

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAP AMERICA, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

CYANDIA, INC.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2024-01496
U.S. Patent No. 8,595,641

**PETITIONER'S REPLY TO
THE PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

LIST OF EXHIBITS

LIST OF NEWLY FILED EXHIBITS

Exhibits concurrently filed with Petitioner’s Reply To The Patent Owner

Preliminary Response:

No.	Description
1045	Correspondence to Cyandia’s Counsel (dated January 14, 2025) (<i>Sotera</i> stipulation)
1046	N/A
1047	Plaintiff’s Supplemental Preliminary Infringement Contentions Claim Chart for U.S. Patent No. 8,595,641 (Appendix C), <i>Cyandia, Inc. v. SAP America, Inc. et al.</i> , Case No. 2-24-cv-00096 (E.D. Tex.)

LIST OF PREVIOUSLY FILED EXHIBITS

No.	Description
1001	U.S. Patent No. 8,595,641 (“ 641 Patent ”)
1002	File History of U.S. Patent No. 8,595,641
1003	Declaration of Christopher M. Schmandt, dated September 30, 2024 (“ Schmandt Decl. ”)
1004	<i>IBM Rational Application Developer V6 Portlet Application Development and Portal Tools</i> (August 2005) (“ WebSphere-Portal ”)
1005	Ron Ben-Natan et al., <i>Mastering IBM WebSphere Portal</i> (2004) (“ Ben-Natan ”)
1006	<i>IBM WebSphere Everyplace Access V5 Handbook for Developers and Administrators Volume I: Installation and Administration</i> (May 2005) (“ WebSphere-Everyplace-1 ”)

No.	Description
1007	<i>IBM WebSphere Everyplace Access V5 Handbook for Developers and Administrators Volume II: Application Development</i> (March 2005) (“ WebSphere-Everyplace-2 ”)
1008	<i>IBM WebSphere Everyplace Access V5 Handbook for Developers and Administrators Volume III: E-Mail and Database Synchronization</i> (April 2005) (“ WebSphere-Everyplace-3 ”)
1009	<i>IBM WebSphere Everyplace Access V5 Handbook for Developers and Administrators Volume IV: Advanced Topics</i> (March 2005) (“ WebSphere-Everyplace-4 ”)
1010	<i>IBM Workplace Web Content Management for Portal 5.1 and IBM Workplace Web Content Management 2.5</i> (January 2006)
1011	<i>IBM WebSphere Portal Collaboration Security Handbook</i> (December 2004)
1012	<i>IBM WebSphere Everyplace Access Version 4.3 Handbook for Developers</i> (2nd ed. Nov. 2003)
1013	<i>IBM WebSphere Portal V5: A Guide for Portlet Application Development</i> (January 2004)
1014	U.S. Provisional Application No. 61/052,765
1015	U.S. Patent No. 7,376,907 (“ Santoro ”)
1016	U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2008/0256643 (“ Jones ”)
1017	<i>Microsoft Computer Dictionary</i> (5th ed.) (excerpts)
1018	U.S. Patent No. 5,548,692 (“ Cok ”)
1019	<i>Microsoft Internet Explorer ResourceKit</i> , Microsoft (1998)
1020	U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2007/0174782 (“ Russo ”)
1021	David Pogue, <i>iPhone The Missing Manual</i> (excerpts) (2007) (“ Pogue 2007 (iPhone) ”)
1022	David Pogue, <i>Mac OS X Leopard The Missing Manual</i> (excerpts) (2007) (“ Pogue 2007 ”)

