

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'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit	Description
2003	Defendant TeleSign Corporation's Responsive Claim Construction Brief, from <i>Twilio Inc. v. TeleSign Corporation</i> , Case No. 5:16-cv-06925-LHK-SVK, ECF No. 110
2004	Transcript of Claim Construction Hearing, from <i>Twilio Inc. v. TeleSign Corporation</i> , Case No. 5:16-cv-06925-LHK-SVK
2005	Order Construing Claim Terms of U.S. Patent Nos. 8,306,021; 8,837,465; and 8,755,376, from <i>Twilio Inc. v. TeleSign Corporation</i> , Case No. 5:16-cv-06925-LHK-SVK, ECF No. 137
2006	Deposition Transcript of Dr. Seth Nielson, from <i>Twilio Inc. v. TeleSign Corporation</i> , Case No. 5:16-cv-06925-LHK-SVK
2007	Declaration of Seth Nielson, Ph.D., from <i>Twilio Inc. v. TeleSign Corporation</i> , Case No. 5:16-cv-06925-LHK-SVK
2008	TeleSign's Patent Local Rule 4-2 Preliminary Claim Constructions, from <i>Twilio Inc. v. TeleSign Corporation</i> , Case No. 5:16-cv-06925-LHK-SVK
2009	Information Disclosure Statement for Application No. 13/743,078, January 16, 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	3
III.	PETITIONER FAILED TO PROPERLY ADDRESS CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	3
IV.	PETITIONER HAS NOT SHOWN A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT AT LEAST ONE CLAIM OF THE '376 PATENT IS UNPATENTABLE	8
A.	Legal Standard for Obviousness	9
B.	Ground 1: The Petition Fails to Demonstrate that the Challenged Claims Would Have Been Obvious Over Maes in View of Ransom .	10
1.	Petitioner Fails to Show, Individually or in Combination, that Maes and Ransom Disclose the “exposing the plurality of API resources through a representation state transfer (REST) API” Limitation.....	11
a.	Maes Fails to Disclose the “exposing the plurality of API resources through a representation state transfer (REST) API” Limitation	11
b.	Ransom Fails to Disclose the “exposing the plurality of API resources through a representation state transfer (REST) API” Limitation.....	14
c.	Petitioner Does Not Explain the Motivation to Combine Maes and Ransom.....	14
2.	Petitioner Fails to Show, Individually or in Combination, that Maes and Ransom Disclose the “receiving a REST API request that specifies and API resource URI” Limitation	20
a.	Maes Fails to Disclose the “receiving a REST API request that specifies and API resource URI” Limitation	20

b.	Ransom Fails to Disclose the “receiving a REST API request that specifies and API resource URI” Limitation	23
c.	Petitioner Does Not Explain the Motivation to Combine Maes and Ransom.....	24
3.	Petitioner Fails to Show that Maes Discloses the “responding to the API request according to the request and the specified resource URI” Limitation	28
a.	Maes Fails to Disclose the “responding to the API request according to the request and the specified resource URI” Limitation	28
b.	Petitioner Fails to Address the “responding to the API request according to the request and the specified resource URI” Limitation	28
C.	Ground 3: The Petition Fails to Demonstrate that the Challenged Claims Would Have Been Obvious Over ETSI-202-391-4 in View of Ransom.....	29
1.	Petitioner Fails to Show, Individually or in Combination, that ETSI and Ransom Disclose the “exposing the plurality of API resources through a representation state transfer (REST) API” Limitation.....	30
a.	ETSI-202-391-4 Fails to Disclose the “exposing the plurality of API resources through a representation state transfer (REST) API” Limitation	30
b.	Ransom Fails to Disclose the “exposing the plurality of API resources through a representation state transfer (REST) API” Limitation.....	33
c.	Petitioner Does Not Explain the Motivation to Combine ETSI-202-391-4 and Ransom.....	33
2.	Petitioner Fails to Show, Individually or in Combination, that ETSI or Ransom Disclose the “receiving a REST API request that specifies an API resource URI” Limitation	38

a.	ETSI-202-391-4 Fails to Disclose the “receiving a REST API request that specifies an API resource URI” Limitation	38
b.	Ransom Fails to Disclose the “receiving a REST API request that specifies an API resource URI” Limitation	41
c.	Petitioner Does Not Explain the Motivation to Combine ETSI and Ransom	41
3.	Petitioner Fails to Show that ETSI Discloses the “responding to the API request according to the request and the specified resource URI” Limitation	45
a.	ETSI Fails to Disclose the “responding to the API request according to the request and the specified resource URI” Limitation	46
b.	Petitioner Fails to Address the “responding to the API request according to the request and the specified resource URI” Limitation	46
V.	CONCLUSION	47

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.