

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AMERICAN AIRLINES, INC. AND SOUTHWEST AIRLINES CO.,

Petitioners,

v.

INTELLECTUAL VENTURES I LLC,

Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2025-00785

U.S. Patent No. 7,257,582

PATENT OWNER'S PRE-INSTITUTION SUR-REPLY

Table of Contents

PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBIT LIST	iii
I. The Arguments In The Reply Miss The Reason Why The Challenged Claims Are Distinguishable From Chow	1
II. The Reply Fails To Demonstrate That The Specification Supports An Embodiment Where The Number Of Subtask Processors Used For Processing Exceeds The Number Of Partitions	3

PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBIT LIST

EX2001	https://www.unifiedpatents.com/faq
EX2002	https://www.unifiedpatents.com/members
EX2003	Reexamination Request challenging U.S. Patent 7,257,582 filed by Unified Patents (No. 90/015,337)
EX2004	Reexamination Request challenging U.S. Patent 8,332,844 filed by Unified Patents (No. 90/019,938)
EX2005	Petition filed in IPR2025-00931
EX2006	Docket from <i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC et al. v. Southwest Airlines, Co.</i> , 7:24-cv-277 (WDTX)
EX2007	www.txwd.uscourts.gov/for-attorneys/judge-albright-courtroom-faq/
EX2008	Docket from <i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC et al. v. American Airlines, Inc.</i> , 4:24-cv-980 (EDTX)
EX2009	Defendant American Airlines, Inc.'s P.R. 3-3 Invalidity Contentions in <i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC et al. v. American Airlines, Inc.</i> , 4:24-cv-980 (EDTX)
EX2010	Defendant Southwest Airlines Co.'s Preliminary Invalidity Contentions in <i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC et al. v. Southwest Airlines, Co.</i> , 7:24-cv-277 (WDTX)
EX2011	Agreed Scheduling Order <i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC et al. v. Southwest Airlines, Co.</i> , 7:24-cv-277 (WDTX)
EX2012	Order Denying Motion to Sever and Stay Claims Against Viasat's In-Flight Connectivity Systems by Defendant American Airlines <i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC et al. v. American Airlines, Inc.</i> , 4:24-cv-980 (EDTX)
EX2013	Declaration of Dr. Daniel Abadi
EX2014	CV of Dr. Daniel Abadi

I. The Arguments In The Reply Miss The Reason Why The Challenged Claims Are Distinguishable From Chow

The issue raised in the Reply -- whether claim 1 requires the number of initially subdivided partitions to be greater than the number of subtask processors -- misses the reason why the claims are distinguishable from Chow. Claim 1 specifies that an input file is initially subdivided into a sufficient number of partitions to support two rounds of processing on the partitions that resulted from the initial subdividing, i.e., the processing of some partitions in step (c) (the first round) and the further processing of unprocessed partitions in step (d) (the second round). More specifically, step (a) of claim 1 specifies that the input file is initially subdivided into "a plurality of partitions," then step (c) recites "simultaneously executing at least a respective one of the subtasks ... in each of at least some of said processors on a respective one of the partitions," and step (d) requires the repetition of step (c) "in at least some of the subtask processors each with another unprocessed partition." Thus, the claim specifies that the input file is initially subdivided into a sufficient number of partitions to support two rounds of processing on the partitions.

Rather than initially dividing the data into enough subtasks to support multiple rounds of processing of the subtasks as claimed, in Chow's solution, the data is divided into subtasks after processing by the task execution units commences. As Chow explains, after a task execution unit completes a subtask, "the task execution unit 200 in step 418 determines a unit of granularity for the next sub-task to be

processed, and then, using the determined granularity, obtains the sub-task from the aggregate task. ... The size of the next sub-task to be processed is dictated by a corresponding granularity unit, also determined [by the task execution unit 200] in step 418." EX1003., 5:29-37 (emphasis added); *see also*, EX2013, ¶43. As explained in the POPR (at 13-17), Chow's proposed solution does not logically divide a "preexisting input file" into all of its partitions before (or "*a priori*") execution of the subtasks. On the contrary, Chow eschewed such an approach because "the data's processing time may be ... difficult to predict" and "even equisized data subparts may require comparatively different processing times." EX1003, 1:44-48. Instead, Chow's solution performs partitioning of each subsequent sub-task from the aggregate task only after each task execution unit completes a prior sub-task. EX2013, ¶¶ 43, 65-68, 70.

