

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Juniper Networks, Inc. & Palo Alto Networks, Inc.  
Petitioners,

v.

Packet Intelligence LLC,  
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2020-00486  
U.S. Patent No. 6,954,789

**PATENT OWNER'S NOTICE OF APPEAL**

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

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1295(a)(4)(A); 35 U.S.C. §§ 141(c), 142, and 319; 37 C.F.R. §§ 90.2(a) and 90.3; and Rule 4(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, Patent Owner Packet Intelligence LLC (“Packet Intelligence”) hereby appeals to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit from the Final Written Decision (Paper 47) entered on September 9, 2021 (attached hereto as Exhibit A); the Order denying Director Review (Paper 49) entered on November 22, 2021 (attached hereto as Exhibit B); and from all underlying orders, decisions, rulings, and opinions that are adverse to Packet Intelligence related thereto and included therein.

In particular, Packet Intelligence identifies the following issues on appeal: whether Mr. Hirshfeld—Commissioner for Patents, Performing the Functions and Duties of the Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office—had authority to deny Packet Intelligence’s request for Director Review; the determination that Claims 31 and 33 of U.S. Patent No. 6,954,789 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a); any finding or determination supporting or relating to these issues; and all other procedural or substantive issues decided adversely to Packet Intelligence in any order, decision, ruling, or opinion by the Board in IPR2020-00486.

Packet Intelligence is concurrently providing true and correct copies of this Notice of Appeal, along with the required fees, to the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office and the Clerk of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

Dated: January 21, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

By: */R. Allan Bullwinkel/*

R. Allan Bullwinkel (Reg. No. 77,630)

Attorney for Patent Owner

Packet Intelligence LLC

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e), a copy of the foregoing PATENT OWNER'S NOTICE OF APPEAL was served via email to lead and backup counsel of record for Petitioners as follows:

Lead Counsel for Petitioner	
Joseph F. Edell (Reg. No. 67,625) FISCH SIGLER LLP 5301 Wisconsin Avenue NW Fourth Floor Washington, DC 20015	Phone: 202-362-3524 <a href="mailto:joe.edell.IPR@fischllp.com">joe.edell.IPR@fischllp.com</a>
Back-Up Counsel for Petitioner	
Scott A. McKeown (Reg. No. 42,866) ROPES & GRAY LLP 2099 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, D.C. 20006-6807	Phone: 202-508-4740 <a href="mailto:scott.mckeown@ropesgray.com">scott.mckeown@ropesgray.com</a>
Adam A. Allgood (Reg. No. 67,306) FISCH SIGLER LLP 5301 Wisconsin Avenue NW Fourth Floor Washington, D.C. 20015	Phone: 202-362-3536 <a href="mailto:adam.allgood@fischllp.com">adam.allgood@fischllp.com</a>
James R. Batchelder (pro hac forthcoming) ROPES & GRAY LLP 1900 University Avenue, 6 <sup>th</sup> Floor East Palo Alto, CA 94303-2284	Phone: 650-617-4000 <a href="mailto:james.batchelder@ropesgray.com">james.batchelder@ropesgray.com</a>
Mark D. Rowland (Reg. No. 32,077) ROPES & GRAY LLP 1900 University Avenue, 6 <sup>th</sup> Floor East Palo Alto, CA 94303-2284	Phone: 650-617-4000 <a href="mailto:mark.rowland@ropesgray.com">mark.rowland@ropesgray.com</a>
Andrew Radsch (pro hac forthcoming) ROPES & GRAY LLP 1900 University Avenue, 6 <sup>th</sup> Floor East Palo Alto, CA 94303-2284	Phone: 650-617-4000 <a href="mailto:Andrew.radsch@ropesgray.com">Andrew.radsch@ropesgray.com</a>

The undersigned further certifies that a copy of the foregoing NOTICE OF APPEAL was electronically filed with the Clerk's Office of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

The undersigned further certifies that a copy of the foregoing NOTICE OF APPEAL was sent to the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office via Federal Express to the following address: Office of the General Counsel, United States Patent and Trademark Office, Madison Building East, Room 10B20, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314.

Dated: January 21, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

By: /R. Allan Bullwinkel/

R. Allan Bullwinkel (Reg. No. 77,630)

Attorney for Patent Owner

Packet Intelligence LLC

# **Exhibit A**

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC. and PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

PACKET INTELLIGENCE LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

IPR2020-00486  
Patent 6,954,789 B2

---

Before CHARLES J. BOUDREAU, JOHN D. HAMANN, and  
KRISTI L. R. SAWERT, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

SAWERT, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

JUDGMENT  
Final Written Decision  
Determining Some Challenged Claims Unpatentable  
*35 U.S.C. § 318(a)*

## I. INTRODUCTION

This is a Final Written Decision in an *inter partes* review challenging the patentability of claims 31, 33, and 34 (“the challenged claims”) of U.S. Patent No. 6,954,789 B2 (Ex. 1005, “the ’789 patent”). We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6 and enter this Decision pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 318(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.73. For the reasons set forth below, we determine that Petitioner has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that claims 31 and 33 are unpatentable, but has not shown by a preponderance of the evidence that claim 34 is unpatentable. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 316(e).

## II. BACKGROUND

### A. Procedural History

Juniper Networks, Inc. and Palo Alto Networks, Inc. (collectively “Petitioner”) filed a Petition (Paper 3, “Pet.”) requesting an *inter partes* review of claims 31, 33, and 34 of U.S. Patent No. 6,954,789 B2 (Ex. 1005, “the ’789 patent”) pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 311. Petitioner supported its Petition with the Declaration of Dr. Jon B. Weissman. Ex. 1006. Packet Intelligence LLC (“Patent Owner”) filed a Preliminary Response (Paper 7, “Prelim. Resp.”).<sup>1</sup>

On September 10, 2020, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 314(a), we instituted trial to determine whether any challenged claim of the ’789 patent is unpatentable based on the grounds raised in the Petition:

---

<sup>1</sup> On our authorization (Paper 8), Petitioner also filed a Preliminary Reply (Paper 9) and Patent Owner filed a Preliminary Sur-Reply (Paper 10) related to discretionary denial of institution under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).



<b>Claim(s) Challenged</b>	<b>35 U.S.C. §<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>References</b>
31	103(a)	Riddle, <sup>3</sup> Ferdinand, <sup>4</sup> Baker <sup>5</sup>
33, 34	103(a)	Riddle, Ferdinand, Wakeman <sup>6</sup>
31	103(a)	Riddle, Ferdinand, Baker, Yu <sup>7</sup>
33, 34	103(a)	Riddle, Ferdinand, Wakeman, Yu
31	103(a)	Riddle, Ferdinand, Baker, RFC1945 <sup>8</sup>
33, 34	103(a)	Riddle, Ferdinand, Wakeman, RFC1945

Paper 20, 9, 53 (“Institution Decision” or “Inst. Dec.”).<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> The Leahy-Smith America Invents Act (“AIA”) included revisions to 35 U.S.C. § 103 that became effective on March 16, 2013. Because the ’789 patent issued from an application filed before March 16, 2013, we apply the pre-AIA version of the statutory basis for unpatentability.

<sup>3</sup> U.S. Patent No. 6,412,000 B1 (issued June 25, 2002) (“Riddle”) (Ex. 1008).

<sup>4</sup> PCT Published Application No. WO 92/19054 (published Oct. 29, 1992) (“Ferdinand”) (Ex. 1009).

<sup>5</sup> PCT Published Application No. WO 97/23076 (published June 26, 1997) (“Baker”) (Ex. 1013).

<sup>6</sup> U.S. Patent No. 5,740,175 (issued April 14, 1998) (“Wakeman”) (Ex. 1014).

<sup>7</sup> U.S. Patent No. 6,625,150 B1 (issued Sept. 23, 2003) (“Yu”) (Ex. 1011).

<sup>8</sup> T. Berners-Lee et al., *Hypertext Transfer Protocol -- HTTP/1.0*, Request for Comments 1945, Network Working Group (May 1996) (“RFC1945”) (Ex. 1010).

<sup>9</sup> Patent Owner filed a Request for Rehearing of the Institution Decision (Paper 24), which we denied (Paper 26).

Patent Owner filed a Response. Paper 27 (“PO Resp.”). Patent Owner supported its Response with the Declaration of Cathleen T. Quigley. Ex. 2061. Petitioner filed a Reply to Patent Owner’s Response. Paper 30 (“Reply”). Patent Owner filed a Sur-Reply. Paper 31 (“Sur-Reply”).

A combined oral hearing in this proceeding, IPR2020-00338 (involving a patent related to the ’789 patent), and IPR2020-00339 (involving other claims of the ’789 patent) was held on June 9, 2021. A transcript of the hearing is included in the record. Paper 45 (“Tr.”). A transcript of an oral hearing held the same day in cases IPR2020-00336 and IPR2020-00337, also involving patents related to the ’789 patent, is also included in the record of this proceeding.<sup>10</sup> Paper 46.

Following oral hearing, we ordered the parties to provide additional briefing on the claim-construction arguments presented in the briefs and at oral hearing. Paper 40 (“Order”). Petitioner and Patent Owner each filed respective Opening Briefs on claim construction. *See* Paper 41 (“Petitioner’s Opening Brief” or “Pet. Br.”); Paper 42 (“Patent Owner’s Opening Brief” or “PO Br.”). Petitioner filed a Responsive Brief to Patent Owner’s Opening Brief, Paper 43 (“Petitioner’s Responsive Brief” or “Pet. Resp. Br.”), and Patent Owner filed a Responsive Brief to Petitioner’s Opening Brief, Paper 44 (“Patent Owner’s Responsive Brief” or “PO Resp. Br.”).

*B. Real Parties in Interest*

Petitioner identifies Juniper Networks, Inc. and Palo Alto Networks, Inc. as its real parties in interest. Pet. 1. Patent Owner identifies Packet

---

<sup>10</sup> The parties had no objection to entering into this record the transcript from the oral hearing for IPR2020-00336 and IPR2020-00337. Tr. 5:22–6:10; *see also* Paper 46, 7:15–8:5.

Intelligence LLC and Packet Intelligence Holdings LLC as its real parties in interest. Paper 5, 2.

*C. Related Matters*

The parties identify three district court litigations as related matters that involve the '789 patent or a related patent: *Packet Intelligence LLC v. Juniper Networks, Inc.*, 3:19-cv-04741 (N.D. Cal.); *Palo Alto Networks, Inc. v. Packet Intelligence LLC*, No. 3:19-cv-02471 (N.D. Cal); and *Packet Intelligence LLC v. NetScout Systems, Inc.*, 2:16-cv-230-JRG (E.D. Tex.). Pet. 1; Paper 5, 2. The parties also identify *Packet Intelligence LLC v. NetScout Sys., Inc.*, No. 19-2041 (Fed. Cir.) as involving patents related to the '789 patent. Pet. 1; Paper 5, 2.

In addition to the present proceeding, the '789 patent is also the subject of an *inter partes* review proceeding in IPR2020-00339, which challenges claims 1, 2, 13–17, 19, 20, 42, 44, 48, and 49 of the '789 patent. A Final Decision in that proceeding is issued concurrently with this Final Decision.

Related U.S. Patent 6,839,751 B1 is the subject of an *inter partes* review proceeding in IPR2020-00338; related U.S. Patent 6,665,725 B1 is the subject of an *inter partes* review proceeding in IPR2020-00336; and related U.S. Patent 6,771,646 B1 is the subject of an *inter partes* review proceeding in IPR2020-00337. Pet. 1–2; Paper 5, 2–3. Final Written Decisions in those proceedings are issued concurrently with this Final Decision.

Lastly, the parties identify the following related matters that are no longer pending before the Board: (i) IPR2017-00629; IPR2017-00630; and IPR2019-01293, which challenged claims of the '789 patent; and (ii) IPR2017-00450; IPR2017-00451; IPR2017-00769; IPR2017-00862;

IPR2020-00486  
Patent 6,954,789 B2

IPR2017-00863; IPR2019-01289; IPR2019-01290; IPR2019-01291;  
IPR2019-01292; IPR2020-00335; and IPR2020-00485, which challenged  
claims of patents related to the '789 patent. Pet. 1–2; Paper 5, 3–5.

*D. The '789 Patent (Ex. 1005)*

The '789 patent, titled “Method and Apparatus for Monitoring Traffic  
in a Network,” relates to “[a] monitor for and a method of examining  
packets passing through a connection point on a computer network.”

Ex. 1005, codes (54), (57). The '789 patent states that “[t]here has long  
been a need for network activity monitors.” *Id.* at 1:55. According to the  
'789 patent, a network activity monitor monitors interconnected networks  
and collects data on objective information, such as “which services (i.e.,  
application programs) are being used, who is using them, how often they  
have been accessed, and for how long.” *Id.* at 1:63–66. This information,  
the '789 patent states, “is very useful in the maintenance and continued  
operation of these networks.” *Id.* at 1:66–67. A real-time network monitor  
may also “provide alarms notifying selected users of problems that may  
occur with the network or site.” *Id.* at 2:3–5.

The '789 patent's network activity monitor receives packets passing  
in either direction through its connection point on the network and  
“elucidate[s] what application programs are associated with each packet” by  
extracting information from the packet, using selected parts of the extracted  
information to identify this packet as part of a flow, “build[ing] a unique  
flow signature (also called a ‘key’) for this flow,” and “matching this flow in  
a database of known flows.” *Id.* at 9:6–9, 13:21–28, 13:60–65.

