

Case IPR2017-01977
Patent No. 8,755,376

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TELESIGN CORPORATION
Petitioner

v.

TWILIO INC.
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2017-01977
Patent: 8,755,376

PATENT OWNER RESPONSE
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.120

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. RELATED PROCEEDINGS.....	2
II. TECHNICAL BACKGROUND.....	3
A. The ‘376 Patent	3
B. SOAP.....	4
C. REST APIs	5
D. Prior Art Relied on by Petitioner.....	6
1. Maes	6
2. Ransom.....	7
3. Jiang	9
4. ETSI Standard 202 391-4 v.1.2.1 (“ETSI-4”) / ETSI Standard 202 391-7 v.1.2.1 (“ETSI-7”) / ETSI Standard 202 391-2 v.1.2.1 (“ETSI-2”) (together, “ETSI Standards”)	9
III. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	10
IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	10
A. Claims 1, 14: “REST API”	10
B. Claims 1, 2, 14, 16: “API resource”	12
C. Claims 1, 14, 16: “API resource URI”	13
D. Claims 1, 2, 14, 16: “URI”	13
V. GROUND 1: THE PETITION FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER MAES IN VIEW OF RANSOM.....	14
A. Petitioner Fails to Show That Maes Discloses “a plurality of API resources” of Claim 1[a]	15
B. Petitioner Fails to Show that Maes and Ransom, Individually or in Combination, Disclose “exposing the plurality of API resources through a representation state transfer (REST) API” of Claim 1[b].....	16

1.	Petitioner Fails to Show that Maes Discloses “the plurality of API resources” of Claim 1[b]	16
2.	Petitioner Fails to Show that Maes and Ransom, Individually or in Combination, Disclose “exposing the plurality of API resources through a Representational State Transfer (REST) API” of Claim 1[b]	17
3.	A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine Maes and Ransom to Arrive at Claim 1[b]	19
C.	Petitioner Fails to Show, Individually or in Combination, that Maes and Ransom Disclose “receiving a REST API request that specifies an API resource URI” of Claim 1[b][i].....	29
1.	Petitioner Fails to Show that Maes and Ransom, Alone or in Combination, Disclose “...specifies an API resource URI” of Claim 1[b][i]	29
2.	Petitioner Fails to Show that Maes and Ransom, Alone or in Combination, Disclose “receiving a REST API request” of Claim 1[b][i]	31
3.	A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine Maes and Ransom to Arrive at Claim 1[b][i]	31
D.	Petitioner Fails to Show that Maes Discloses “responding to the API request according to the request and the specified resource URI” of Claim 1[b][ii].....	33
E.	Petitioner Fails to Show Maes and Ransom, Individually or in Combination, Disclose the Challenged Dependent Claims	34
1.	Petitioner Fails to Show Maes and Ransom, Individually or in Combination, Disclose Claim 2.....	35
2.	Petitioner Fails to Show Maes and Ransom, Individually or in Combination, Disclose Claim 14.....	36
3.	Petitioner Fails to Show Maes and Ransom, Individually or in Combination, Disclose Claim 16.....	37
4.	Petitioner Fails to Show Maes and Ransom, Individually or in Combination, Disclose Claim 19.....	38

VI. GROUND 2: THE PETITION FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE CLAIMS 5 AND 17 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER

MAES IN VIEW OF RANSOM AND FURTHER IN VIEW OF JIANG	39
VII. GROUND 3: THE PETITION FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER ETSI-202-391-4 IN VIEW OF RANSOM.....	40
A. Petitioner Fails to Show That ETSI-4 Discloses “a plurality of API resources” of Claim 1[a]	40
B. Petitioner Fails to Show, Individually or in Combination, that ETSI-4 and Ransom Disclose “exposing the plurality of API resources through a representation state transfer (REST) API” of Claim 1[b].....	41
1. Petitioner Fails to Show that ETSI-4 Discloses “the plurality of API resources” of Claim 1[b]	41
2. Petitioner Fails to Show that ETSI-4 and Ransom, Individually or in Combination, Disclose “exposing the plurality of API resources through a Representational State Transfer (REST) API” of Claim 1[b]	42
3. A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine ETSI-4 and Ransom to Arrive at Claim 1[b].....	44
C. Petitioner Fails to Show, Individually or in Combination, that ETSI-4 and Ransom Disclose “receiving a REST API request that specifies an API resource URI” of Claim 1[b][i].....	48
1. Neither ETSI-4 or Ransom, Individually or in Combination, Discloses “receiving a REST API request that specifies an API resource URI” of Claim 1[b][i]	48
2. Petitioner Fails to Show that ETSI-4 and Ransom, Individually or in Combination, Disclose “receiving a REST API request” of Claim 1[b][i]	49
3. A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine ETSI-4 and Ransom to Arrive at Claim 1[b][i]	51
D. Petitioner Fails to Show that ETSI-4 Discloses “responding to the API request according to the request and the specified resource URI” of Claim 1[b][ii].....	53
E. Petitioner Fails to Show Maes and Ransom, Individually or in Combination, Disclose the Challenged Dependent Claims	54

1.	Petitioner Fails to Show ETSI-4 and Ransom, Individually or in Combination, Disclose Claim 2.....	54
2.	Petitioner Fails to Show ETSI-4 and Ransom, Individually or in Combination, Disclose Claim 5.....	55
3.	Petitioner Fails to Show ETSI-4 and Ransom, Individually or in Combination, Disclose Claim 14.....	55
4.	Petitioner Fails to Show ETSI-4 and Ransom, Individually or in Combination, Disclose Claim 16.....	56
VIII.	GROUND 4: THE PETITION FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE CLAIM 17 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER ETSI-4 IN VIEW OF RANSOM AND FURTHER IN VIEW OF ETSI-7.....	56
IX.	GROUND 5: THE PETITION FAILS TO DEMONSTRATE CLAIM 19 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER ETSI-4 IN VIEW OF RANSOM AND FURTHER IN VIEW OF ETSI-2.....	57
X.	OBJECTIVE INDICIA ESTABLISH NON-OBVIOUSNESS	57
A.	Petitioner Copied Patent Owner’s Invention.....	58
B.	Patent Owner’s Products Embody the Claimed Invention.....	59
C.	Patent Owner’s Products Have Achieved Significant Commercial Success Because of the Inventive Features	61
D.	Patent Owner’s Claimed Technology Received Industry-Wide Praise	63
E.	There Was a Long-Felt Need for the Invention	64
XI.	CONCLUSION	65

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.