Simply put, the Reply's quarrel with whether or not claim 1 requires the initially subdivided partitions to be greater in number than the number of subtask processors is beside the point. Claim 1 clearly requires a sequence of operations not met by Chow where the input file is initially subdivided into a sufficient number of partitions to later support two rounds of processing.

II. The Reply Fails To Demonstrate That The Specification Supports An Embodiment Where The Number Of Subtask Processors Used For Processing Exceeds The Number Of Partitions

The Reply mischaracterizes Figure 4 of the '582 Patent. The specification states that "[i]n the example depicted in FIG. 4, two subtasks -- Subtask 1 and Subtask 2, are invoked to perform a sort." EX1001, 6:14-16 (emphasis added). In contrast to the "modified" version of FIG. 4 in the Reply, the actual version of FIG. 4 has only Subtasks 1 and 2 (not Subtasks 3-7) -- nor does the specification say that "descriptions of all of said partitions ... are distributed to each of seven subtask processors," as alleged in the Reply (at 2). The statement in the Reply (at 2) that "[n]o processing occurs in Sub Tasks 3-7, because ... those processors are busy with other tasks" was made up by Petitioners. The description of Figure 4 fails to disclose Sub Tasks 3-7, let alone suggest that "those processors are busy with other tasks."

Figure 4 of the '582 Patent indeed contemplates a case where "the partitions" initially subdivided from the input file (i.e., six partitions, identified as Input 1-Input 6) are greater in number than the number of subtask processors (i.e., the two subtask processors -- Subtask 1 and Subtask 2 -- shown in the actual version of FIG. 4). The Reply fails to identify any disclosure in the specification of any embodiment where this relationship does not hold. Instead, the specification of the '582 Patent discloses division of the preexisting input file into more partitions than available processors so that multiple rounds of processing of the input file are required.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 25, 2025

By: /Daniel H. Golub/
Daniel H. Golub
Registration No. 33,701

*Counsel for Patent Owner
Intellectual Ventures I 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 PRE-INSTITUTION SUR-REPLY** was served via email (as consented to by counsel) on September 25, 2025 to lead and backup counsel of record for Petitioner as follows:

John B. Campbell
jcampbell@McKoolSmith.com
MCKOOL SMITH, P.C.
303 Colorado Street, Suite 2100
Austin, TX 78701

Alan Block
ablock@mckoolsmith.com
McKool Smith, P.C.
300 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2900
Los Angeles, California 90071

Casey Shomaker
cshomaker@mckoolsmith.com
McKool Smith, P.C.
300 Crescent Court, Suite 1200
Dallas, TX 75201

Keith D. Harden
kharden@munckwilson.com
Munck Wilson Mandala, LLP
2000 McKinney Ave., Ste. 1900
Dallas, Texas 75201

S. Wallace Dunwoody
wdunwoody@munckwilson.com
Munck Wilson Mandala, LLP
2000 McKinney Ave., Ste. 1900
Dallas, Texas 75201

Michael C. Wilson
mwilson@munckwilson.com
Munck Wilson Mandala, LLP
2000 McKinney Ave., Ste. 1900
Dallas, Texas 75201

AA_Intellectual_Ventures@mckoolsmith.com

SWA-IV@munckwilson.com

Dated: September 25, 2025

By: /Daniel H. Golub/
Daniel H. Golub
Registration No. 33,701

*Counsel for Patent Owner
Intellectual Ventures I LLC*