Figure 3, reproduced below, depicts various components of the  
network packet monitor 300, including parser subsystem 301, analyzer  
subsystem 303, and database of known flows 324. *Id.* at 11:49–16:52.




Figure 3 “is a functional block diagram of a process embodiment of the present invention that can operate as the packet monitor.”  
 Ex. 1005, 7:56–59.

Parser subsystem 301 “parses the packet and determines the protocol types and associated headers for each protocol layer that exists in the packet 302,” “extracts characteristic portions (signature information) from the packet 302,” and “build[s] a unique flow signature (also called a ‘key’) for this flow.” *Id.* at 12:19–24, 13:27–29; *see also id.* at 32:38–34:20 (describing an example of how the disclosed monitor builds signatures and flow states in the context of a Sun Remote Procedure Call (RPC), where, after all of the required processing, “KEY-2 may . . . be used to recognize packets that are in any way associated with the application ‘a<sup>2</sup>’”); Fig. 2.

Analyzer system 303 then determines whether the packet has a matching flow-entry in database of flows 324, and processes the packet

accordingly, including, for example, determining whether the packet belongs to an existing conversational flow or a new (i.e., not previously encountered) flow and, in the case of the latter, performing state processing to determine whether the conversational flow has been “fully characterized” and should be finalized. *Id.* at 13:60–16:52. The ’789 patent discloses that:

Future packets that are part of the same conversational flow have their state analysis continued from a previously achieved state. When enough packets related to an application of interest have been processed, a final recognition state is ultimately reached, i.e., a set of states has been traversed by state analysis to completely characterize the conversational flow. The signature for that final state enables each new incoming packet of the same conversational flow to be individually recognized in real time.

In this manner, one of the great advantages of the present invention is realized. Once a particular set of state transitions has been traversed for the first time and ends in a final state, a short-cut recognition pattern—a signature—can be generated that will key on every new incoming packet that relates to the conversational flow. Checking a signature involves a simple operation, allowing high packet rates to be successfully monitored on the network.

*Id.* at 16:17–34.

#### *E. The Challenged Claims*

Petitioner challenges claims 31, 33, and 34 of the ’789 patent. Pet. 8. Each of these claims depends, directly or indirectly, from independent claim 19 of the ’789 patent. Although claim 19 is challenged in co-pending IPR2020-00339 (*see supra* § II.B), not in this proceeding, claim 19 is illustrative of the subject matter claimed in the ’789 patent and is reproduced below to provide context for the challenged claims. Claim 19 recites:

19. A packet monitor for examining packets passing through a connection point on a computer network, each packets [*sic*] conforming to one or more protocols, the monitor comprising:

- (a) a packet acquisition device coupled to the connection point and configured to receive packets passing through the connection point;
  - (b) an input buffer memory coupled to and configured to accept a packet from the packet acquisition device;
  - (c) a parser subsystem coupled to the input buffer memory and including a slicer, the parsing subsystem configured to extract selected portions of the accepted packet and to output a parser record containing the selected portions,
  - (d) a memory for storing a database comprising none or more flow-entries for previously encountered conversational flows, each flow-entry identified by identifying information stored in the flow-entry;
  - (e) a lookup engine coupled to the output of the parser subsystem and to the flow-entry memory and configured to lookup whether the particular packet whose parser record is output by the parser subsystem has a matching flow-entry, the looking up using at least some of the selected packet portions and determining if the packet is of an existing flow; and
  - (f) a flow insertion engine coupled to the flow-entry memory and to the lookup engine and configured to create a flow-entry in the flow-entry database, the flow-entry including identifying information for future packets to be identified with the new flow-entry, the lookup engine configured such that if the packet is of an existing flow, the monitor classifies the packet as belonging to the found existing flow; and if the packet is of a new flow, the flow insertion engine stores a new flow-entry for the new flow in the flow-entry database, including identifying information for future packets to be identified with the new flow-entry,
- wherein the operation of the parser subsystem depends on one or more of the protocols to which the packet conforms.

Ex. 1005, 36:30–37:2.

Of the claims challenged in this proceeding, claim 31 depends directly from claim 19. Claim 31 recites:

31. A packet monitor according to claim 19, further comprising:  
a compiler processor coupled to the parsing/extraction operations  
memory, the compiler processor configured to run a compilation  
process that includes:

receiving commands in a high-level protocol description  
language that describe the protocols that may be used in packets  
encountered by the monitor and any children protocols thereof,  
and

translating the protocol description language commands into a  
plurality of parsing/extraction operations that are initialized into  
the parsing/extraction operations memory.

*Id.* at 37:61–38:6.

### III. ANALYSIS

We have reviewed the parties’ respective briefs as well as the relevant evidence discussed in those papers. For the reasons discussed in detail below, we determine that Petitioner has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that claims 31 and 33, but not claim 34, of the ’789 patent are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as having been obvious.

#### *A. Legal Standards*

To prevail in its challenges to the patentability of the challenged claims of the ’789 patent, Petitioner must demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that the claims are unpatentable. 35 U.S.C. § 316(e); 37 C.F.R. § 42.1(d) (2019). “In an [*inter partes* review], the petitioner has the burden from the onset to show with particularity why the patent it challenges is unpatentable.” *Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.*, 815 F.3d 1356, 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (citing 35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3) (2012) (requiring *inter partes* review petitions to identify “with particularity . . . the evidence that supports the grounds for the challenge to each claim”)). This burden of persuasion never shifts to patent owner. *See Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Nat’l*



*Graphics, Inc.*, 800 F.3d 1375, 1378 (Fed. Cir. 2015); *see also In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd.*, 829 F.3d 1364, 1375–78 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (discussing the burden of proof in *inter partes* review).

A claim is unpatentable for obviousness if, to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art, “the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made.” 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) (2006); *see also KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 406 (2007). The question of obviousness is resolved on the basis of underlying factual determinations including: (1) the scope and content of the prior art; (2) any differences between the claimed subject matter and the prior art; (3) the level of ordinary skill in the art; and (4) when in evidence, objective evidence of nonobviousness.<sup>11</sup> *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17–18 (1966). A petitioner cannot satisfy its burden of proving obviousness by employing “mere conclusory statements.” *Magnum Oil*, 829 F.3d at 1380. Moreover, a decision on the ground of obviousness must include “articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.” *KSR*, 550 U.S. at 418 (citing *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)).

We analyze Petitioner’s asserted grounds of unpatentability in accordance with the above-stated principles.

*B. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art*

We consider the asserted grounds of unpatentability in view of the understanding of a person of ordinary skill in the art and, thus, begin with

---

<sup>11</sup> The parties do not direct our attention to any evidence of objective indicia of nonobviousness.

the level of ordinary skill in the art. The level of ordinary skill in the art is “a prism or lens through which . . . the Board views the prior art and the claimed invention” to prevent hindsight bias. *Okajima v. Bourdeau*, 261 F.3d 1350, 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2001). In assessing the level of ordinary skill in the art, various factors may be considered, including the “type of problems encountered in the art; prior art solutions to those problems; rapidity with which innovations are made; sophistication of the technology; and educational level of active workers in the field.” *In re GPAC Inc.*, 57 F.3d 1573, 1579 (Fed. Cir. 1995). “[O]ne or more factors may predominate.” *Id.*

Petitioner contends that an ordinarily skilled artisan would have “had a bachelor’s degree in electrical engineering, computer engineering, computer science, or a related field (or its equivalent), and one to two years of experience working in networking environments, including at least some experience with network traffic monitors and/or analyzers.” Pet. 8–9 (citing Ex. 1056, 13–14; Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 195–201). In our Institution Decision, we adopted Petitioner’s articulation of the level of skill in the art, which we determined was consistent with the ’789 patent and the asserted prior art. Inst. Dec. 26–27. In its Response, Patent Owner states that it “generally does not object to this finding.” PO Resp. 22.

We apply Petitioner’s definition of the level of ordinary skill in the art, as we did in the Institution Decision. Inst. Dec. 26–27. We also maintain our determination that the definition offered by Petitioner is consistent with the teachings of the ’789 patent and the prior art of record. *Cf. Okajima*, 261 F.3d at 1355 (noting that the prior art itself may reflect an appropriate level of skill in the art).

*C. Claim Construction*

In interpreting the claims of the '789 patent, we “us[e] the same claim construction standard that would be used to construe the claim[s] in a civil action under 35 U.S.C. [§] 282(b).” 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b). The claim construction standard includes construing claims in accordance with the ordinary and customary meaning of such claims as would have been understood by one of ordinary skill in the art and the prosecution history pertaining to the patent. *See id.*; *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 1312–14 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc). We need not explicitly interpret every claim term for which the parties propose a construction. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 314(a) (2012); *Vivid Techs., Inc. v. Am. Sci. & Eng'g, Inc.*, 200 F.3d 795, 803 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (“[O]nly those terms need be construed that are in controversy, and only to the extent necessary to resolve the controversy.”); *see also Nidec Motor Corp. v. Zhongshan Broad Ocean Motor Co.*, 868 F.3d 1013, 1017 (Fed. Cir. 2017) (applying *Vivid Techs.* in the context of an *inter partes* review).

*1. Incorporation by reference of previous disclosures*

The '789 patent claims the benefit of two U.S. patent applications: (1) Provisional Application No. 60/141,903, filed on June 30, 1999 (Ex. 1016, “the provisional application”), and (2) Application No. 09/608,237, filed June 30, 2000, which issued as U.S. Patent No. 6,651,099 on November 18, 2003 (Ex. 1001, “the '099 patent”). *See* Ex. 1005, code (60), (63). The '789 patent states that “the contents” of these documents “are incorporated herein by reference.” *See id.* at 1:6–12 (incorporating by reference the application leading to the '099 patent), 13–17 (incorporating by reference the provisional application). Throughout their papers, the parties refer to the disclosures of the '099 patent and the

provisional application, and state that the '789 patent incorporates the entire contents of those disclosures. *See, e.g.*, PO Resp. 2 n.1; Reply 2 n.1, 4.

We agree with the parties that the '789 patent incorporates the disclosures of the '099 patent and the provisional application by specific reference to those documents. Ex. 1005, code (60), (63), 1:6–17; *see also* 37 C.F.R. § 1.57. Thus, we also refer to the '099 patent and the provisional application when discussing claim construction—not only for consistency with the parties, but also for consistency throughout our final decisions involving related *inter partes* proceedings between these parties. *See Advanced Display Sys., Inc. v. Kent State Univ.*, 212 F.3d 1272, 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (stating that material incorporated by reference is “effectively part of the host document as if it were explicitly contained therein”); *see also Trs. of Columbia Univ. v. Symantec Corp.*, 811 F.3d 1359, 1365–66 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (using statements in a provisional application to construe claim terms in a patent incorporating the provisional application by reference).

## 2. Overview

The only claim-construction dispute remaining in this proceeding concerns the meaning of “conversational flow[s],” as recited in independent claim 19.<sup>12</sup> *See* Ex. 1005, 36:45–48 (claim 19 reciting “a memory for storing a database comprising none or more flow-entries for previously encountered conversational flows, each flow-entry identified by identifying information stored in the flow-entry”). At the heart of the parties’ dispute is the following passage from the '099 patent:

---

<sup>12</sup> As noted above, challenged claims 31, 33, and 34 depend—directly or indirectly—from claim 19. As such, the challenged claims also include the “conversational flow[s]” limitation of claim 19.

A conversational flow, on the other hand, is the sequence of packets that are exchanged in any direction as a result of an activity—for instance, *the running of an application on a server as requested by a client*. It is desirable to be able to identify and classify conversational flows rather than only connection flows. The reason for this is that *some conversational flows involve more than one connection, and some even involve more than one exchange of packets between a client and server*.

Ex. 1001, 2:37–45 (emphases added). In our Institution Decision, we preliminarily construed “conversational flow” as a “sequence of packets that are exchanged in any direction as a result of an activity.” Inst. Dec. 30. We declined to include the phrases “for instance, the running of an application on a server as requested by a client” and “some conversational flows involve more than one connection,<sup>[13]</sup> and some even involve more than one exchange of packets between a client and server” in the construction of “conversational flow,” as Patent Owner had requested. *Id.* We explained that those passages, because they begin with the phrases “for instance,” “where some,” and “some,” are “merely exemplary and non-limiting.” *Id.*

Petitioner does not challenge our preliminary construction. Tr. 7:23–9:7. Patent Owner, however, argues that our construction captures only a “*part* of the definition in the specification,” and improperly “excludes some of the clarifying language that is *also* part of the explicit definition in the specification.” PO Resp. 23. According to Patent Owner, “[t]hat clarifying language is important for understanding the nature of a conversational flow.” *Id.*

---

<sup>13</sup> The '099 patent expressly defines “connection flow”: “The term ‘connection flow’ is commonly used to describe all the packets involved with a single connection.” Ex. 1001, 2:35–37. Neither party disputes this definition of “connection flow.”

Specifically, Patent Owner argues that the written description of the '789 patent provides an express definition of the term “conversational flow” and that the express definition controls even though it contains exemplary language. *Id.* at 23–24 (citing *Sinorgchem Co., Shandong v. Int’l Trade Comm’n*, 511 F.3d 1132, 1137 (Fed. Cir. 2007)). Patent Owner argues that the language following “for instance” is necessary for understanding a “conversational flow,” because that language “makes apparent that ‘conversational flow’ must relate to a conversation” and “involves an application activity involving *the same client*.” *Id.* at 26 (emphasis added); *see also* Sur-Reply 1 (arguing that an “‘activity’ occurs between specific entities”); PO Br. 1 (arguing that an activity “must relate to the actions of a particular client or end user”). “Ignoring that language,” Patent Owner argues, “risks losing the basic and fundamental requirement of a ‘conversation.’” PO Resp. 26.

