

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

Avi Networks, Inc.,  
Petitioner

v.

Citrix Systems, Inc.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case No. Unassigned

U.S. Patent No. 9,148,493

---

**Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 9,148,493**

Mail Stop **PATENT BOARD**  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

|   | <b><u>Page</u></b> |
|---|--------------------|
| I. INTRODUCTION .....   | 1                  |
| II. MANDATORY NOTICES .....   | 1                  |
| A. Real Parties-in-Interest 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1).....                                 | 1                  |
| B. Related Matters Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2) .....                                   | 1                  |
| 1. Current Litigation.....  | 1                  |
| 2. Administrative proceedings .....   | 2                  |
| C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel.....  | 2                  |
| D. Service of Information Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4) .....                            | 3                  |
| III. PAYMENT OF FEES .....  | 3                  |
| IV. REQUIREMENTS OF <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW .....                                    | 3                  |
| A. Standing.....  | 4                  |
| B. Identification of Challenge and Relief Requested .....                               | 4                  |
| C. How the Challenged Claims are to be Construed Under 37<br>C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3)..... | 7                  |
| D. How the Challenged Claims are Unpatentable Under 37 C.F.R.<br>§ 42.104(b)(4).....    | 8                  |
| E. Supporting Evidence Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(5) .....                             | 8                  |
| V. THRESHOLD REQUIREMENT FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW .....                                  | 8                  |
| VI. LEVEL OF SKILL IN THE ART .....   | 9                  |
| A. Person of Ordinary Skill.....  | 9                  |
| B. Background in the Relevant Art.....  | 9                  |
| 1. The Protocol Stack.....  | 9                  |
| 2. Proxies.....   | 12                 |
| 3. Persistent Connections .....   | 13                 |

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
(continued)

|  | <b><u>Page</u></b> |
|--|--------------------|
| 4. Connection Pooling.....   | 14                 |
| VII. OVERVIEW OF THE '493 PATENT .....   | 14                 |
| A. Summary of the Alleged Invention of the '493 Patent .....   | 14                 |
| B. Summary of the Prosecution History of the '493 Patent .....   | 18                 |
| C. Proposed Claim Constructions .....  | 19                 |
| VIII. DETAILED CHALLENGE .....   | 22                 |
| A. Ground 1: Squid Anticipates Claims 1–5, 7, 9–13, 15, and 17–<br>20 under § 102.....                       | 23                 |
| 1. Overview of Squid .....   | 23                 |
| 2. Squid is a Printed Publication.....   | 26                 |
| 3. Squid 2.0 Source Code.....  | 31                 |
| 4. Analysis of Unpatentability .....   | 38                 |
| B. Ground 2: Squid Renders Claims 1–5, 7, 9–13, 15, and 17–20<br>obvious under § 103 .....                   | 58                 |
| C. Ground 3: Squid in light of RFC 2068 Renders Claims 8 and<br>16 obvious under § 103 .....                 | 59                 |
| D. Ground 4: Susai in light of Squid Renders Claims 1–5, 7, 9–13,<br>15, and 17–20 obvious under § 103 ..... | 62                 |
| E. Ground 5: Susai over RFC 2068 Renders Claims 1–5, 7–13,<br>and 15–20 obvious under § 103 .....            | 77                 |
| IX. CONCLUSION.....  | 80                 |
| X. CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT .....   | 81                 |

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

|   | <b>Page(s)</b> |
|---|----------------|
| <b>Cases</b>  |                |
| <i>Baron v. Bausch &amp; Lomb Inc.</i> ,<br>No. CIV-79-2C, 1992 WL 46979 (W.D.N.Y. Feb. 25, 1992).....  | 30             |
| <i>Citrix Systems, Inc. v. Avi Networks, Inc.</i> ,<br>No. 1:17-cv-1843 (D. Del.).....  | 1              |
| <i>Dow Jones &amp; Co. v. Ablaise Ltd.</i> ,<br>632 F. Supp. 2d 23 (D.D.C. 2009), <i>vacated on jurisdictional<br/>grounds</i> , 606 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2010) ..... | 28, 30         |
| <i>Eolas Techs. Inc. v. Adobe Systems, Inc.</i> ,<br>No. 6:09-cv-446, 2012 WL 12896524 (E.D. Tex. July 19, 2012).....   | 30             |
| <i>In re Hall</i> ,<br>781 F.2d 897 (Fed. Cir. 1986) .....  | 26             |
| <i>HTC Corp. v. Cellular Communications Equip., LLC</i> ,<br>877 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....   | 7              |
| <i>Inpro II Licensing, S.A.R.L. v. T-Mobile</i> ,<br>450 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2006) .....   | 21             |
| <i>In re Klopfenstein</i> ,<br>380 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....   | 27             |
| <i>SciMed Life Sys., Inc. v. Davanced Cardiovascular Sys., Inc.</i> ,<br>242 F.3d 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....   | 21             |
| <i>SRI Int’l, Inc. v. Internet Sec. Sys., Inc.</i> ,<br>511 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....  | 27             |
| <i>Suffolk Techs., LLC v. AOL Inc.</i> ,<br>752 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....  | 27             |

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**  
(continued)

|   | <b><u>Page(s)</u></b> |
|---|-----------------------|
| <i>Voter Verified, Inc. v. Premier Election Solutions, Inc.</i> ,<br>698 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2012) ..... | 27, 29                |
| <b>Statutes</b>   |                       |
| 35 U.S.C. § 102 .....   | 6                     |
| 35 U.S.C. § 311 .....   | 26                    |
| <b>Regulations</b>  |                       |
| 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) .....   | 7                     |
| 83 F.R. 51358 (2018) .....  | 7                     |

# 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.