No.	Description
1023	Harry Newton, <i>Newton's Telecom Dictionary</i> (20th ed.2004) (excerpts) (“ Newton 2004 ”)
1024	U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2004/0044736 (“ Austin-Lane ”)
1025	Affidavit of Nathaniel Frank-White, Records Request Processor at the Internet Archive, dated August 16, 2024
1026	IBM Redbooks, <i>WebSphere Application Server V6 - System Management and Configuration Handbook</i> (Feb. 2005)
1027	Copyright Office Public Catalog: detailed record catalog entry for <i>IBM Rational Application Developer V6, Portlet Application Development and Portal Tools</i> , 1st ed., Registration Number/Date: TX0006234319 / 2005-09-13
1028	Library of Congress Catalog: detailed record catalog entry for <i>IBM Rational Application Developer V6, Portlet Application Development and Portal Tools</i> , LCCN number: 2005284159
1029	Copyright Office Public Catalog: detailed record catalog entry for <i>IBM WebSphere Everyplace Access V5 Handbook for Developers and Administrators Volume I: Installation and Administration</i> (May 2005), Registration Number/Date: TX0006244913 / 2005-08-12
1030	Library of Congress Catalog: detailed record catalog entry for <i>IBM WebSphere Everyplace Access V5 Handbook for Developers and Administrators Volumes I-IV</i> , LCCN number: 2005280318
1031	Copyright Office Public Catalog: detailed record catalog entry for <i>IBM WebSphere Everyplace Access V5 Handbook for Developers and Administrators Volume II: Application Development</i> (March 2005), Registration Number/Date: TX0006170514 / 2005-05-20
1032	Copyright Office Public Catalog: detailed record catalog entry for <i>IBM WebSphere Everyplace Access V5 Handbook for Developers and Administrators Volume III: E-Mail and Database Synchronization</i> (April 2005), Registration Number/Date: TX0006169440 / 2005-06-17

No.	Description
1033	Copyright Office Public Catalog: detailed record catalog entry for <i>IBM WebSphere Everyplace Access V5 Handbook for Developers and Administrators Volume IV: Advanced Topics</i> (March 2005), Registration Number/Date: TX0006170517 / 2005-05-20
1034	U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2007/0283020 (“ Chowdary ”)
1035	U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2007/0033251 (“ Mandalia ”)
1036	U.S. Patent No. 8,751,948 (“ 948 Patent ”)
1037	WSRP standard 1.0 specification
1038	WSRP standard 2.0 specification
1039	U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2007/0130541 (“ Louch ”)
1040	Claims Listing
1041	U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2005/0159823
1042	Copyright Office Public Catalog: detailed record catalog entry for <i>Mastering IBM WebSphere Portal</i> (2004), Registration Number/Date: TX0006003513 / 2004-08-02
1043	Library of Congress Catalog: detailed record catalog entry for <i>Mastering IBM WebSphere Portal</i> (2004), LCCN number: 2004274459
1044	Affidavit of Nathaniel Frank-White, Records Request Processor at the Internet Archive, dated September 20, 2024

Pursuant to the Board email of January 28, 2025, Petitioner SAP America, Inc. submits this Reply to the POPR (Paper 6).

I. THE POPR’S IMPLIED CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS ARE WRONG AND THE PRIOR ART RENDERS THE CLAIMS OBVIOUS¹

The POPR tries to distinguish the Petition’s prior art by importing limitations into three claim elements and alleging that certain prior art embodiments do not teach the elements under overly narrow constructions. The claim elements are not so narrow. Even if they were, the prior art discloses examples that teach them.

A. “a matrix having a plurality of user-selectable items representing a corresponding plurality of authorized channels through which the user receives and/or interacts with respective portions of the secure user-centric information” (EX1001, claims 1, 31-33)

1. The POPR’s Implied Constructions Are Wrong And The Petition Explains Why The Prior Art Teaches This Element

Interacts: While the claims recite “user-selectable items”² and the specification describes interacting with a user-selectable item (i.e., an icon) by clicking the icon to call up a native application, the POPR argues for a narrower construction excluding this express claim language and embodiment. The POPR

¹ While the boundary of several of the claim terms is unclear, that indefiniteness does not prevent comparing the asserted prior art teachings to the challenged claims.