Patent Owner also argues our construction is incorrect because, prior to this *inter partes* review, “every tribunal to have considered the proper construction for ‘conversational flow’ has accepted . . . the same construction advanced by Patent Owner” here:

the sequence of packets that are exchanged in any direction as a result of an activity—for instance, the running of an application on a server as requested by a client—and where some conversational flows involved more than one connection, and some even involve more than one exchange of packets between a client and server.

*Id.* at 24–25. As an example, Patent Owner argues that the District Court for the Eastern District of Texas adopted this construction in *Packet Intelligence LLC v. NetScout Systems, Inc.*, and that the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit “addressed conversational flows and connection flows when

*affirming* the jury’s infringement verdict in *NetScout*, which necessarily hinged on applying the court’s claim construction of ‘conversational flow.’” *Id.* at 25 (citing Ex. 2060, 3).

### 3. *Analysis*

Independent claim 19 recites a “a memory for storing a database comprising none or more flow-entries for previously encountered conversational flows.” Ex. 1005, 36:45–47 (claim 19). As explained above, the parties agree that “conversational flow” includes “the sequence of packets that are exchanged in any direction as a result of an activity,” but disagree whether the phrases “for instance, the running of an application on a server as requested by a client” and “some conversational flows involve more than one connection, and some even involve more than one exchange of packets between a client and server” should limit the meaning of “conversational flow.” Patent Owner argues that those phrases are necessary because they make clear that a conversational flow is client-specific. Thus, the parties’ basic dispute is whether a conversational flow is limited to a *specific client or user*, as Patent Owner argues, or may include *multiple clients or users*, as Petitioner contends. *Compare, e.g.*, PO Resp. 26 (arguing that “the basic and fundamental requirement” of a conversational flow is that it “involves an application activity involving the same client”), *with* Reply 3 (contending that “[t]he definitional language of ‘conversational flow’ doesn’t contain any requirement for identifying flows based on a particular user or client”).

Starting with the passage reproduced above that we identified as the heart of the parties’ dispute (Ex. 1001, 2:37–45), we determine that the “for instance” phrase is exemplary and does not limit a “conversational flow” to a specific client or user. The phrase “for instance” is synonymous with “for

example,” and necessarily indicates that “the running of an application on a server as requested by a client” exemplifies, but does not limit, the conversational flow to a server and a specific client or user.

Our determination that the “for instance” phrase is exemplary and non-limiting is consistent with Patent Owner’s argument in its Preliminary Response that the “some” phrase (“some conversational flows involve more than one connection, and some even involve more than one exchange of packets between a client and server”) is non-limiting. Specifically, Patent Owner argued that the use of the word “some” necessarily means that “*some* conversational flows involve multiple connections, while, *some* involve a single connection.” Prelim. Resp. 24 (citing Ex. 1001, 2:42–43). Similarly here, while “conversational flow” certainly may involve the running of an application on a server as requested by a single client or user, “conversational flow” is not *limited* to a single client or user.

Indeed, the ’099 patent and the provisional application expressly contemplate classifying connection flows from different clients into the same conversational flow when those connections involve the same activity. These documents describe, in the context of identifying packets as part of a conversational flow, a client/server protocol known as Service Advertising Protocol (SAP), which is “used to identify the services and addresses of servers attached to a network.” Ex. 1016, 3:12–14; Ex. 1001, 2:49–52. The provisional application describes a packet exchange between a client and the server in which the client sends a SAP request to a server for print service, and the server sends a SAP reply that identifies the print service address:

In a first exchange, a client sends a SAP request to a server, for example, for print service. The server sends a SAP reply that identifies a particular address, for example, SAP #5, as the print service on that server. Such may be responses used to update a



table, for example in a router, known as the Server Information Table.

Ex. 1016, 3:14–18; *see also* Ex. 1001, 2:53–58. The provisional application then describes a client who has “inadvertently seen” the SAP reply, and therefore does not need to make a SAP request, but may send a print request directly to SAP #5:

A client who has inadvertently seen this reply or who has access to the table (via the router that has the Server Information Table, for example) would know that SAP #5 for such this [*sic*] server is a print service. Therefore, in order to print data on the server, such a client does not need to make the request for a print service, but simply to send data to be printed specifying SAP #5.

Ex. 1016, 3:18–23; *see also* Ex. 1001, 2:58–64.

The provisional application explains that the packet exchange between the client who has “inadvertently seen” the print service address and SAP #5 is not connected to the initial packet exchange, “which was with a different client”:

This sending of data to be printed again involves an exchange of data between a client and a server, disjoint [*sic*] from the previous exchange which was *with a different client* setting up that SAP #5 is a print service on this server is a second connection.

Ex. 1016, 3:23–25 (emphasis added). Similarly, the ’099 patent describes this packet exchange as “independent of the initial exchange.” Ex. 1001, 2:64–67.

The provisional application states that “[i]t is desirable for a network packet monitor to be able to ‘virtually concatenate’ the first exchange that defines SAP #5 as the print service on the server with the second exchange that uses the print service.” Ex. 1016, 3:25–28. In this case, the provisional application explains, the two packet exchanges (the first between a client and the server and the second between a client and SAP #5) “would then be

correctly identified as being part of the same flow if the clients were the same,” but also, “[t]hey would *even be recognized if the clients were not the same.*” *Id.* at 3:28–30 (emphasis added). Similarly, the ’099 patent states that “because one features [*sic*] of the invention is to correctly identify the second exchange as being associated with a print service on that server, such exchange would *even be recognized if the clients were not the same.*” Ex. 1001, 3:44–48 (emphasis added).

We interpret the SAP description in the provisional application and ’099 patent as describing two seemingly disjointed packet exchanges involving two different clients or users (the first packet exchange between a client and the server and the second packet exchange between the client who has “inadvertently seen” the print service address and SAP #5) as belonging to the same “conversational flow.” And because Patent Owner’s proposed construction—that a “conversational flow” is client-specific—is inconsistent with the written description, we decline to limit a “conversational flow” to a specific client or user.

Patent Owner argues that our interpretation of the SAP example is incorrect because “[t]he second sentence” of that example—i.e., “such exchange would even be recognized if the clients were not the same”—merely “illustrates how a later print request by a different client can also be recognized as a *print request activity* because it uses the now known address of the print service.” Sur-Reply 7 (emphasis added). We are not persuaded. In the provisional application, this description of the second client follows the statement that “[i]t is desirable to be able to identify and classify *conversational flows,*” Ex. 1016, 3:7–8 (emphasis added), and is followed by statements describing “[o]ther protocols that are similar in that they may lead to disjointed *conversational flows,*” *id.* at 4:1–5 (emphasis added). The

provisional application also states that “[p]rior art network monitors do not presently have the ability to recognize such disjointed flows as belonging to the same conversational flow.” *Id.* at 4:13–14. Similarly, in the ’099 patent, the phrase “such exchange would even be recognized if the clients were not the same” is soon followed by the statement that “[w]hat distinguishes this invention from prior art network monitors is that it has the ability to *recognize disjointed flows as belonging to the same conversational flow.*” Ex. 1001, 3:48–51 (emphasis added). We view these statements, in context, as reinforcing the notion that the disclosed invention sought to classify disjointed connection flows—even those involving more than one client or user—into the same conversational flow based on a specific activity, such as print service.

We are not persuaded by Patent Owner’s argument that *Sinorgchem* compels a different result here. *See* PO Resp. 23–24. In *Sinorgchem*, the claim language at issue was “controlled amount,” of which the patent stated:

A ‘controlled amount’ of protic material is an amount up to that which inhibits the reaction of aniline with nitrobenzene, e.g., up to about 4% H<sub>2</sub>O based on the volume of the reaction mixture when aniline is utilized as the solvent.

511 F.3d at 1136. The International Trade Commission “agreed that the patentee had expressly defined the term ‘controlled amount’ in the specification but held that the language ‘e.g., up to about 4% H<sub>2</sub>O based on the volume of the reaction mixture when aniline is utilized as the solvent’ should not be considered part of that definition,” in part because the Commission considered “the 4% limit as merely an example that did not apply to all situations in which aniline was used as the solvent.” *Id.* at 1137. The Federal Circuit rejected the Commission’s construction, holding that “[w]hen aniline is used as the solvent, the express definition is neither

ambiguous nor incomplete—the ‘controlled amount’ is ‘up to about 4% H<sub>2</sub>O based on the volume of the reaction mixture’—and we need look no further for its meaning.” *Id.* at 1138.

Patent Owner argues that *Sinorgchem* stands for the proposition that an express definition in the specification controls even if it contains exemplary language. PO Resp. 24. According to Patent Owner, the phrase “for instance, the running of an application on a server as requested by a client” is the express definition of “conversational flow” that we must accept, even though it contains the exemplary language “for instance.” *Id.* We do not agree because, in *Sinorgchem*, the patent at issue described “at least six different solvents,” of which aniline was just one example. The Federal Circuit reasoned that, *when* aniline was used as the solvent, *then* the upper limit of protic material was “up to about 4% H<sub>2</sub>O.” *Sinorgchem*, 511 F.3d at 1138. In other words, the use of aniline was a condition precedent (“when aniline is utilized”) that, when satisfied, triggered the condition subsequent upper limit of protic material (“up to about 4% H<sub>2</sub>O”). *Id.* The language in the ’099 patent (“for instance, the running of an application on a server as requested by a client”)—unlike that in *Sinorgchem*—is not conditional. Thus, we find *Sinorgchem* to be inapposite to the facts of this case.

Finally, Patent Owner’s argument that “[b]efore the Institution Decisions in this and the related IPRs, every tribunal to have considered the proper construction for ‘conversational flow’ has accepted . . . the same construction advanced by Patent Owner,” PO Resp. 24–27, does not persuade us that our construction here is erroneous.

Despite Patent Owner’s argument, neither the District Court nor the Federal Circuit appears to have expressly analyzed “conversational flow”

and determined that the claim term necessarily includes the language recited within the “for instance,” “where some,” and “some” phrases. In *Packet Intelligence LLC v. NetScout Systems*, for example, the District Court merely adopted Patent Owner’s construction without analysis after the parties “reached agreement” at a hearing dated March 2, 2017. Ex. 1067, 6. And the Federal Circuit, if anything, appears to have relied on a definition of “conversational flow” lacking the additional phrases Patent Owner advances here. Ex. 2060, 3. Specifically, in describing “conversational flows,” the court stated that:

The specifications explain that it is more useful to identify and classify “conversational flows,” *defined as* “the sequence of packets that are exchanged in any direction as a result of an activity.”

*Id.* (citing Ex. 1001, 2:45–47) (emphasis added). Finally, we also observe that the Board’s constructions of “conversational flow” in prior proceedings were made in institution decisions and, thus, were merely preliminary. *See, e.g.*, Ex. 1056, 10 (interpreting “conversational flow” “*for purposes of this Decision*” (emphasis added)).

For these reasons, we have considered the constructions of the other panels and tribunals, but are not persuaded that our construction of “conversational flow” is mistaken or inconsistent with those other constructions. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.100 (b) (“Any prior claim construction determination concerning a term of the claim in a civil action, or a proceeding before the International Trade Commission, that is timely made of record in the inter partes review proceeding *will be considered.*” (emphasis added)).

4. *Summary*

In summary, having considered the totality of the arguments and evidence anew at the close of trial, we determine that “conversational flow[s]” means a “sequence of packets that are exchanged in any direction as a result of an activity,” without the additional restriction that the conversational flow must be client- or user-specific.

D. *The Prior Art*

Before turning to Petitioner’s asserted grounds of unpatentability, we provide a brief summary of the asserted references.

1. *Riddle (Ex. 1008)*

Riddle relates to a method for automatically classifying packet flows for use in allocating bandwidth resources by a rule of assignment of a service level. Ex. 1008, 4:6–10. The method comprises applying individual instances of traffic classification paradigms to packet network flows based on selectable information obtaining from layers of a multi-layered communication protocol in order to define a characteristic class, then mapping the flow to the defined traffic class. *Id.* at 4:10–15. Figure 3 is reproduced below.




FIG. 3

Figure 3 illustrates a system for automatically classifying traffic. Ex. 1008, 12:27–28.

With reference to Figure 3, traffic tree 302 classifies new traffic under a particular member class node. *Id.* at 12:28–30. Traffic classifier 304 detects services for incoming traffic. *Id.* at 12:30–31. Knowledge base 306 contains heuristics for determining traffic classes. *Id.* at 12:32–33. A plurality of saved lists 308 stores classified traffic pending incorporation into traffic tree 302. *Id.* at 12:37–38.

Figure 4A is reproduced below.




FIG. 4A

Figure 4A illustrates a flowchart 401 of processing steps for automatically classifying traffic. Ex. 1008, 12:42–43.

In a step 402 of Figure 4A, a flow specification is parsed from the flow being classified. *Id.* at 12:43–44. Then in step 404, the flow specification parsed from the flow in step 402 is compared with the traffic specifications in each node of the classification tree. *Id.* at 12:44–47. In decisional step 406, a determination is made of whether traffic matches one of the classes being classified. *Id.* at 12:48–50. If this is so, then in step 408, an entry is made in a list of identifying characteristics, such as protocol type, IP protocol number, server port, traffic type, MIME type, or time of occurrence of traffic. *Id.* at 12:50–53.



