

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re: U.S. Patent No. 7,552,124  
Inventors: Vladimir Drukin  
Serial No.: 09/658,671  
Filed: June 17, 2004  
Issued: June 23, 2009  
Entitled: “Natural Language for Programming a Specialized Computing System”

Request for Reexamination Filing Date: July 17, 2017

Mail Stop *Ex Parte* Reexam  
Attn: Central Reexamination Unit  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

**REQUEST FOR *EX PARTE* REEXAMINATION OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,552,124**  
**INCLUDING AMENDMENT**

Dear Sir:

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 302-305 and 37 C.F.R. § 1.510, IXI IP, LLC (the “Requestor” or “Patent Owner”) hereby requests *ex parte* reexamination of claims 6-10 of U.S. Patent No. 7,552,124, entitled “Natural Language for Programming a Specialized Computing System,” which issued on June 23, 2009.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF APPENDICES .....	iii
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. CLAIMS FOR WHICH REEXAMINATION IS REQUESTED.....	4
III. CITATION OF PRIOR ART PRESENTED .....	4
IV. STATEMENT POINTING OUT EACH SUBSTANTIAL NEW QUESTION OF PATENTABILITY.....	6
V. RELEVANT INFORMATION CONCERNING THE '124 PATENT.....	6
A. RELATED MATTERS.....	6
B. SUMMARY OF DISCLOSURE OF THE '124 PATENT .....	7
VI. DETAILED EXPLANATION OF THE PERTINENCY AND MANNER OF APPLYING THE CITED ART TO EVERY CLAIM FOR WHICH REEXAMINATION IS REQUESTED .....	9
A. SNQ 1: Obviousness Of Claims 6-10 Over <i>Maes</i> in view of <i>Preston</i> .....	10
1. <i>Maes</i> and <i>Preston</i> – Claim 6 .....	10
2. <i>Maes</i> and <i>Preston</i> – Claim 7 .....	19
3. <i>Maes</i> and <i>Preston</i> – Claim 8 .....	19
4. <i>Maes</i> and <i>Preston</i> – Claim 9 .....	20
5. <i>Maes</i> and <i>Preston</i> – Claim 10 .....	21
B. SNQ 2: Obviousness Of Claims 6-10 Over <i>Maes</i> in view of <i>Ittycheriah</i> and <i>Preston</i> .....	21
1. <i>Maes</i> , <i>Ittycheriah</i> , and <i>Preston</i> – Claim 6 .....	22
2. <i>Maes</i> , <i>Ittycheriah</i> , and <i>Preston</i> – Claim 7 .....	24
3. <i>Maes</i> , <i>Ittycheriah</i> , and <i>Preston</i> – Claim 8 .....	25
4. <i>Maes</i> , <i>Ittycheriah</i> , and <i>Preston</i> – Claim 9 .....	25
5. <i>Maes</i> , <i>Ittycheriah</i> , and <i>Preston</i> – Claim 10 .....	25
C. SNQ 3: Obviousness Of Claims 6-10 Over <i>Pazandak</i> in view of <i>White</i> and <i>Manson</i> .....	25
1. <i>Pazandak</i> , <i>White</i> , and <i>Manson</i> – Claim 6.....	26
2. <i>Pazandak</i> , <i>White</i> , and <i>Manson</i> – Claim 7.....	36

3.	<i>Pazandak, White, and Manson</i> – Claim 8.....	36
4.	<i>Pazandak, White, and Manson</i> – Claim 9.....	37
5.	<i>Pazandak, White, and Manson</i> – Claim 10.....	37
VII.	THE GROUNDS OF THE 1669 IPR AND 898 IPR DO NOT RENDER THE NEW CLAIMS UNPATENTABLE .....	38
A.	Grounds from the 1669 and 898 IPRs Do Not Render New Claim 11 Unpatentable .....	38
1.	The combination of <i>Maes</i> and <i>Preston</i> as alleged in the 1669 IPR does not render new claim 11 unpatentable .....	38
a.	The combination of <i>Maes</i> and <i>Preston</i> does not teach “determining implementation. . .” as recited in new claim 11.....	39
b.	The combination of <i>Maes</i> and <i>Preston</i> does not teach “determining a level of complexity. . .” as recited in claim 11.....	40
c.	The combination of <i>Maes</i> and <i>Preston</i> does not teach producing and receiving executable code as recited in claim 11.....	41
2.	The combination of <i>Maes, Ittycheriah, and Preston</i> as alleged in the 898 IPR does not render new claim 11 unpatentable.....	43
a.	The combination of <i>Maes, Ittycheriah, and Preston</i> does not teach “determining implementation. . .” as recited in new claim 11.....	43
b.	The combination of <i>Maes, Ittycheriah, and Preston</i> does not teach “determining a level of complexity. . . .” as recited in new claim 11. ....	45
c.	The combination of <i>Maes, Ittycheriah, and Preston</i> does not teach producing and receiving executable code, as recited in new claim 11.....	46
3.	The combination of <i>Pazandak, White, and Manson</i> does not render new claim 11 unpatentable .....	47
a.	The combination of <i>Pazandak, White, and Manson</i> does not teach “determining implementation. . .” as recited in new claim 11. ....	47

- b. The combination of *Pazandak, White, and Manson* does not teach “determining a level of complexity. . .” as recited in new claim 11. ....48
    - c. The combination of *Pazandak, White, and Manson* does not teach producing and receiving executable code, as recited in new claim 11.....49
  - B. Grounds from the 1669 and 898 IPRs Do Not Render New Claim 12 Unpatentable ..... 51
    - 1. The combination of *Maes* and *Preston* does not render new claim 12 unpatentable..... 51
    - 2. The combination of *Maes, Ittycheriah, and Preston* does not render new claim 12 unpatentable ..... 53
    - 3. The combination of *Pazandak, White, and Manson* does not render new claim 12 unpatentable ..... 54
- VIII. CONCLUSION ..... 56

**TABLE OF APPENDICES**

<b>Appendix</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>A</b>	U.S. Patent No. 7,552,124 of Drukin
<b>B</b>	Google, Inc. v. IXI IP, LLC, IPR2016-01669, Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,552,124, Paper No. 2 (August 25, 2016)
<b>C</b>	Google, Inc. v. IXI IP, LLC, IPR2016-01669, Decision, Institution of <i>Inter Partes</i> Review, Paper No. 9 (March 8, 2017)
<b>D</b>	Microsoft Corp. <i>et al.</i> v. IXI IP, LLC, IPR2017-00898, Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,552,124, Paper No. 4 (February 16, 2017)
<b>E</b>	U.S. Patent No. 7,003,463 of Maes <i>et al.</i> (“Maes”)
<b>F</b>	U.S. Patent No. 5,937,383 of Ittycheriah <i>et al.</i> (“Ittycheriah”)
<b>G</b>	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0046061 of Preston <i>et al.</i> (“Preston”)
<b>H</b>	U.S. Patent No. 7,027,975 of Pazandak <i>et al.</i> (“Pazandak”)
<b>I</b>	U.S. Patent Publication No. 20020072918 of White <i>et al.</i> (“White”)
<b>J</b>	U.S. Patent No. 7,085,708 of Manson (“Manson”)
<b>K</b>	U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030182132 of Niemoeller <i>et al.</i> (“Niemoeller”)
<b>L</b>	<i>Microsoft Computer Dictionary</i> , Microsoft Press, 5 <sup>th</sup> ed. (2002) (excerpts)
<b>M</b>	Amended Claims Presented with Request
<b>N</b>	Support for Amended Claims Presented with Request

# 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.