² The POPR relies on incorrect claim language (presumably from U.S. Patent No. 8,578,285) that omits the “user-selectable items” term. Paper 6 at 18, 21, 33.

argues that “interact” (Paper 6 at 24) requires more than “clicking on an icon to call up a separate application” (*id.* at 18-19). Nothing in the specification or claims requires more. The specification indicates the opposite because it describes channel interaction as clicking an icon that opens a separate native application apart from the channel. EX1001, 6:42-44, 8:60-67 (“When the user interacts ... by ... clicking, interactions with information ... may be displayed in native applications or through a channel 202.”). The 2008 provisional, which the POPR cites (Paper 6 at 19), confirms that “channels can be animated or static and can display images and/or text” and “launch an application” (EX1014, 11, 18, 20). Similarly, Patent Owner’s infringement contentions point to clickable “links” that “launch the corresponding apps” (EX1047, 3, 9 (“Each of the links is a secure user-centric channel”)).

“*User-centric*”: The POPR argues that “user-centric” requires that the visual component of the channels cannot be the same for different users of a system (i.e., not generic icons or links) (*see, e.g.*, Paper 6 at 20, 25). However, the patent states that “channels may be representative of any form of information or content” including “static icons.” EX1001, 6:41-44; *id.*, 4:16-17, 10:51-52. The 2008 provisional confirms that channels “can be represented as static icons” (EX1014, 11; *see also id.*, 19-21) and can be generic (*id.*, 19, 27, 56). Patent Owner’s infringement contentions similarly point to links that “always look the same,” and thus are not user-specific representations. EX1047, 9, 39 (pointing to links that

“always look the same”).

“*Secure*”: Although the intrinsic evidence’s disclosure of “secure user-centric information” includes public information such as news or stocks, the POPR implies a narrower construction excluding these embodiments. *See* Paper 6 at 14, 23-24, 29-31. The POPR argues that for information to be “secure,” it must be “sensitive or otherwise confidential information” (*id.* at 29) that is “securely maintained” (*id.* at 24) in “a secure and specific database” where “both the security of the applications affected as well as the security of the user may be confirmed” (*id.* at 29)—thus excluding a user’s selection of news and stocks. This implied construction is inconsistent with the intrinsic evidence because the specification and claims describe “secure user-centric information” as including RSS reader information, which is a news aggregator. EX1001, 4:14-24, 16:26-47 (claim 4: “the secure user-centric information includes ... RSS (Really Simple Syndication) reader information”). And the 2008 provisional identifies “news and stocks” as channel information. EX1014 at 23, 28, 44-45. The POPR also argues that “just because the WebSphere references disclose a login screen, does not mean the data displayed is ‘secure’....” Paper 6 at 30. But Patent Owner’s infringement contentions point to “information transmitted” that is generated when “when the user logs into the system.” EX1047, 23.

Thus, the POPR’s implied constructions are wrong, and the prior art teaches this limitation for at least the reasons in the Petition. *E.g.*, Paper 1 at 27-30, 34-40.

2. Prior Art Teaches Element Under POPR's Constructions

Interacts: The WebSphere references describe interacting with channels while in the channel grid framework in more ways than just clicking a link or icon to open a separate display (e.g., an application) (e.g., Paper 1 at 42-49), as alleged in the POPR (Paper 6 at 2, 14-15, 24-27). The stock portlet allows the user to interact with dynamic stock information while in the channel grid framework by entering a specific stock in a search box and selecting a “Get Quote” button. EX1005, 276 (cited by Paper 1 at 14, 95); EX1006, 43 (cited by Paper 1 at 19, 31, 80, 87-88, 93-94). A poll portlet allows a user to interact with dynamic poll information while in the channel grid framework by voting for one or more poll options and viewing the results of the poll. EX1005, 275, 276 (cited by Paper 1 at 14, 95), 277 (cited by Paper 1 at 43, 46-47, 96). Each portlet displays an edit icon within the channel grid framework that, when selected, allows the user to configure the portlet (e.g., set the city from which they receive dynamic weather information) while in the channel grid framework. EX1004, 50 (cited by Paper 1 at 50, 52, 54); EX1005, 245 (cited by Paper 1 at 83-84).³ Each channel (portlet) is further interactive in that it responds to