Figure 4B is reproduced below.




FIG. 4B

Figure 4B illustrates a flowchart 403 of the processing steps for integrating traffic classes into a classification tree. Ex. 1008, 13:36–38.

In a step 420 of Figure 4B, an instance of saved traffic is received from a saved traffic list 308. *Id.* at 13:40–42. Next, in decisional step 422, the instance of saved traffic is examined to determine whether it is well known and a name representing its type exists. *Id.* at 13:42–45. If this is so, then processing continues with a test of whether the saved traffic belongs to a service aggregate in step 426. *Id.* at 13:45–47. Otherwise, in step 423, the

instance of saved traffic is examined to determine whether it appears to be a server connection port of an unregistered IP port. *Id.* at 13:47–50. If this is not so, then processing continues with the next traffic class in the saved list in step 420. *Id.* at 13:51–52. In decisional step 426, the instance of saved traffic is examined to determine whether it belongs to a service aggregate. *Id.* at 13:52–54. If the traffic does belong to a service aggregate, then, in step 428, a traffic class is created which will match all components of the service aggregate. *Id.* at 13:57–59. In further step 425, a new traffic class is created to match the instance of saved traffic. *Id.* at 13:59–62.

2. *Ferdinand (Ex. 1009)*

Ferdinand relates to a system for “monitoring and managing communication networks for computers.” Ex. 1009, code (54), 1:3–4. Ferdinand discloses a monitoring system with “a Network Monitor 10 and a Management Workstation 12.” *Id.* at 11:32–12:1. In monitoring the network, Ferdinand indicates that a “statistical object represents a network parameter for which performance information is gathered,” and that Monitor 10 keeps information about monitored statistical objects in “Statistics Module (STATS) 36.” *Id.* at 22:18–22. STATS 36 is a database (*id.* at 19:5–11) and “defines the database and it contains subroutines for updating the statistics which it keeps” (*id.* at 28:14–15). Examples of data the database stores include records “per ip address,” “per ip pair,” “per udp pair,” “per ftp control connection,” and “per ftp data connection.” *Id.* at 29:3–30:7.

3. *Baker (Ex. 1013)*

Baker relates to systems and methods for parsing, filtering, generating and analyzing data (or frames of data) transmitted over a data

communications network. Ex. 1013, 3:32–35. Figure 1 of Baker is reproduced below.




FIG. 1

Figure 1 illustrates a network interface system. Ex. 1013, 8:11–13.

Baker describes a network interface system 10 implemented in a network device including input devices 12, data storage devices 14, analysis control logic 16 for facilitating input, storage, retrieval and analysis of network frames, and output devices 18 for forwarding frames or displaying or orienting the results of frames. *Id.* at 10:10–17. A data storage device 14 includes a data file 20 of network frames having  $n$  protocol data records. *Id.* at 10:17–19. Protocol description files 22 also are stored in the data storage device 14, where the protocol description files 22 describe a subset of a network protocol and include rules for analyzing that protocol. *Id.* at 10:21–25. The network device control logic 16 retrieves a subset of network frames from the input devices 12 or data files 20 which satisfy criteria based upon extracted field values and filtering criteria contained in the protocol description files 22. *Id.* at 10:26–31. The network device control logic 16

also determines frames and protocol header lengths, gathers statistics, performs verifications and error checks, determines routes, varies values, and formats output. *Id.* at 10:31–35.

Baker further describes that the network interface system parses successive protocol headers and further parses remaining information as application data and a frame pad. *Id.* at 26:27–32. Baker also describes that the network interface system parses fixed and optional fields in a selected protocol. *Id.* at 26:32–35. Baker additionally describes that the network interface system performs operations on extracted field values. *Id.* at 26:35–27:3. Baker further describes that the network interface system makes branching, next protocol determination, and validity decisions based on the extracted field values. *Id.* at 27:3–7.

#### 4. *Wakeman (Ex. 1014)*

Wakeman relates to a local access network (LAN) network switch that includes a random access memory (RAM) forwarding database (FDB) containing address-to-port mappings for all devices connected to the switch's ports, as well as at least one CAM-cache connected to one or more of the switch's ports. Ex. 1014, codes (54), (57). By way of background, Wakeman explains that LAN network switches typically include a switch engine (SE), an FDB, and one or more dozens of ports, where the FDB may be implemented either as a hardware CAM or as a RAM. *Id.* at 1:18–23, 1:55–56. According to Wakeman, a hardware CAM is “very fast,” but “can be prohibitively expensive,” whereas RAM “can be implemented at a fraction of the cost of such hardware CAM” but is “typically too slow to keep up” with a network switch's SE. *Id.* at 1:56–67. By including both a RAM FDB and a CAM-cache having an access time much faster than that of the FDB, Wakeman's switch purportedly overcomes the problems in the

prior art. *Id.* at 2:22–30; *see also id.* at 2:15–18 (citing a need for a network switch that is “not confined by the rigid balancing between the superior performance of a CAM database and the cost savings of a RAM database”).

5. *Yu (Ex. 1011)*

*Yu* relates to “an architecture 100 for applying policies to network data traffic.” *Ex. 1011*, 2:46–50. The architecture includes three components: (i) an application “such as a firewall, virtual private network (VPN), or traffic management,” (ii) a “policy engine,” and (iii) an API between these two components. *Id.* at 2:51–62.

*Yu* describes a “flow classification specification 203a provides the screening criteria for the flow classifier logic 204 to sort network traffic into flows,” that “[a]ll packets that match the same flow classification specification 203a form a flow,” that “a flow is a stream of correlated packets to which policy decisions apply,” and that “a flow classifier 204 classifies the packet according to one or more classification specifications 203a and finds one or more corresponding action specifications 203b.” *Id.* at 3:32–59. *Yu* further describes that a “stream is an ‘instantiation’ of a flow-packets that have the same source and destination address, source and destination port, and protocol type,” and “[p]ackets may be sorted into streams, and a flow may include one or more streams,” where “[a]ll packets belonging to the same stream are to be regulated by the same policy.” *Id.* at 4:2–9.

In *Yu*, “the stream classifier 207 matches the packets to a particular stream specification 208 and then, using the corresponding action specifications 210, activates the proper action processors 206.” *Ex. 1011*, 5:8–11.

6. *RFC1945 (Ex. 1010)*

RFC1945 is an informational specification, published by the Network Working Group, and concerns Hypertext Transfer Protocol 1.0. Ex. 1010, 1. The publication “reflects common usage of the protocol referred to as ‘HTTP/1.0’.” *Id.* The RFC defines several message headers, such as “Referer,” which “allows the client to specify, for the server’s benefit, the address (URI) of the resource from which the Request-URI was obtained,” and “Server,” which “contains information about the software used by the origin server to handle the request.” *Id.* at 44–45.

*E. Obviousness Over Riddle in View of Ferdinand and Baker*

Petitioner contends that claim 31 would have been obvious over Riddle in view of Ferdinand and further in view of Baker. Pet. 18–75. Patent Owner opposes. PO Resp. 34–46; Sur-Reply 13–16, 19–20. Having considered the totality of the arguments and evidence, we find that Petitioner has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that claim 31 is unpatentable as having been obvious over Riddle in view of Ferdinand and Baker.

Claim 31 depends from claim 19. Ex. 1005, 37:61–62. Claim 19 is not before us in this proceeding, but is at issue in related case IPR2020-00339. Petitioner repeats its analysis of claim 19 from the Petition in IPR2020-00339, and then provides its arguments and evidence for dependent claim 31. We first analyze Petitioner’s arguments and evidence for claim 19, and then turn to claim 31.

1. *Independent Claim 19*

a) *Preamble*

The preamble of claim 19 recites “[a] packet monitor for examining packets passing through a connection point on a computer network, each packets [*sic*] conforming to one or more protocols.” Ex. 1005, 36:30–32.

To the extent that the preamble is limiting, Petitioner persuasively shows that it is taught by Riddle. *See* Pet. 30–34 (citing Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 263–269, 618–623, 736, 866, 892).

Specifically, Petitioner persuasively shows that Riddle’s classifier operates in a network-connected computer system (e.g., in a server acting as a packet monitor and a network interface acting as a packet acquisition device) and parses and examines traffic flow packets passing through a network. *Id.* at 30–31 (citing Ex. 1008, code (57), 1:57–61, 4:6–17, 5:53–67, 12:27–41, 14:22–40, Fig. 3; Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 262–264). Thus, we agree with Petitioner that Riddle teaches a “method of examining packets . . . on a computer network” and a “packet monitor” for doing the same.

As to the claimed “connection point,” Petitioner contends, and we agree, that “the ’789 [p]atent acknowledges these points are where the packet monitor connects to the network.” *Id.* at 31–32 (citing Ex. 1005, 8:69–9:19, Fig. 1 (showing connection points 121–125)). Petitioner persuasively shows that Riddle’s packet monitor “connects to [a] network connection . . . via a system gateway” and thus teaches a “connection point” as claimed and described in the ’789 patent. *Id.* at 31 (citing Ex. 1008, 5:53–67, 6:9–15, 7:21–24, Figs. 1A, 1B; Ex. 1006 ¶ 265). Further, for networks connecting multiple clients and servers, Riddle teaches examining packets via “‘network routing means’ and/or routers,” which we agree with Petitioner also serve as “connection point[s]” as claimed. Ex. 1008, 7:10–34, Figs. 1C, 3; Pet. 32; Ex. 1006 ¶ 266.

Finally, as to the packets “conforming to one or more protocols,” we agree with Petitioner that Riddle teaches this feature. Pet. 33–34. Riddle’s system “relates to digital packet telecommunications, and particularly to management of network bandwidth based on information ascertainable from

multiple layers of OSI network model.” Ex. 1008, 1:54–57. Riddle’s Figure 1D shows the ISO network model diagramming the relationship between layers of the TCP/IP protocol suite (e.g., the application, transport, network, data link, and physical layers (80–88)). *Id.* at 7:35–8:46, Fig. 1D; Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 621–622; Pet. 34. Thus, we agree with Petitioner that an ordinarily skilled artisan would have understood that the packets disclosed in Riddle conform to the OSI-described protocols. Pet. 34 (citing Ex. 1006 ¶ 623).

Patent Owner does not substantively address Petitioner’s contentions or otherwise argue that Riddle fails to disclose the subject matter recited in the preamble of claim 19. For the reasons detailed above, we are persuaded that Petitioner has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that Riddle teaches this subject matter and adopt the contentions set forth in the Petition and in Dr. Weissman’s Declaration as mapped to the preambles as our own findings. *See In re NuVasive, Inc.*, 841 F.3d 966, 974 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (explaining that the Board need not make specific findings about claim limitations that a patent owner does not dispute are disclosed in the prior art).

*b) Packet Acquisition Device Limitation*

Next, claim 19 recites “a packet acquisition device” limitation: “a packet acquisition device coupled to the connection point and configured to receive packets passing through the connection point.” Ex. 1005, 36:34–36. Petitioner persuasively shows that Riddle teaches this subject matter. *See* Pet. 34–36 (citing Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 263–269, 273, 624–626, 737, 867, 892).

Specifically, Petitioner identifies various “packet acquisition device[s] coupled to [a] connection point” in Riddle, including network interface 40, which is connected to the system gateway depicted in Riddle’s Figures 1A



and 1B, and “network routing means” and router 75 depicted in Riddle’s Figure 1C. *Id.* at 34–35 (citing Ex. 1008, 6:5–15, 7:21–24, 16:54–17:15 (claim 8), Figs. 1A–1C; Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 624–625).

As to “receiv[ing] packets,” Petitioner persuasively shows that Riddle describes automatically classifying packet flows to help allocate bandwidth resources. *Id.* at 36. We agree with Petitioner and Dr. Weissman that, for this reason, an ordinarily skilled artisan “would have understood that Riddle’s packet acquisition device is configured to receive packets.” *Id.* (citing Ex. 1008, code (57), 4:7–17; Ex. 1006 ¶ 626).

Patent Owner does not substantively address Petitioner’s contentions or otherwise argue that Riddle fails to disclose the subject matter recited in the packet acquisition device limitation of claim 19. For the reasons detailed above, we are persuaded that Petitioner has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that Riddle teaches this subject matter and adopt the contentions set forth in the Petition and in Dr. Weissman’s Declaration as mapped to that undisputed limitation as our own findings. *NuVasive*, 841 F.3d at 974.

*c) Input Buffer Memory Limitation*

Next, claim 19 recites “an input buffer memory coupled to and configured to accept a packet from the packet acquisition device.” Ex. 1005, 36:37–38. Petitioner persuasively shows that Riddle teaches this subject matter, or that an input buffer memory would have been obvious over the combination of Riddle and Ferdinand. Pet. 36–38 (citing Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 270–276, 689–691, 893).

Specifically, Petitioner contends, and we agree, that Riddle’s memory subsystem 35a “acts as an input buffer memory by holding data in preparation for parsing and examination.” *Id.* at 37 (citing Ex. 1008, 6:5–15, Figs. 1A–1B; Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 271–273). In addition, Riddle’s Figure 1A

illustrates the memory subsystem 35a coupled to the network interface 40 (i.e., a packet acquisition device) via the system gateway, and is thus “coupled to and configured to accept a packet from the packet acquisition device.” Ex. 1008, 6:1–23, 16:54–17:15 (claim 8), Fig. 1A; Ex. 1006 ¶ 272. We further agree with Dr. Weissman that an ordinarily skilled artisan would have understood that Riddle’s memory subsystem 35a acts as “an input buffer memory” as claimed because the TCP/IP protocol allows for temporary storage in packet-buffer memory. Ex. 1006 ¶ 274 (citing Ex. 1027, 71–72). Petitioner also contends, and we agree, that an ordinarily skilled artisan would have understood Riddle’s router queues packets, and that a queue functions as a buffer memory within the router. Pet. 37 (citing Ex. 1008, 2:51–54, 7:21–24, 16:54–17:15 (claim 8); Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 273–274).

