

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

UNIFIED PATENTS INC.,  
Petitioner

v.

INTELLECTUAL VENTURES II LLC  
Patent Owner

---

IPR2016-01404  
Patent 6,968,459

---

**PATENT OWNER INTELLECTUAL VENTURES II LLC'S  
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION**

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 '459 patent solved the important problem of authorized users copying sensitive data to unsecured removable storage devices.....	2
III.	Claim construction.....	6
IV.	Ground 1: The Board should deny institution because Petitioner did not establish a reasonable likelihood that Bensimon anticipates claims 1, 13, 14, 33, 39, 46, and 48.....	7
	A. Overview of Bensimon.....	7
	B. Petitioner did not establish a reasonable likelihood that Bensimon anticipates claims 1, 33, 39, 46, and 48. ....	8
	1. Overview of the differences between Bensimon and claims 1, 33, and 39.....	9
	2. Petitioner did not show that Bensimon discloses the “ <i>restricted-access mode</i> ” operation recited in claims 1, 33, and 39. ....	10
	3. Petitioner did not show that Bensimon discloses “ <i>device-specific security information</i> ” as recited in claims 1, 33, and 39 .....	14
	C. Petitioner did not establish a reasonable likelihood that Bensimon anticipates independent claims 13 and 14.....	17
V.	Ground 2: The Board should deny institution because Petitioner did not establish a reasonable likelihood that the combination of Bensimon and Takahashi renders obvious claims 2, 15, and 34.....	20
	A. Petitioner did not establish a reasonable likelihood that Bensimon and Takahashi renders obvious claim 2. ....	21
	B. Petitioner did not establish a reasonable likelihood that Bensimon and Takahashi renders obvious independent claim 15. ....	22

1.	Petitioner did not show that the combination of Bensimon and Takahashi teaches or suggests “ <i>providing restricted-access.</i> ”	22
2.	Petitioner did not show that the combination of Bensimon and Takahashi teaches or suggests “ <i>encrypting digital data using the security information.</i> ”	23
3.	Petitioner did not show that the combination of Bensimon and Takahashi teaches or suggests “ <i>device-specific security information</i> ” as recited in claim 15.	28
VI.	Ground 3: The Board should deny institution because Petitioner did not establish a reasonable likelihood that the combination of Kimura and Takahashi renders obvious claim 18.	29
A.	Petitioner did not establish a reasonable likelihood that the combination of Kimura and Takahashi teaches or suggests “ <i>sensing whether the storage device has security information.</i> ”	33
B.	Petitioner did not establish a reasonable likelihood that the combination of Kimura and Takahashi teaches or suggests “ <i>encrypting digital data using the security information.</i> ”	35
VII.	Conclusion.	39

## Table of Authorities

### Cases

<i>General Elec. Co. v. TAS Energy Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00163, 2014 WL 1994554 (PTAB May 13, 2014) .....	27
<i>In re Chaganti</i> , 2014 WL 274514 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	26
<i>In re Kahn</i> , 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	26
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	26
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	6
<i>Vivid Techs. v. Amer. Science</i> , 200 F.3d 795 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	6

### Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) .....	26
--------------------------	----

### Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.65 .....	27
-------------------------	----

**Exhibit List**

<i>Exhibit #</i>	<i>Description</i>
<b>2001</b>	Microsoft Dictionary
<b>2002</b>	Schneier, B., <i>Applied Cryptography</i> , 2d. Ed., Wiley, 1996

# 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.