³ Reliance on these portlets is permissible because 1) the Petition cites to the pages where these portlets are disclosed, 2) they are part of the same embodiment (portlet on a portal page) relied on in the Petition, 3) they are raised in direct response to the

user input in another channel within the matrix. “In ‘live’ portals, ... the user is presented with one portlet on a page that presents a choice of data, a list of stocks for example, and choosing from the list causes another portlet to be updated with the details of the choice.” EX1004, 152 (cited by Paper 1 at 28, 43, 46-48, 52, 66), 39 (cited by Paper 1 at 66).

User-centric: As explained in the Petition (Paper 1), the WebSphere references’ channels (portlets) are “user-specific” at least because each user’s preferences and access rights determine which channels are displayed in the channel grid and which information is displayed within each channel. *E.g.*, Paper 1 at 27-30, 57-63. “Personalization enables the portal to deliver user-specific information targeting a user based on their unique information.” EX1004, 2 (quoted by Paper 1 at 27). “Base customization, such as choosing which portlets are desired on a page, is accomplished by the user via administration functionality. Advanced personalization via rules engines, user preferences and profiles is accomplished by the provided personalization services.” EX1004, 16 (cited by Paper 1 at 76).

Secure: The channels display sensitive or confidential information sent from a secure server. The channels display internal (non-public) company news, such as

POPR’s new claim construction arguments, and 4) Cyandia can respond. *Cf.* *Axonics, Inc. v. Medtronic, Inc.*, 75 F.4th 1374, 1379, 1384 (Fed. Cir. 2023).

“Your Co Cafeteria Serving 64oz Diet Coke for 99 cents,” and the URL indicates a user has logged in. EX1004, 49 (quoted by Paper 1 at 15, 36-37, 44). The channels also include a user’s secure email account, notes, calendar, and contacts. Paper 1 at 28-29, 42-43, 98 (citing, e.g., EX1005, 141). The channels also allow user interaction with bank accounts (EX1004, 632 (cited by Paper 1 at 83), 418-419) and other non-public information, including human resources, enterprise resource planning, and customer relationship management. EX1004, 4, 41 (cited by Paper 1 at 22, 47, 83); EX1005, xxv, 392-397, 439, 462-463, 469. This information is sent from a secure server (e.g., a producer portal server) that is authenticated using a certificate. EX1004, 899-900 (cited by Paper 1 at 47, 59, 71-72, 76).

B. “service support instructions that determine how the plurality of authorized channels behave” (EX1001, claims 1, 31-33)

1. The POPR’s Implied Construction Is Wrong And The Petition Explains Why The Prior Art Teaches This Element

In contradiction to the specification and infringement contentions, the POPR argues that “service support instructions” exclude “user preferences” dictating “a consistent look and feel” across platforms. Paper 6 at 35-37. The specification, however, expressly describes “service support instructions” as “instructions as to how the user wishes information to behave” (EX1001, 7:53-54) (i.e., user preferences), and the infringement contentions point to “instructions allowing the user to have the same or personalized experience (such as same design) across all

the platforms he is using” (EX1047, 13) (i.e., a consistent look and feel). The POPR construction also improperly requires dictating how the *information* behaves in a channel *displayed in a matrix* (Paper 6 at 37), while the claim language refers more broadly to how “authorized channels behave on the user platform.”⁴ EX1001, 15:32-34. Thus, the POPR’s narrow construction is wrong, and the prior art teaches this limitation for at least the reasons in the Petition. Paper 1 at 49-55.

