

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC.

Petitioner

v.

IMPLICIT, LLC

Patent Owner

Case: IPR2020-00587

Patent No. 9,591,104

**PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES*
REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 9,591,104**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	THE IMPLICIT PATENTS	1
II.	THE PROSECUTION HISTORY OF THE IMPLICIT PATENTS	4
III.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	7
IV.	APPLICABLE LAW	7
V.	THE BOARD SHOULD DECLINE TO INSTITUTE PROCEEDINGS UNDER SECTION 325(D).....	8
A.	Factor (a): The Patent Office Has Already Considered Decasper	9
B.	Factor (b): The “New” CheckPoint Reference and the Smith Reference Are, At Most, Cumulative of Other Examined Art	10
C.	Factor (c): The Asserted Prior Art Was Highlighted During Examination of the Implicit Patents.....	14
D.	Factor (d): The Patent Office Considered the Prior Art in the Same Light That Petitioner Asserts Here	16
E.	Factor (e): Petitioner Does Not Point to Any Examination Error.....	18
F.	Factor (f): Petitioner Does Provide Sufficient Additional Evidence ..	19
VI.	CONCLUSION	19

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG
IPR2017-01586, Paper 8 (PTAB Dec. 15, 2017).....*passim*

Invantis, Inc. v. Glaukos Corp.
No. IPR2019-00483 (Paper No. 8), 2019 PAT. APP. LEXIS 10371
(P.T.A.B. July 8, 2019)13

Puma N. Am., Inc. v. Nike Inc.
IPR2019-01042, Paper No. 10, 2019 Pat. App. LEXIS 12352
(P.T.A.B. Oct. 31, 2019)10, 18, 19

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....*passim*

EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit	Description
2001	Request for <i>Inter Partes</i> Reexamination of U.S. Patent No. 6,629,163
2002	Decision Instituting <i>Inter Partes</i> Reexamination of U.S. Patent No. 6,629,163
2003	Action Closing Prosecution in <i>Inter Partes</i> Reexamination of U.S. Patent No. 6,629,163
2004	Decision Vacating <i>Inter Partes</i> Reexamination of U.S. Patent No. 6,629,163
2005	Request for <i>Inter Partes</i> Reexamination of U.S. Patent No. 7,711,857
2006	Decision Instituting <i>Inter Partes</i> Reexamination of U.S. Patent No. 7,711,857
2007	Right of Appeal Notice in <i>Inter Partes</i> Reexamination of U.S. Patent No. 7,711,857
2008	Excerpts of File History of U.S. Patent No. 8,694,683
2009	September 1995 CheckPoint FireWall-1 White Paper
2010	July 1994 CheckPoint FireWall-1 Technical White Paper
2011	IBM Local Area Network Concepts and Products: Routers and Gateways
2012	Active Gateway: A Facility for Video Conferencing Traffic Control
2013	Excerpts of October 3, 2017 Deposition of Daniel Decasper

...

Patent Owner Implicit, LLC (“Implicit”) opposes institution of *Inter Partes* Review on all grounds. The Patent Office has already thoroughly examined the Implicit Patents. And petitioner Juniper Networks, Inc. (“Petitioner” or “Juniper”) raises subject matter that the Patent Office extensively considered during examination of the Implicit Patents and their family.

For that reason, the Board’s *Becton, Dickinson* factors weigh in favor of exercising discretion under Section 325(d) and denying this Petition. The purpose of *Inter Parties* Review proceedings is to review patents that may have lacked an adequate prior art record during prosecution or whose examination may not have provided a sufficient opportunity for a thorough review. The Implicit Patents are not those type of patents. For these reasons, and those below, Implicit respectfully requests that the Board decline to institute the proceedings.¹

I. THE IMPLICIT PATENTS

The Petitions involve six related patents that are referred to collectively as the Demultiplexing Patents (or “the Implicit Patents”).² Each Patent shares a common specification and is part of a large Demultiplexing Patent family. The Patents provide an architecture for demultiplexing data into different messages (or flows) to

¹ Should the Board institute proceedings, Implicit reserves its rights to challenge the Petition on any basis, including whether the cited references are prior art.

² The Implicit Patents here are U.S. Patent Nos. 8,694,683 (“the ’683 Patent”); 9,270,790 (“the ’790 Patent”); 9,591,104 (“the ’104 Patent”); 10,027,780 (“the ’780 Patent”); 10,033,839; (“the ’839 Patent”) and 10,225,378 (“the ’378 Patent”).

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.