Alternatively, relying on the testimony of Dr. Weissman, Petitioner contends that an ordinarily skilled artisan “would have been motivated and found it obvious to include an input buffer memory in Riddle’s memory storage based either upon [an artisan’s] own knowledge of network devices or Ferdinand’s teachings.” *Id.* at 37–38 (citing Ex. 1006 ¶ 275). We agree. Specifically, Petitioner provides persuasive evidence in Riddle and in Dr. Weissman’s testimony that an ordinarily skilled artisan “would have known that input buffer memories, such as queues, were found in every routing device.” *Id.* at 37 (citing Ex. 1008, 2:51–55; Ex. 1006 ¶ 275). Petitioner also provides persuasive evidence that an ordinarily skilled artisan “would have understood that an input buffer memory temporarily stores incoming packets until the device is ready to process the packets” so as to avoid the loss of packets. *Id.* (citing Ex. 1009, 49:2–12; Ex. 1006 ¶ 275). For example, Ferdinand teaches a frame buffer (i.e., input buffer memory)

that is used to accept packets in network monitors. Ex. 1009, 26:2–7, 41:17–31, 49:11–12; Ex. 1006 ¶ 275.

We agree with Petitioner that an ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated, based on Ferdinand’s teachings, to “modify Riddle’s monitor with an input buffer memory to temporarily store received packets and improve performance by limiting packet drops,” and that including such input buffer memory in a packet acquisition device in accordance with Riddle’s and Ferdinand’s teachings “amounts to nothing more than combining known prior-art technologies used in their ordinary and predictable manner to queue packet traffic.” Pet. 38 (citing Ex. 1006 ¶ 276). Moreover, we agree with Petitioner that “Riddle and Ferdinand are in the same field of endeavor and contain overlapping disclosures with similar purposes,” and “illustrate that it was well-known and ubiquitous in the art for networking devices to include database storage structures” such as buffers. *Id.* at 28–29 (citing Ex. 1009, 19:8–12, 20:22–22:12, 26:2–7, 28:14–17, Figs. 5, 7A–7C; Ex. 1006 ¶ 258).

Patent Owner does not substantively address Petitioner’s contentions or otherwise argue that Riddle, either alone or in combination with Ferdinand, fails to disclose or suggest the input buffer memory limitation recited in claim 19. Accordingly, for the reasons detailed above, we are persuaded that Petitioner has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that Riddle and/or the combination of Riddle and Ferdinand teaches or suggests this subject matter, and that an ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine the teachings of the prior art as Petitioner proposes. We therefore adopt the contentions set forth in the Petition and in Dr. Weissman’s Declaration as mapped to this undisputed limitation of claim 19 as our own findings. *NuVasive*, 841 F.3d at 974.

*d) Parser Subsystem Limitation*

Claim 19 recites “a parser subsystem coupled to the input buffer memory and including a slicer, the parsing subsystem configured to extract selected portions of the accepted packet and to output a parser record containing the selected portions.” Ex. 1005, 36:39–44. Relying on disclosure in Riddle of a processor programmed to perform parsing/extraction operations and coupled to memory, Petitioner persuasively shows that Riddle discloses a parser subsystem (including a slicer) as recited in claim 19. Pet. 38–42 (citing Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 279–280, 692–700, 868, 894–896).

Specifically, Riddle teaches “a processor means operative to: parse a packet into a first flow specification” and illustrates in Figure 1A that the processor 30 is coupled to memory subsystem 35. Ex. 1008, 6:1–15, Fig. 1A. Riddle teaches that the parser applies “individual instances of traffic classification paradigms to packet network flows based on selectable information obtained from a plurality of layers of a multi-layered communication protocol in order to define a characteristic class, then mapping the flow to the defined traffic class.” *Id.* at 4:10–15. And Riddle teaches that the parser extracts identifying characteristics (i.e., a signature for the flow) such as patterns and/or reference strings from headers. *Id.* at 8:67–9:27; 12:42–59. Thus, we agree with Petitioner that Riddle teaches a parser subsystem (including a slicer) coupled to memory that parses and extracts packet portions. Pet. 39–40 (citing Ex. 1008, 4:10–15, 9:28–42, 9:48–49, 12:26–41, 12:42–53, 15:55–16:14 (claim 1), 16:54–17:15 (claim 8), 17:21–18:16 (claim 11), Fig. 4A; Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 693–694, 279–280). Further, Petitioner persuasively shows that Riddle teaches outputting the parser records containing the selected identifying characteristics in the same

way as disclosed by the '789 patent. *Id.* at 40–41 (citing Ex. 1005, 13:44–54; Ex. 1008, 8:67–9:27; 12:42–59, Fig. 4A; Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 697–698).

Patent Owner does not substantively address Petitioner’s contentions or otherwise argue that Riddle fails to disclose the subject matter recited in the parser record limitation of claim 19. For the reasons detailed above, we are persuaded that Petitioner has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that Riddle teaches this subject matter.

*e) Flow-Entry Database Limitations*

Claim 19 recites “a memory for storing a database comprising none or more flow-entries for previously encountered conversational flows, each flow-entry identified by identifying information stored in the flow-entry.” Ex. 1005, 36:45–48.

*(1) The Parties’ Arguments*

Petitioner contends that Riddle alone or in view of Ferdinand renders the flow-entry database limitations obvious. Pet. 43–58 (citing Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 301–339, 342, 371–372, 628–636). As to the recited “memory for storing . . . flow-entries” feature, Petitioner contends that Riddle’s packet monitor includes a storage subsystem 35 that stores flow-entry lists of previously encountered flows in a series of lists that include a plurality of flow-entries encountered by the monitor. *Id.* at 43–44 (citing Ex. 1008, 6:1–23, 6:43–50, 12:37–59, Figs. 1A, 1B, 3; Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 328–339, 628). According to Petitioner, Riddle incorporates the saved lists into a classification tree, where each node of the tree represents a traffic class. *Id.* (citing Ex. 1008, 8:47–50, 9:28–33, 2:37–41, Fig. 3; Ex. 1006 ¶ 329). Relying on the testimony of Dr. Weissman, Petitioner contends that an ordinarily skilled artisan would have understood that Riddle’s saved lists 308 “store flow-entries in memory.” *Id.* at 44–45 (citing Ex. 1006 ¶ 334).

Further, Petitioner contends that “Riddle identifies a ‘service aggregate’ which is one type of traffic.” *Id.* at 45 (citing Ex. 1008, 11:10–22, 13:53–59; Ex. 1006 ¶ 632). Petitioner contends that Riddle’s “service aggregate links together into a ‘conversation’ multiple connection flows based on specific software program activity (e.g., PointCast traffic),” and therefore, “Riddle teaches storing separate entries for encountered conversational flows.” *Id.* (citing Ex. 1006 ¶ 636; Ex. 1008, 11:60–63). Additionally, Petitioner contends that Riddle, in Figure 4B, “illustrates processing of the flow-entries of Figure 4A to determine whether a traffic class, such as a service aggregate, needs to be created for the flow,” and that Riddle’s monitor retrieves previously stored data from the saved lists, tests whether the retrieved traffic belongs to a service aggregate (i.e., “conversational flow”), and if so, creates a traffic class that “will match all components of the service aggregate.” *Id.* at 46–47 (citing Ex. 1008, 4:49–51, 13:35–14:6, Fig. 4B; Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 332–334).

According to Petitioner, an ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated and would have found it obvious to store Riddle’s lists and related tree in a flow-entry database, based either on the artisan’s own knowledge of network devices or on Ferdinand’s teachings, in order, for example, to increase functionalities in furtherance of Riddle’s desired goal of determining whether the packet monitor has received duplicate flow-entries. *Id.* at 47–49 (citing, e.g., Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 335, 338–339, 629–631; Ex. 1008, 6:1–15, 10:1–18 (Table 2); 12:32–35, 12:37–38, 12:53–57, 12:61–13:9, 14:1–5, 15:1–15, Fig. 4A; Ex. 1009, 23:19–23, 27:16–19, 28:14–24, 29:4–30:10, 39:23–40:16, 54:13–17, 60:10–15, Figs. 7A–7C, 22).

Petitioner further contends that Riddle discloses flow-entries of “previously encountered conversational flows” in at least two ways:

“(a) classifying based on service aggregates and (b) classifying based on PointCast.” *Id.* at 50 (citing Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 301–327, 632–636). As to the former, Petitioner contends that “Riddle teaches identifying whether packets are part of ‘service aggregates,’ i.e., traffic classes linking separate connection flows based on the associated application,” and that “these ‘service aggregates’ meet the claimed ‘conversational flows.’” *Id.* (citing Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 302–303). Indeed, Petitioner contends, Riddle’s claims 1 and 2 teach that the service aggregates are conversational flows. *Id.* at 53–55 (citing Ex. 1008, 15:56–16:14 (claim 1) (reciting “said network having any number of flows” and “parsing a packet into a first flow specification”), 16:15–26 (claim 2) (reciting “for at least a second flow having a second flow specification, recognizing said second flow specification and said first flow specification to comprise together a service aggregate” and “associating said first flow specification and said second flow specification with a newly-created classification tree node, said newly-created classification tree type node having a first traffic specification corresponding to said first flow specification and a second traffic specification corresponding to said second flow specification”); Ex. 1006 ¶ 313).

Regarding “PointCast Traffic,” Petitioner contends that the provisional application, from which the ’789 patent claims priority and which is incorporated by reference, expressly “specifies that PointCast traffic flows include an identification signature, and that identifying PointCast traffic is an example of identifying a conversational flow.” Pet. 56–57 (citing Ex. 1016, 7:16–25; Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 320–321). Because Riddle “creates a single traffic class for disjointed PointCast connection flows by searching headers for URLs that begin with ‘/FIDO-1/,”” Petitioner contends, “Riddle thus teaches identifying a conversational flow.” *Id.*

(citing Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 322–324; Ex. 1008, 11:57–12:9). Petitioner contends that an inventor of the ’789 patent previously testified that creating a single flow to describe such disjointed flows is a type of conversational flow. *Id.* at 57 (citing Ex. 1068, 55:11–57:15; Ex. 1071 ¶ 4; Ex. 1072, 3). Petitioner also contends that “Riddle teaches that one of its autoclassification processes identifies PointCast traffic using the outside service field of the class,” specifying that “certain traffic may be distinguished by a signature,” and “[a]ccordingly, based on Riddle’s teachings, [an ordinarily skilled artisan] would have understood that Riddle stores flow-entries for ‘previously encountered conversational flows’ such as PointCast traffic.” *Id.* at 57–58 (citing Ex. 1008, 11:50–53, 14:54–63, 15:28–31; Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 325, 326–327). Finally, Petitioner contends that Riddle teaches “each flow-entry identified by identifying information stored in the flow-entry” as claimed, because Riddle enters characteristics of the traffic flow into the saved list (step 408), which identifying information includes “a flow specification and indicators.” *Id.* at 58 (citing, *e.g.*, Ex. 1008, 12:42–59, Figs. 4A–4B; Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 342, 628).

In response to Petitioner’s contentions, Patent Owner argues, first, that Riddle fails to teach “conversational flows,” *see* PO Resp. 34–45, and second, that the combination of Riddle and Ferdinand does not teach the claimed flow-entry database, *see id.* at 45–46. As to “conversational flows,” Patent Owner argues that Riddle classifies traffic into generic traffic classes, but does not perform any more granular analysis. *Id.* at 40. According to Patent Owner, Riddle has no need or ability to recognize whether a particular group of packets in one direction relate to another flow or may form part of a conversational flow implicating an activity, unlike the claims of the ’789 patent “which require specific operations involving



conversational flows.” *Id.* Further, according to Patent Owner, “just because Riddle discloses a traffic classification activity does not mean that it discloses or suggests the specific activity required in the ’789 [p]atent, which is narrowly focused on conversational flows.” *Id.* at 41–42. Patent Owner argues that “Riddle combines flows based on the type of activity,” but “the ’789 [p]atent inventions recognize separate conversational flows even when these different flows are based on the same type of activity.” *Id.* at 42. Still further, Patent Owner argues that “‘conversational flows’ include *bidirectional* exchanges of packets,” but Riddle “expressly teaches that its traffic classes are limited to unidirectional traffic.” *Id.* at 44 (citing Ex. 1008, 8:50–53, 11:28–29, 13:57–59; Ex. 2061 ¶¶ 64–65, 83). According to Patent Owner, “[b]ecause Riddle’s traffic classes are unidirectional, they cannot satisfy the ‘conversational flow’ element required in every challenged claim.” *Id.* at 44–45.

