

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AKAMAI TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

LIMELIGHT NETWORKS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-00348
Patent 8,750,155

Patent Owner's Preliminary Response

Table of Contents

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	SUMMARY OF THE PATENTED TECHNOLOGY	4
III.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	4
IV.	STANDARD FOR INSTITUTING <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW	6
V.	A POSITA WOULD NOT COMBINE DEVANNEAUX WITH CHU 11	
A.	<i>The Petition Relies on the Assertion That It Would Be Obvious to Combine Devanneaux and Chu.....</i>	<i>11</i>
B.	<i>The Petition Relies on Mere Conclusory Statements Regarding the Combination of Devanneaux and Chu.....</i>	<i>12</i>
C.	<i>Dr. Bhattacharjee’s Declaration Uses Merely Conclusory Statements, and Never Explains Why Implementing the Chu TCP Architecture into the Devanneaux Edge Servers is a “Simple Substitution,” or Why The Substitution Would Provide “Predictable Results”</i>	<i>17</i>
D.	<i>Chu Ties Its TCP Architecture To “Riskier New Behavior,” Showing Its Use in Devanneaux is not a “Predictable Result”.....</i>	<i>25</i>
E.	<i>Implementing the Chu Plug-In Architecture Would Disrupt the Normal Edge Server Operations of Devanneaux.....</i>	<i>26</i>
F.	<i>Implementing the Chu Plug-In Architecture While Maintaining Normal Edge Server Operations is Beyond the Skill of a POSITA.....</i>	<i>31</i>
G.	<i>The Court Cannot Properly Evaluate the Combination of Devanneaux and Chu or Devanneaux and Haverstock Because Petitioner Fails to Identify the Differences Between the Claimed Invention and the Prior Art, in Accordance with the Graham Factors.....</i>	<i>36</i>
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	38

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Comm'ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	17, 24
<i>In re Am. Acad. Of Sci. Tech. Ctr.</i> , 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	5
<i>Ancestry.com DNA, LLC v. DNA Genotek Inc.</i> , IPR2016-01152, Paper 11 (Nov. 23, 2016)	14, 21
<i>In re Bass</i> , 314 F.3d 575 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	5
<i>Bausch & Lomb, Inc. v. Barnes-Hind/Hydrocurve, Inc.</i> , 796 F.2d 443 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	9
<i>CaptionCall v. Ultratec, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01359, Paper 75 (Dec. 14, 2016)	36
<i>Cardiocom, LLC v. Robert Bosch Healthcare Sys., Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00439, Paper 26 (Jan. 16, 2014), <i>aff'd</i> 2016 WL 3545685 (Fed. Cir. June 29, 2016)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs. v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (June 20, 2016)	4
<i>Front Row Techs., LLC v. MLB Advanced Media, L.P.</i> , IPR2015-01932, Paper 7 (Mar. 24, 2016)	8
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966)	7
<i>InTouch Techs., Inc. v. VGO Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 751 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	16
<i>Johns Manville Corp. v. Knauf Insulation, Inc.</i> , IPR2015-01402, Paper 18 (Oct. 21, 2015)	8, 36

<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	8
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>LG Display Co., Ltd. v. Innovative Display Techs. LLC</i> , IPR2015-00487, Paper 36 (July 15, 2016)	15, 24
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	6, 7, 8, 24
<i>Minerva Surgical, Inc. v. Hologic, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00680, Paper 8 (Sept. 12, 2016).....	15, 24
<i>Nautilus Hyosung Inc. v. Diebold, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00633, Paper 9 (Aug. 22, 2016).....	16
<i>Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.</i> , 810 F.2d 1561 (Fed. Cir. 1987)	9
<i>SAP Am. Inc. v. Clouding IP, LLC</i> , IPR2014-00299, Paper 8 (July 9, 2014)	8
<i>Silver Star Capital, LLC v. Power Integrations, Inc.</i> , IPR 2016-00736, Paper 11 (Aug. 26, 2016).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Wowza Media Sys., LLC v. Adobe Sys. Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00054, Paper 12 (April 8, 2013)	13, 17, 24

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 103	7, 8, 9
35 U.S.C. § 103(a)	1, 11
35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	6
35 U.S.C. § 316(e)	6

Other Authorities

37 C.F.R. §§ 42.24 <i>et seq.</i>	2
---	---

37 C.F.R. § 42.65(a).....	10
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)	4
37 C.F.R. § 42.108(b)	6
37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c).....	6
77 Fed. Reg. 48,756 (Aug. 14, 2012)	6, 8, 9
MPEP § 2143.01(V).....	31

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.