden establishing that Goddard teaches or suggests “ <i>wherein an amount of the service resource is exhausted upon being consumed by the network-based agent.</i> ”	39
3.	Petitioner did not meet its burden establishing that Goddard teaches or suggests an “event handler.”	43
D.	Petitioner fails to establish that the combination of Goddard and Bauer renders claim 21 obvious [Ground 4].	46
VI.	Conclusion.	47

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<i>Hewlett-Packard Co. v. U.S. Philips Corp.</i> , IPR2015-01506, Decision Denying Institution, Paper 15 (PTAB Jan. 19, 2016)...	32
<i>Open Text S.A. v. Box, Inc.</i> , No. 13-CV-04910-JD, 2015 WL 4940798 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 19, 2015)	32
<i>SRI Int'l v. Internet Sec. Sys.</i> , 511 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	32
<i>Standard Innovation Corp. v. Lelo, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00148, Final Written Decision, Paper 42 (PTAB Apr. 23, 2015).....	33
<i>Stryker Corp. v. Karl Storz Endoscopy-America, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-00764, Paper 13 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 2, 2015).....	29, 40

EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit No.	Description
2001	<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. HCC Insurance Holdings, Inc.</i> , Civil Action No. 6:15-CV-660-JRG, the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge K. Nicole Mitchell
2002	Gourley, David <i>et al.</i> , HTTP: The Definitive Guide (2002)
2003	Luotonen, Ari, “Web Proxy Servers” (1998)

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.