Regarding the claimed flow-entry database limitations, Patent Owner argues that Riddle does not use conversational flows, and accordingly, “fails to disclose multiple limitations present in the claims of the ’789 [p]atent,” such as the recited flow-entry database “comprising none or more flow-entries for previously encountered conversational flows.” *Id.* at 45 (citing Ex. 2061 ¶ 87). Further, Patent Owner argues, although the Petition relies on the combination of Riddle and Ferdinand as teaching this limitation, “Ferdinand gathers statistics on network traffic” and “never discloses or suggests storing ‘flow-entries for previously encountered conversational flows.’” *Id.* (citing Ex. 1009, 7:17–18, 8:3–5). “Nor would Ferdinand have reason to implement such a solution,” according to Patent Owner, “because its goal is merely to keep count,” and “[i]t can do so by the standard statistical measures described in the specification.” *Id.* at 45–46.

In its Reply, Petitioner contends that Patent Owner’s arguments do not analyze Riddle under the Board’s construction of “conversational flows,” but instead under Patent Owner’s own incorrect construction. Reply 8–10. Regardless, Petitioner contends, Riddle discloses “conversational flows” even under Patent Owner’s construction. *Id.* at 11. First, according to Petitioner, “Riddle specifies that its service aggregate ‘is provided for certain applications that use more than one connection in a *particular* conversation between a *client* and a *server*.’” *Id.* (citing Ex. 1008, 11:10–19). For example, Petitioner contends, “Riddle describes listing service aggregates based on their source and/or destination, e.g., ‘host1,’ where host1 can represent a client or a server involved in an FTP flow.” *Id.* at 11–12 (citing Ex. 1008, 2:13–21, 7:12–21, 13:8–26, Fig. 1C; Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 311–312, 823). Further, Petitioner contends that “Riddle teaches defining a traffic class by URI-pattern (e.g., ‘/sales/\*’) and by the specific client/server pair involved (e.g., from ‘client Z’ to ‘server Y’).” *Id.* at 12 (citing Ex. 1008, 8:58–9:11; Pet. 62–63).

In response to Patent Owner’s argument that Riddle classifies inbound and outbound flows only separately, rather than bidirectionally, Petitioner contends that Riddle, in fact, discloses that all traffic in a particular conversation between a client and a service is classified into a single service aggregate. *Id.* at 13 (citing Ex. 1008, 11:12–15; Pet. 46–47). Petitioner cites, for example, disclosure in Riddle that the service aggregate for an FTP session contains “each conversation” between the client and server for the session, which Petitioner contends refers to all packets exchanged in either direction. *Id.* at 13–14 (citing Ex. 1008, 11:13–19, 12:1–12, 13:54–59; Pet. 48). Still further, Petitioner argues that “Riddle isn’t limited to flow classification based on port or server identity,” but discloses, for example,

that “flow classification can use port numbers and can further ‘extend to examination of the data contained in a flow’s packets’ via signature-based analysis.” *Id.* at 14 (citing Ex. 1008, 11:50–53; Pet. 71). Petitioner contends that “Telnet traffic’s multi-packet ‘option negotiations’ ‘may indicate an appropriate class,’ an example of classification from exchanged data, not port number.” *Id.* (citing Ex. 1008, 11:66–67).

Lastly, in response to Patent Owner’s arguments that “Riddle . . . has no disclosure of a flow-entry database” and that “Ferdinand never discloses or suggests storing ‘flow-entries for previously encountered conversational flows’” (PO Resp. 45–46), Petitioner contends that Patent Owner does not address the Petition’s contention that, “based upon [an ordinarily skilled artisan’s] knowledge of network devices, [that artisan] would have been motivated and found it obvious to store Riddle’s classification information, such as flow-entry lists 308, in a database.” Reply 15 (citing Pet. 25–29, 47–49). Petitioner further contends that the Petition alleges that the “flow-entry database” limitations would have been obvious over “Riddle alone or in combination with Ferdinand,” not based on Ferdinand alone, and that Patent Owner’s arguments with respect to Ferdinand individually are irrelevant to Petitioner’s asserted ground of unpatentability. *Id.* at 16 (citing Pet. 25–29, 48–49). Citing arguments presented in the Petition, Petitioner contends that “[t]he ‘flow-entry database limitations’ would have been obvious in view of Riddle’s teachings regarding flow-entries and relational databases based on Ferdinand’s teachings regarding statistics databases for storing flow classification information.” *Id.* (citing Pet. 25–29, 47–49).

In the Sur-Reply, Patent Owner argues that Riddle fails to disclose “conversational flows,” because Riddle does not classify activities based on a particular client, Riddle categorizes inbound and outbound traffic

separately, and Riddle fails to distinguish between different activities of the same type. Sur-Reply 13–16. First, according to Patent Owner, Petitioner’s contention that a service aggregate can distinguish between the same type of activity between different clients (Reply 11–12) “hinges on an extrapolation of how a single connection example is classified that is not supported by the rest of the specification.” Sur-Reply 14. According to Patent Owner:

In Riddle, service aggregates are a “common traffic class” that are “created with a plurality of traffic specifications.” EX1008 at 11:15–23. Riddle notes “[a] traffic class is broadly defined as traffic between *one or more clients* and *one or more servers*.” *Id.* at 8:48–49, 14:18–20 (“[A]nother method of identifying an individual traffic class is to detect simultaneous connections to the same host port from different clients.”). Thus, Riddle does not classify traffic per user, but by the type of traffic based on properties such as the ports being used. This understanding reflects Riddle’s stated purpose—bandwidth management.

Petitioner also suggests that, because a traffic class can be defined in terms of a specific source or destination IP address, . . . Riddle discloses “classifying traffic into client-specific conversational flows.” Reply at 12 (citing Riddle at 8:58–9:11, 10:1–17). That is incorrect. A rule written specifically for a client’s IP address would not distinguish one client activity from another; it would simply aggregate all traffic for that client. Defining a traffic class in terms of a specific source or destination address is an implementation of the conventional technique of matching one or more parts of a 5-tuple—but not a conversational flow. PO [Resp.] 6, 19–20; EX2061 ¶¶ 62–65, 81–83.

*Id.* at 14. Further, Patent Owner argues, “Riddle expressly teaches that its traffic classes are limited to unidirectional traffic, and that service aggregates are traffic classes.” *Id.* at 15. Finally, with regard to the recited “flow-entry database,” Patent Owner responds that, notwithstanding Petitioner’s arguments that implementing these limitations would have been obvious,

“Petitioner provided no evidence or argument to show it would have been ‘unusually simple’ to add the claimed limitations, nor that the technology is ‘particularly straightforward.’” *Id.* at 19. According to Patent Owner, “[t]he challenged claims do not recite a database generally, but recite a flow-entry database specifically adapted for use in a packet monitor,” and an ordinarily skilled artisan “would have understood the statistics database of Ferdinand to serve a very different purpose than the claimed flow-entry database.” *Id.* at 19–20.

(2) *Analysis*

Having considered the full trial record, we are persuaded that Petitioner has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that the combination of Riddle and Ferdinand renders obvious the recited flow-entry database limitations in view of the proper construction of “conversational flow.” *See supra* § III.C. Petitioner’s contentions, which we adopt, are supported by the cited evidence and are persuasive. Moreover, we are persuaded that an ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Riddle and Ferdinand as proposed by Petitioner and supported by the testimony of Dr. Weissman. *See* Pet. 28–29 (citing Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 256–257, 259).

As an initial matter, for the reasons set forth in Section III.C above, we conclude that the term “conversational flow” is not client- or user-specific. Further, notwithstanding Patent Owner’s arguments that Riddle is concerned with bandwidth management rather than network monitoring, PO Resp. 40–43; Sur-Reply 13, obviousness does not require that the prior art address the same problem identified by the patent. *See KSR*, 550 U.S. at 419 (“[N]either the particular motivation nor the avowed purpose of the patentee controls . . . . What matters is the objective reach of the claim. If the claim

extends to what is obvious, it is invalid.”); *Outdry Techs. Corp. v. Geox S.p.A.*, 859 F.3d 1364, 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2017) (“The motivation supported by the record . . . need not be the same motivation articulated in the patent.”).

Further, contrary to Patent Owner’s contentions (PO Resp. 44–45; Sur-Reply 15–16), neither the Board’s construction of “conversational flow” nor Patent Owner’s proposed construction *requires* “bidirectional” exchanges of packets (*see supra* § III.C; PO Resp. 23–26). Indeed, both the Board’s adopted construction and Patent Owner’s proposed construction recite, *inter alia*, “the sequence of packets that are exchanged *in any direction* as a result of an activity.” *Supra* § III.C (emphasis added); PO Resp. 23–26. The phrase “in any direction” is not limited to bidirectional packet flows but also encompasses unidirectional flows. As Petitioner points out, this interpretation is consistent with the testimony of Ms. Quigley, who states that conversational flows “can,” rather than “must,” include bidirectional exchanges. Ex. 2061 ¶ 83; Reply 13 n.41. Regardless, we further agree with Petitioner that Riddle’s disclosure—that all traffic in a particular conversation between a client and a server is classified into a single service aggregate—teaches bidirectional exchange. Reply 13 (citing Ex. 1008, 11:12–19, 12:1–12, 13:54–59); *see also* Pet. 52 (mapping Riddle’s service aggregates to the claimed conversational flows and stating that Riddle’s “Table 3 specifies detecting services in ‘both directions’”).

Having concluded that Riddle teaches the claimed “conversational flows,” we are further persuaded by Petitioner’s contentions that an ordinarily skilled artisan would have found it obvious in view of the combined teachings of Riddle and Ferdinand to store flow-entries for previously encountered conversational flows in a database. *See* Pet. 48–49. Riddle discloses storing flow entries in its series of lists 308 that include a

plurality of flow-entries encountered by the monitor, and Petitioner persuasively shows, with the support of Dr. Weissman’s testimony, that an ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated, based either on Riddle’s own disclosure of relational database 306 or on the teachings of Ferdinand, to implement Riddle’s saved flow-entries in a database, in order, for example, to increase functionalities in furtherance of Riddle’s desired goal of determining whether the packet monitor has received duplicate flow-entries. *Id.* at 47–49 (citing, *e.g.*, Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 335, 338–339, 629–631; Ex. 1008, 6:1–15, 10:1–18 (Table 2); 12:32–35, 12:37–38, 12:53–57, 12:61–13:9, 14:1–5, 15:1–15, Fig. 4A; Ex. 1009, 23:19–23, 27:16–19, 28:14–24, 29:4–30:10, 39:23–40:16, 54:13–17, 60:10–15, Figs. 7A–7C, 22).

Finally, because the asserted ground is based on the combination of Riddle and Ferdinand, Patent Owner’s arguments that Ferdinand does not individually teach storing flow-entries in a database are unpersuasive. *See Bradium Techs. LLC v. Iancu*, 923 F.3d 1032, 1050 (Fed. Cir. 2019) (holding that arguments that “attack the disclosures of the two references individually” cannot overcome a ground premised on the combination of those references (citing *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 1097 (Fed. Cir. 1986) (“Non-obviousness cannot be established by attacking references individually where the rejection is based upon the teachings of a combination of references.”))).

Accordingly, for these reasons, we are persuaded that Petitioner has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that the recited flow-entry database limitations are taught by the combination of Riddle and Ferdinand.

*f) Lookup Engine Limitation*

Claim 19 recites “a lookup engine coupled to the output of the parser subsystem and to the flow-entry memory and configured to lookup whether

the particular packet whose parser record is output by the parser subsystem has a matching flow-entry, the looking up using at least some of the selected packet portions and determining if the packet is of an existing flow.”

Ex. 1005, 36:49–55. Petitioner persuasively shows that Riddle and/or Riddle in view of Ferdinand renders this limitations obvious. Pet. 58–60 (citing Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 328–339, 342, 627–636, 652, 705–706, 739–741, 868, 899).

Specifically, while referring back to its contentions with respect to the flow-entry database limitation, *see supra* § III.E.1.e.1., Petitioner contends that “Riddle looks up whether a received packet belongs to a flow-entry using its processor and memory subsystem, which is the claimed ‘lookup engine.’” Specifically, Petitioner contends that “Riddle’s operations run on a processor having programming code performing lookup functions to match parsed flow specifications to a traffic class.” Pet. 58–60 (citing Ex. 1008, 5:53–57, 11:10–23, 12:42–49, 13:36–62. 16:54–17:15 (claim 8); Fig. 4A; Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 333, 342, 706). We agree with Petitioner and Dr. Weismann that an ordinarily skilled artisan “would have understood Riddle’s processor and memory include a lookup engine,” because Riddle’s lookup engine is configured to determine whether a received packet belongs to a flow-entry in the flow-entry lists. *Id.* at 60 (citing Ex. 1006 ¶ 706).

Patent Owner does not substantively address Petitioner’s contentions or otherwise argue that Riddle, either alone or in combination with Ferdinand, fails to disclose or suggest the lookup engine limitation recited in claim 19. Accordingly, for the reasons detailed above, we are persuaded that Petitioner has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that Riddle and/or the combination of Riddle and Ferdinand teaches or suggests this subject matter, and that an ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to



combine the teachings of the prior art as Petitioner proposes. We therefore adopt the contentions set forth in the Petition and in Dr. Weissman's Declaration as mapped to these undisputed limitations of claim 19 as our own findings. *NuVasive*, 841 F.3d at 974.

*g) Flow Insertion Engine Limitation*

Claim 19 recites, in part, “a flow insertion engine coupled to the flow-entry memory and to the lookup engine and configured to create a flow-entry in the flow-entry database, the flow-entry including identifying information for future packets to be identified with the new flow-entry.” Ex. 1005, 36:56–60. Petitioner persuasively shows that Riddle teaches this subject matter of claim 19. Pet. 61–62 (citing Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 715–720, 900–903).