2. Prior Art Teaches Element Under POPR’s Construction

Even under the POPR’s improper construction, the WebSphere references teach this claim element. WebSphere’s page aggregation dictates how information behaves in a channel while displayed in a matrix, using device and portlet information, and user preferences: “Page aggregation is the process that collects information about the user’s choices, the device being used and the selected portlets, then takes that information and combines it to create a display that is appropriate for the device.” EX1004, 27 (cited by Paper 1 at 52, 54-55, 104). A portal page is “the product of the aggregation of several information sources, which include the portal page ..., page theme, skins, and the screen.” EX1005, 143-163 (cited by Paper 1 at

⁴ The POPR relies on incorrect claim language (presumably from U.S. Patent No. 8,578,285), that recites “the secure user-centric information” instead of the “plurality of authorized channels.” Paper 6 at 36-37.

19, 53-54); *see also* Section I.A.2 (describing information behavior within in the matrix). Moreover, as explained in Petition and above, the information delivered to the user is screened based on the user's role / access rights (*e.g.*, Paper 1 at 21, 57-63) and preferences (*supra* Section I.A.2). Further, channels behave dynamically in response to user inputs made to other channels. *Supra* Section I.A.2. (citing, *e.g.*, EX1004, 39 (cited by Paper 1 at 66), 152 (cited by Paper 1 at 28, 43, 46-48, 52, 66)).

C. “synchronize functions and features of one or more of the plurality of channels” (EX1001, claim 1, 31-33)

1. The POPR's Implied Construction Is Wrong And The Petition Explains Why The Prior Art Teaches This Element

Despite the claim language stating that “synchroniz[ing] functions and features” is caused “by deploying secure user-centric information” (EX1001, 15:35-39), the POPR instead argues that “synchroniz[ing] functions and features” is “separate and distinct from the ‘information’ presented in a channel” and refers to “how information is synthesized and delivered to a user.” Paper 6 at 34-35. Nothing in the specification so alters the express claim language. Moreover, Patent Owner's infringement contentions contradict POPR's implied construction: “The Accused Instrumentalities allow any data [i.e., information] transmitted to any platform (including relating to any work done or changes made by the user) to be saved automatically, which also means that this data is accessible at any point in time on any external computing device used by the user.” EX1047, 21. Thus, the POPR's

construction is wrong, and the prior art teaches this limitation for at least the reasons in the Petition. Paper 1 at 55-57.

2. Prior Art Teaches Element Under POPR's Construction

Even under the POPR's improper construction, the WebSphere references still teach this claim element. The POPR is wrong that WebSphere synchronization is limited to data synchronization or deployment of information. WebSphere synchronizes settings, which control how information is synthesized and delivered, based on at least controls and restrictions for date, priority, conflict resolution, privacy, time zone, and scope—all functions and features of synchronized contacts, tasks, calendars, memos, etc. *E.g.*, EX1008, 2, 38, 43, 50, 55, 101, 116, 144⁵; Paper 1 at 56-58, 65, 74, 98. The POPR also ignores the Petition's citations to WEA references describing portlet synchronization, e.g., Microsoft Exchange, across devices. EX1005, 479-480 (cited by Paper 1 at 56); *see also* EX1005, 4.

II. CONCLUSION

Patent Owner's arguments should be rejected and trial instituted.

Dated: February 11, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Roy Chamcharas /
Roy Chamcharas (Reg. No. 61,735)
Lead Counsel for Petitioner

⁵ *See supra* fn. 3 (explaining why reliance on this disclosure is permissible).

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
IN COMPLIANCE WITH 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e)(4)

The undersigned certifies that on February 11, 2025, Petitioner emailed copies of **Petitioner's Reply To The Patent Owner Preliminary Response and Exhibits 1045 and 1047** to the following email addresses, which Patent Owner has agreed constitutes service. *See* Paper 4 (Patent Owner's Mandatory Notices).

jhannah@kramerlevin.com

jprice@kramerlevin.com

kkastens@kramerlevin.com

jfuller@kramerlevin.com

ckeller@kramerlevin.com

svdocketing@kramerlevin.com

By: /Roy Chamcharas/

Roy Chamcharas (Reg. No. 61,735)

roy.chamcharas@klarquist.com

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600

121 S.W. Salmon Street

Portland, Oregon 97204

Tel: 503-595-5300

Fax: 503-595-5301

Counsel for Petitioner