Specifically, while referring back to its contentions with respect to the flow-entry database limitation of claim 19, *see supra* § III.E.1.e.1., Petitioner contends that, as shown in Figure 4B, “Riddle describes looking up whether a particular packet has a matching entry for a stored service aggregate flow (i.e., ‘conversational flow’) at step 426, and if not, creates a new flow-entry at step 425 for further packets to be identified with the new flow-entry.” Pet. 61 (citing Ex. 1008, 11:10–23, 13:36–62, Fig. 4B; Ex. 1006 ¶ 716). We agree with Petitioner and Dr. Weissman that an ordinarily skilled artisan “would have understood that Riddle’s processor and the corresponding code performing the functions above constitute the claimed ‘flow insertion engine,’” given Riddle’s teachings that a new flow-entry is created if the packet does not have a matching entry in a service aggregate. *Id.* at 62 (citing Ex. 1006 ¶ 706).

Patent Owner does not substantively address Petitioner’s contentions or otherwise argue that Riddle fails to disclose or suggest the flow insertion

engine limitation recited in claim 19. Accordingly, for the reasons detailed above, we are persuaded that Petitioner has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that Riddle teaches this subject matter and adopt the contentions set forth in the Petition and in Dr. Weissman's Declaration as mapped to this undisputed limitation of claim 19 as our own findings. *NuVasive*, 841 F.3d at 974.

*h) Classifying Flows Limitations*

Next, claim 19 recites limitations relating to the classification of packets as belonging to an existing flow or a new flow, depending on whether the packet "is of an existing flow," or "is of a new flow." See Ex. 1005, 36:60–67. Relying on the testimony of Dr. Weissman, and reiterating its contentions with respect to the flow-entry database limitation (*supra* § III.E.1.e.1), Petitioner persuasively shows that Riddle teaches each of these remaining limitations. Pet. 63–65 (citing, *e.g.*, Ex. 1008, 5:53–57, 9:28–41, 10:19–56, 12:42–60, 13:36–62, 15:16–27, Figs. 2A–2B, 3, 4A–4B; Ex. 1006, 650–652, 655, 705–706, 721–728, 742, 870–871, 904–905).

Specifically, as explained above (*supra* §§ III.E.1.f–g), Riddle's lookup engine looks up whether a flow is a new flow or an existing flow, and if the packet is of a new flow, Riddle's flow insertion engine creates a new flow-entry and identifying information to associate future packets with the new flow-entries. Ex. 1008, 12:42–60, 13:36–62, Fig. 4A (step 408), Fig. 4B (step 425).

Patent Owner does not substantively address Petitioner's contentions or otherwise argue that Riddle fails to disclose or suggest the classifying flows limitations recited in claim 19. Accordingly, for the reasons detailed above, we are persuaded that Petitioner has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that Riddle teaches this subject matter and adopt the contentions set

forth in the Petition and in Dr. Weissman’s Declaration as mapped to these undisputed limitations of claim 19 as our own findings. *NuVasive*, 841 F.3d at 974.

*i) Protocol Limitation*

The final limitation of claim 19 specifies that the “operation of the parser subsystem depends on one or more of the protocols to which the packet conforms.” *See* Ex. 1005, 37:1–2. We agree with Petitioner that Riddle teaches this limitation. Pet. 66–67 (citing Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 729–733, 872, 906; Ex. 1008, 4:10–15, 9:28–42, 9:48–49, 9:64–65, 11:48–67, 12:3–12, 12:26–41).

Specifically, Riddle teaches that its packet applies “individual instances of traffic classification paradigms to packet network flows based on selectable information obtained from a plurality of layers of a *multi-layered communication protocol* in order to define a characteristic class, then mapping the flow to the defined traffic class.” Ex. 1008, 4:10–15 (emphasis added). Thus, we agree with Petitioner that an ordinarily skilled artisan “would have understood that the operation of Riddle’s parsing subsystem depends on the one or more protocols of the received packets.” Pet. 67 (citing Ex. 1003 ¶ 733).

Patent Owner does not substantively address Petitioner’s contentions or otherwise argue that Riddle fails to disclose or suggest the protocol limitations recited in claim 19. Accordingly, we are persuaded that Petitioner has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that Riddle teaches this subject matter and adopt the contentions set forth in the Petition and in Dr. Weissman’s Declaration as mapped to these undisputed limitation of claim 19 as our own findings. *NuVasive*, 841 F.3d at 974.

2. *Dependent Claim 31*

We now turn to claim 31. Claim 31 recites that the packet monitor further comprises:

a compiler processor coupled to the parsing/extraction operations memory, the compiler processor configured to run a compilation process that includes:

receiving commands in a high-level protocol description language that describe the protocols that may be used in packets encountered by the monitor and any children protocols thereof, and

translating the protocol description language commands into a plurality of parsing/extraction operations that are initialized into the parsing/extraction operations memory.

Ex. 1005, 37:61–38:6.

In support of its contentions as to the combination of Riddle and Baker, Petitioner provides a detailed mapping of Baker’s teachings of “compilation processes that (a) receive commands in a high-level protocol description language describing protocols and (b) translate those commands into parsing/extraction operations.” Pet. 70–75 (citing Ex. 1013, 2:63–3:8, 11:26–12:6, 17:7–18, 21:32–24:5 (Tables 12–13) 128:20–132:24; Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 408–421, 589–594, 918–919). Patent Owner does not substantively address Petitioner’s contentions or otherwise argue that the prior art fails to disclose or suggest the limitations recited in dependent claim 31. We have reviewed Petitioner’s contentions and supporting evidence regarding these limitations, and are persuaded that Petitioner has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that Riddle teaches this subject matter and adopt the contentions set forth in the Petition and in Dr. Weissman’s Declaration as mapped to these undisputed limitation of claim 19 as our own findings. *NuVasive*, 841 F.3d at 974.

Moreover, as explained above in Section III.E.1.e.2, we are persuaded that an ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Riddle and Ferdinand as proposed by Petitioner and supported by the testimony of Dr. Weissman. *See* Pet. 28–29 (citing Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 256–257, 259). And, as to reasons for adding the teachings of Baker, we agree with Petitioner that “Riddle, Ferdinand, and Baker are in the same field of endeavor and contain overlapping disclosures with similar purposes.” *Id.* at 69 (citing Ex. 1013, 1:2–2:10, 3:32–4:6; Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 400–402). We further credit the unrebutted testimony of Dr. Weissman that an ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Riddle’s processor with compilation processes that (a) “receive[] commands in a high-level protocol description language describing protocols” and (b) “translate[] those commands into parsing/extraction operations.” Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 403–404.

### 3. *Summary*

After having analyzed the entirety of the trial record, we determine that Petitioner has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that claim 31 is unpatentable over the combination of Riddle, Ferdinand, and Baker. In particular, we find that Petitioner has demonstrated sufficiently that the teachings of the prior art account for all limitations of the claims, have been properly combined, and that an ordinarily skilled artisan would have found it obvious to combine these teachings in the manner proposed by Petitioner.

#### *F. Obviousness Over Riddle in View of Ferdinand and Further in View of Wakeman*

Petitioner contends that claims 33 and 34 would have been obvious over Riddle in view of Ferdinand and further in view of Wakeman. Pet. 75–81. Claims 33 and 34 depend from claim 31 and further recites a “cache subsystem.” Ex. 1005, 38:22–30. In claim 33, the cache subsystem “is

coupled to and between the lookup engine and the flow-entry database memory providing for fast access of a set of likely-to-be-accessed flow-entries from the flow-entry database.” *Id.* at 38:22–27. In claim 34, the cache subsystem “is an associate cache subsystem including one or more content addressable memory cells (CAMS).” *Id.* at 38:29–30.

Petitioner contends that using a cache subsystem “to speed up flow processing was well known in the art.” Pet. 79 (citing Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 640, 648). Petitioner points to Ferdinand as disclosing various examples of caches, such as sets of 64KB caches, and contends that Ferdinand teaches the coupling of a flow-entry database to a cache. *Id.* (citing Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 640, 648; Ex. 1009, 18:27–29, 28:14–21). Petitioner also points to Wakeman as disclosing “a CAM-cache at length.” *Id.* at 80 (citing Ex. 1014, 1:20–28, 2:31–49, 3:36–45, Fig. 2; Ex. 1006 ¶ 645).

Relying on Dr. Weissman’s Declaration, Petitioner also contends that an ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine the teachings of the references with a reasonable expectation of success. *Id.* at 80–81. In particular, Petitioner contends that the skilled artisan would have been motivated “to modify the flow-entry database of the Riddle-Ferdinand combination to improve the database by providing faster access and retrieval of likely-to-be-accessed flow-entries, such as Ethernet packet source and destination addresses.” *Id.* at 80 (citing Ex. 1006 ¶ 648).

We address each of these dependent claims individually below.

*1. Claim 33: Cache Subsystem Limitation*

As to claim 33, we find that Petitioner persuasively maps the limitations of these dependent claims to the cited art (and to the testimony of Dr. Weissman in support of the combination of references). Specifically Petitioner contends, and we agree, that Riddle in view of Ferdinand or

Wakeman renders cache subsystem limitation obvious, based on Riddle's disclosure of examining flow-entries from stored flow-entry lists (*see supra* § III.E.1.e), together with Ferdinand's or Wakeman's cache systems. Pet. 79–80 (citing Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 637–653, 707–714, 922; Ex. 1008, 13:40–47; Ex. 1009, 18:27–29, 28:14–21; Ex. 1014, 1:20–28, 1:55–67, 2:31–49, 3:36–45, 4:31–40, 5:22–27, Figs. 2, 3). Moreover, we are persuaded that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Riddle and Ferdinand or Wakeman as proposed by Petitioner and supported by the testimony of Dr. Weissman. *See id.* at 28–29 (citing Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 256–257, 259–261), 77–78 (citing Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 613–616, 921). Again, Patent Owner does not present separate and specific arguments for any of these dependent claims. *See generally* PO Resp. We adopt the contentions set forth in the Petition and in Dr. Weissman's Declaration as mapped to the limitations of the challenged claims as our own findings. *NuVasive*, 841 F.3d at 974.

2. *Claim 34: Associative Cache Subsystem Limitation*

As noted above, Petitioner contends that Riddle in view of Ferdinand and Wakeman renders obvious the subject matter of claim 34. Pet. 81 (citing Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 681–685, 923–924; Ex. 1005, 24:17–31). Petitioner contends that “[c]onsistent with the ’789 [p]atent’s cache design paradigm including CAMs,” an ordinarily skilled artisan “would have understood that an associative cache was a well-known cache design paradigm.” *Id.* (citing Ex. 1005, 24:17–31; Ex. 1006 ¶ 682). Petitioner contends that an ordinarily skilled artisan would have understood that Wakeman's CAM cache “is a fully associative cache due to Wakeman's lack of a cache placement policy indicating there are no constraints on placement within Wakeman's cache.” *Id.* (citing Ex. 1006 ¶ 683). Petitioner further contends that it would have

been obvious to modify Riddle's monitor with a cache subsystem as taught by Ferdinand, Wakeman, or by the common knowledge of [an ordinarily skilled artisan], to improve performance and reduce look-up times of source and destination addresses of Ethernet packets." *Id.* (citing Ex. 1006 ¶ 684).

Patent Owner contends that the asserted prior art fails to teach or suggest the associative cache subsystem recited in claim 34. PO Resp. 53–55. In particular, Patent Owner argues:

Petitioners argue that the use of an associative cache subsystem in '789 Claim 34 is obvious, because: "a [person of ordinary skill in the art] would have understood that an associative cache was a well-known cache design paradigm in which a memory block can appear in any cache line and that the cache line is a form of a content addressable memory." Petition at 75–76. Petitioners provide no support for this beyond a citation to Dr. Weissman, and Dr. Weissman provides only a conclusion that "Wakeman's CAM cache can be a fully associative cache," despite Wakeman not identifying what kind of cache it uses. Petitioners further argue "a [person of ordinary skill in the art] would have understood that Wakeman's CAM cache is fully associative due to Wakeman not disclosing a cache placement policy indicating there are no constraints on placement within Wakeman's cache." *Id.* Dr. Weissman does not explain why the *absence* of a discussion of a cache placement policy in Wakeman would lead a [person of ordinary skill in the art] to just assume that Wakeman was teaching using of an associative cache placement policy.

First, Dr. Weissman did not provide any facts or analysis underlying his opinion, and therefore his analysis is entitled to little weight. 37 CFR § 42.65(a). His conclusory statement that Wakeman could be modified to utilize an associative cache does not demonstrate that a [person of ordinary skill in the art] would have been motivated to implement Wakeman's cache as a fully associative cache. "The mere fact that the prior art could be so modified would not have made the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification." *In*



*re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 682 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (quoting *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 902 (Fed. Cir. 1984)) (emphasis added).

Second, even if an associative cache were a “common type of cache” as Dr. Weissman claims, its mere existence does not mean its use with the specific combination of elements claimed in ’646 Patent Claim 3 would have been obvious. Ex. 1006 ¶ 683; Ex. 2061 ¶¶ 88–90. Associative caches are more expensive than direct mapping caches due to the requirement that every potential cache location must be searched in parallel when checking whether a value is already in the cache. Ex. 2061 ¶ 89. Wakeman asserts that “[c]hoosing an appropriate network switch [] requires a balancing between cost and performance”—it does not espouse the use of an associative caching policy over any other policy, and in light of Wakeman’s emphasis on balancing cost, a [person of ordinary skill in the art] would not simply assume Wakeman to be teaching the use of the more expensive associative cache (as Dr. Weissman appears to argue). EX1014 (Wakeman) at 2:1–2; Ex. 2061 ¶ 90. If the use of an associative cache was truly as “common” in the field as Petitioners assert, then Petitioners would have offered a reference or at least some form of evidence demonstrating that its use was common in the field, or that a [person of ordinary skill in the art] would have assumed the use of an associative cache in the absence of any discussion on cache placement policy. They did not, and for at least these reasons Petitioners have not shown claim 3 to be invalid.

*Id.*

In its Reply, Petitioner responds that Patent Owner and Ms. Quigley “concede that an associative cache was a known cache design that predates the challenged claims” and “don’t dispute that the prosecution history illustrates that using an associative cache was readily understood in the art to expedite memory accesses to and from processors.” Reply 26 (citing PO Resp. 54; Ex. 2061 ¶ 88). Petitioner further contends that “Dr. Weissman and the Petition refer to the prosecution history in which the Examiner discussed how associative caches were known in the art,” and

“Dr. Weissman explains it would have been obvious to use associative caches because they expedite memory access for databases, particularly when storing Ethernet packet addresses, as taught in Riddle and Ferdinand.” *Id.* at 26–27 (citing Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 643–648, 683, 684, 923; Pet. 75–78, 81). Still further, Petitioner argues that Ms. Quigley’s testimony on which Patent Owner bases its lack-of-motivation argument “is bereft of any evidentiary support and is conclusory,” and therefore is entitled to little weight. *Id.* at 28 (citing Ex. 2061 ¶ 89; PO Resp. 54–55; 37 CFR § 42.65(a)). According to Petitioner, the fact that other cache types existed does not lessen the obviousness of using an associative cache in Riddle’s system, and Ms. Quigley’s testimony that Wakeman teaches away from using an associative cache “overlooks unrebutted testimony from Dr. Weissman that ‘[associative] caches were well-known to reduce look-up times’ and thus would have improved the performance of Riddle’s system.” *Id.* at 28–29 (citing *In re Mouttet*, 686 F.3d 1322, 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2012); Pet. 81; Ex. 1006 ¶¶ 684, 923).

Having reviewed the full trial record, we conclude that Petitioner has not established by a preponderance of the evidence that claim 34 is unpatentable over the combination of Riddle, Ferdinand, and Wakeman. We agree with Patent Owner that Petitioner provides insufficient evidence to support its contentions. Indeed, the Petition’s discussion with respect to the “associative cache subsystem” limitation of claim 34 does not even cite Wakeman but instead cites only the testimony of Dr. Weissman and the specification of the ’789 patent. *See* Pet. 81.<sup>14</sup> And neither Dr. Weissman’s

---

<sup>14</sup> To be sure, the discussion of claim 34 in the Petition also includes an internal cross-reference to the “discuss[ion] for claim 33,” discussed at pages 79–80 of the Petition. Pet. 81. Although the discussion of that

testimony nor the '789 patent provides persuasive support for Petitioner's assertion that the artisan "would have understood that Wakeman's CAM cache is fully associative due to Wakeman's lack of a cache placement policy indicating there are no constraints on placement within Wakeman's cache." *Id.* We agree with Patent Owner that Dr. Weissman "does not explain why the *absence* of a cache placement policy in Wakeman would lead [an ordinarily skilled artisan] to just assume that Wakeman was teaching using of an associative cache placement policy." PO Resp. 54. Thus, we determine that Dr. Weissman's testimony in this regard is entitled to little, if any, weight. 37 CFR § 42.65(a). Moreover, as Patent Owner argues and we agree, Dr. Weissman's statement that Wakeman could be modified to utilize an associative cache does not demonstrate that an ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to implement Wakeman's cache as a fully associative cache. PO Resp. 54–55 (citing *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 682 (Fed. Cir. 1990)). Although we agree with Petitioner that there is no indication that Wakeman disparages the use of an associative cache (Reply 28–29), there still needs to be "some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness" (*KSR*, 550 U.S. at 418). We do not find such underpinning on the record before us. Accordingly, we determine that Petitioner has not shown by a preponderance of the evidence that claim 34 is unpatentable over Riddle in view of Ferdinand and further in view of Wakeman.

---

limitation does include citations to Wakeman (*see* Pet. 79–80 (citing Ex. 1014, 1:20–28, 1:55–67, 2:31–49, 3:36–45, 4:31–40, 5:22–27, Figs. 2–3)), notably absent from that discussion is any assertion that Wakeman specifically suggests an associative cache.

3. *Summary*

After having analyzed the entirety of the trial record, we determine that Petitioner has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that claim 33, but not claim 34, is unpatentable over the combination of Riddle, Ferdinand, and Wakeman. In particular, we find that Petitioner has demonstrated sufficiently that the teachings of the prior art account for all limitations of the claim 33, have been properly combined, and that an ordinarily skilled artisan would have found it obvious to combine these teachings in the manner proposed by Petitioner. As to claim 34, however, we find that Petitioner has not provided sufficient and persuasive evidence and reasoning that Wakeman (in combination with Riddle and Ferdinand) teaches or suggests the associative cache limitation.

*G. Obviousness Over Riddle in View of Ferdinand and Baker, and Further in View of Yu or Further in View of RFC1945*

Petitioner also contends that claim 31 would have been obvious over Riddle, Ferdinand, and Baker, and further in view of Yu, or further in view of RFC1945. *See* Pet. 82–84 (the combination of Riddle, Ferdinand, Baker, and Yu), *id.* at 85–91 (the combination of Riddle, Ferdinand, Baker, and RFC1945). Having determined that Petitioner establishes by a preponderance of the evidence that the subject matter of claim 31 would have been obvious over Riddle in view of Ferdinand and Baker, we need not address Petitioner’s additional grounds challenging this claim. *See SAS Inst. Inc. v. Iancu*, 138 S. Ct. 1348, 1359 (2018) (holding that a petitioner “is entitled to a final written decision addressing all of the claims it has challenged”); *Boston Sci. Scimed, Inc. v. Cook Grp. Inc.*, 809 F. App’x 984, 990 (Fed. Cir. 2020) (nonprecedential) (“We agree that the Board need not

address [alternative grounds] that are not necessary to the resolution of the proceeding.”).

*H. Obviousness Over Riddle in View of Ferdinand and Wakeman and Further in View of Yu or Further in View of RFC1945*

Petitioner also contends that claims 33 and 34 would have been obvious over Riddle in view of Ferdinand and further in view of Wakeman and Yu, or Riddle in view of Ferdinand and further in view of Wakeman and RFC1945. Pet. 82–91.

*1. Claim 33*

As to claim 33, we have determined that Petitioner establishes by a preponderance of the evidence that the subject matter of that claim would have been obvious over Riddle in view of Ferdinand and Baker, and therefore we need not address Petitioner’s additional grounds challenging this claim. *SAS Inst.*, 138 S. Ct. 1359; *Boston Sci.*, 809 F. App’x at 990.

*2. Claim 34*

As to claim 34, Petitioner relies on Yu or RFC1945, rather than Riddle, for the teaching of conversational flows. *See* Pet. 82 (stating that “[w]hile Riddle itself discloses identifying the claimed ‘conversational flows,’ Yu further demonstrates identifying conversational flows through its ‘flow classification’”); *id.* at 85 (stating that “[w]hile Riddle itself discloses identifying the claimed ‘conversational flows,’ RFC1945 further demonstrates identifying conversational flows based on the application-level protocol”). Petitioner does *not* rely on Yu or RFC1945 to teach or suggest the associative cache subsystem limitation of claim 34, instead relying on Wakeman for this limitation. *See id.* at 84 (stating that “Riddle, Ferdinand, and Wakeman (Ground 2) disclose all the remaining elements of the Challenged Claims” other than a “conversational flow”). But, as explained

immediately above, we find that Petitioner fails to sufficiently show that Wakeman teaches or suggests the associative cache subsystem limitation. Accordingly, we determine that Petitioner has not shown by a preponderance of the evidence that claim 34 is unpatentable over Riddle in view of Ferdinand and further in view of Wakeman and Yu, or Riddle in view of Ferdinand and further in view of Wakeman and RFC1945.

#### IV. CONCLUSION<sup>15</sup>

Petitioner establishes by a preponderance of the evidence that claims 31 and 33 of the '789 patent are unpatentable. Petitioner fails to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that claim 34 of the '789 patent is unpatentable.

---

<sup>15</sup> Should Patent Owner wish to pursue amendment of the challenged claims in a reissue or reexamination proceeding subsequent to the issuance of this decision, we draw Patent Owner's attention to the April 2019 *Notice Regarding Options for Amendments by Patent Owner Through Reissue or Reexamination During a Pending AIA Trial Proceeding*. 84 Fed. Reg. 16,654 (Apr. 22, 2019). If Patent Owner chooses to file a reissue application or a request for reexamination of the challenged patent, we remind Patent Owner of its continuing obligation to notify the Board of any such related matters in updated mandatory notices. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(3), (b)(2).

V. ORDER

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that claims 31 and 33 of U.S. Patent No. 6,954,789 B2 are held unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious;

ORDERED that claim 34 of U.S. Patent No. 6,954,789 B2 is not held unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious; and

FURTHER ORDERED that, because this is a Final Written Decision, parties to the proceeding seeking judicial review of this decision must comply with the notice and service requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 90.2.

In summary:

<b>Claim(s)</b>	<b>35 U.S.C. §</b>	<b>References</b>	<b>Claims Shown Unpatentable</b>	<b>Claims Not shown Unpatentable</b>
31	103(a)	Riddle, Ferdinand, Baker	31	
33, 34	103(a)	Riddle, Ferdinand, Wakeman	33	34
31	103(a)	Riddle, Ferdinand, Baker, Yu <sup>16</sup>		
33, 34	103(a)	Riddle, Ferdinand, Wakeman, Yu <sup>17</sup>		34
31	103(a)	Riddle, Ferdinand, Baker, RFC1945 <sup>18</sup>		
33, 34	103(a)	Riddle, Ferdinand, Wakeman, RFC1945 <sup>19</sup>		34
<b>Overall Outcome</b>			31, 33	34

---

<sup>16</sup> As explained above, we do not reach this ground. *See supra* § III.G.

<sup>17</sup> As explained above, we do not reach this ground, except with respect to claim 34. *See supra* § III.H.

<sup>18</sup> As explained above, we do not reach this ground. *See supra* § III.G.

<sup>19</sup> As explained above, we do not reach this ground, except with respect to claim 34. *See supra* § III.H.



IPR2020-00486  
Patent 6,954,789 B2

FOR PETITIONER:

Joseph F. Edell  
Adam A. Allgood  
FISCH SIGLER LLP  
joe.edell.ipr@fischllp.com  
adam.allgood@fischllp.com

Scott A. McKeown  
James R. Batchelder  
Mark D. Rowland  
Andrew Radsch  
ROPES & GRAY LLP  
scott.mckeown@ropesgray.com  
james.batchelder@ropesgray.com  
mark.rowland@ropesgray.com  
andrew.radsch@ropesgray.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

R. Allan Bullwinkel  
Michael Heim  
HEIM PAYNE & CHORUSH, LLP  
abullwinkel@hpcllp.com  
mheim@hpcllp.com

# **Exhibit B**

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE OFFICE OF THE UNDERSECRETARY AND DIRECTOR OF  
THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC. and PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

PACKET INTELLIGENCE LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

IPR2020-00336 (Patent 6,665,725 B1)  
IPR2020-00337 (Patent 6,771,646 B1)  
IPR2020-00338 (Patent 6,839,751 B1)  
IPR2020-00339 (Patent 6,954,789 B2)  
IPR2020-00486 (Patent 6,954,789 B2)

---

Before ANDREW HIRSHFELD, *Commissioner for Patents, Performing the  
Functions and Duties of the Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual  
Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.*

ORDER

IPR2020-00336 (Patent 6,665,725 B1)  
IPR2020-00337 (Patent 6,771,646 B1)  
IPR2020-00338 (Patent 6,839,751 B1)  
IPR2020-00339 (Patent 6,954,789 B2)  
IPR2020-00486 (Patent 6,954,789 B2)

The Office has received a request for Director review of the Final Written Decision in each of the above-captioned cases. *See, e.g.*, IPR2020-00336, Ex. 3100. The requests were referred to Mr. Hirshfeld, Commissioner for Patents, Performing the Functions and Duties of the Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

It is ORDERED that the request for Director review in each case is denied;  
and

FURTHER ORDERED that the Patent Trial and Appeal Board's Final Written Decision in each case is the final decisions of the agency.

IPR2020-00336 (Patent 6,665,725 B1)  
IPR2020-00337 (Patent 6,771,646 B1)  
IPR2020-00338 (Patent 6,839,751 B1)  
IPR2020-00339 (Patent 6,954,789 B2)  
IPR2020-00486 (Patent 6,954,789 B2)

For PETITIONER:

Joseph Edell  
Adam Allgood  
FISCH SIGLER LLP  
Joe.edell.irp@fischllp.com  
Adam.allgood@fischllp.com

Scott McKeown  
James Batchelder  
Mark Rowland  
ROPES & GRAY LLP  
Scott.mckeown@ropesgray.com  
James.batchelder@ropesgray.com  
Mark.rowland@ropesgray.com

For PATENT OWNER:

Robert Bullwinkel  
Michael Heim  
HEIM PAYNE & CHORUSH, LLP  
abulwinkel@hpcllp.com  
mheim@hpcllp.com