

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FEDEX CORPORATION, and FEDEX OFFICE
AND PRINT SERVICES, INC.
Petitioners

v.

VALTRUS INNOVATIONS LTD.,
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2025-01490
Patent No. 7,120,832

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO THE PETITION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BACKGROUND	2
A.	Overview of the '832 Patent.....	2
B.	The Claims of the '832 Patent.....	4
1.	Independent Claim 1	4
2.	Independent Claim 12	5
3.	Independent Claim 25	5
C.	The Parallel Litigations	6
D.	The IPR Petition's Alleged Unpatentability Grounds.....	7
III.	PETITIONERS HAVE NOT SHOWN A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF PREVAILING ON ANY CHALLENGED CLAIMS	8
A.	Petitioners' Irreconcilable Claim Construction Positions Before Different Tribunals Warrant Denial of the Petition	8
B.	The Petition Should Be Denied Because it Relies on Unreliable Expert Testimony to Supply A Key Limitation	12
IV.	CONCLUSION.....	16

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Applera Corp.</i> , 599 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	9, 10
<i>IPXL Holdings, L.L.C. v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , 430 F.3d 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	10
<i>Samsung Elecs. Am., Inc. v. Prisua Eng'g Corp.</i> , 948 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	10

Agency Decisions

<i>American Airlines, Inc. et al. v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC</i> , IPR2025-01055, Paper 11 (PTAB November 21, 2025)	14
<i>Tesla, Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC</i> IPR2025-00340, Paper 18 (Director Squires November 5, 2025)	10
<i>TikTok Inc. v. NTech Properties, Inc.</i> , IPR2024-01339, Paper 9 (PTAB Feb. 25, 2025)	14
<i>Xerox Corp. v. Bytemark Inc.</i> , IPR2022-00624, Paper 12 (PTAB Feb. 10, 2023)	14, 16

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 112	9
--------------------------	---

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3)	12
-----------------------------------	----

PATENT OWNER’S EXHIBIT LIST

No.	Exhibit Description
2001	Memorandum titled “ <i>Director Institution of AIA Trial Proceedings</i> ,” dated October 17, 2025 (“the Director Institution Memo”)
2002	Memorandum titled “Interim Processes for PTAB Workload Management,” dated March 26, 2025 (“the Interim Processes Memo”)
2003	PTAB Proposed Rule 2025-0025
2004	<i>Ex parte</i> Reexamination request filed by NetApp, Inc. in <i>Ex Parte</i> Reexamination No. 90/015,602
2005	Complaint in <i>Valtrus Innovations Ltd. et al v. The Home Depot, Inc. et al.</i> , Case No. 2:25-cv-00081-JRG (E.D. Tex. January 27, 2025)
2006	Second Amended Docket Control Order in <i>Valtrus Innovations Ltd. et al v. The Home Depot, Inc. et al.</i> , Case No. 2:25-cv-00081-JRG (E.D. Tex. January 27, 2025)
2007	First Amended Docket Control Order in <i>Valtrus Innovations Ltd. et al v. FedEx Corporation et al.</i> , Case No. 2:25-cv-00516-JRG (E.D. Tex. May 9, 2025)
2008	Complaint in <i>Valtrus Innovations Ltd. et al v. NetApp, Inc.</i> , Case No. 2:25-cv-00517-JRG (E.D. Tex. May 9, 2025)
2009	Complaint in <i>NetApp, Inc. v. Valtrus Innovations Ltd. et al.</i> , Case No. 1:25-cv-06138 (S.D.N.Y. July 25, 2025)
2010	<i>Reserved</i>
2011	Complaint in <i>Valtrus Innovations Ltd. et al v. Lenovo Group Limited et al.</i> , Case No. 2:25-cv-00080-JRG (E.D. Tex. January 27, 2025)
2012	Complaint in <i>Starbucks Corporation v. Valtrus Innovations Ltd. et al.</i> , Case No. 2:25-cv-01859 (W.D. Wash. September 25, 2025)
2013	Docket Navigator Statistics for Judge Gilstrap
2014	Docket Navigator Statistics for EDTX Patent Cases

No.	Exhibit Description
2015	Invalidity Contentions (cover pleading) in <i>Valtrus Innovations Ltd. et al v. The Home Depot, Inc. et al.</i> , Case No. 2:25-cv-00081-JRG (E.D. Tex. January 27, 2025)
2016	Invalidity Contentions ('832 patent Wolf Chart) in <i>Valtrus Innovations Ltd. et al v. The Home Depot, Inc. et al.</i> , Case No. 2:25-cv-00081-JRG (E.D. Tex. January 27, 2025)
2017	Declaration of Angela Quinlan
2018	R. Mansinghani, et al., “A Data-Based Look at Ex Parte Reexaminations,” American Bar Association (March 26, 2025)
2019	Invalidity Contentions (cover pleading) in <i>Valtrus Innovations Ltd. et al v. FedEx Corporation et al.</i> , Case No. 2:25-cv-00516-JRG (E.D. Tex. May 9, 2025)

I. INTRODUCTION

Patent Owner’s Brief in Support of Discretionary Denial (Paper 16, “Discretionary Denial Brief”) laid out a host of reasons why institution of the Petition for *Inter Partes* Review (Paper 1) of U.S. Pat. No. 7,120,832 (“the ’832 Patent”) filed by Fedex Corporation and FedEx Office and Print Services, Inc. (collectively, “FedEx” or “Petitioners”) would be an inappropriate use of Office resources and why discretionary denial of the Petition is accordingly appropriate. In this Patent Owner Preliminary Response (“POPR”) Patent Owner provides yet more reason to deny the Petition—because it fails to establish a reasonable likelihood of success as to any challenged claim, for multiple reasons.

First, the Petition fails because Petitioners have proffered unexplained and irreconcilably contrary claim construction positions before this tribunal and the parallel district court, and thus failed to comply with their responsibility to clearly articulate in the petition “[h]ow the challenged claim is to be construed.” Specifically, in parallel district court litigation, Petitioners have taken the position that numerous challenged terms—including multiple claim terms in all challenged independent claims—are indefinite for “fail[ing] to inform, with reasonable certainty, those skilled in the art about the scope of the invention.” EX2019 at 95-96. Yet, in the Petition, Petitioners purport to be capable of reasonably interpreting the claims under the *Philips* standard and applying the prior art based on those

interpretations, in parallel district court litigation Petitioners have taken the position that numerous challenged terms—including multiple claim terms in all challenged independent claims—are indefinite for “fail[ing] to inform, with reasonable certainty, those skilled in the art about the scope of the invention.” EX2019 at 95-96. This is plainly improper and grounds for denial under Office precedent.

Second, the Petition should be denied because it fails to establish a reasonable likelihood that the prior art discloses a key limitation present in every challenged independent claim. Instead, the Petition relies on vague allegations regarding knowledge or interpretation of a POSITA to fill gaps in the Petition’s mapping, and these allegations hinge on conclusory expert testimony that is substantially identical to the attorney argument in the Petition. Such expert testimony that merely parrots the Petition cannot satisfy Petitioner’s to establish a reasonable likelihood of success.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Overview of the ’832 Patent

The inventors of the ’832 patent identified a significant problem with the prior art—critical computer memory storage devices often declined in performance over time, in a manner that was largely hidden to typical computer users. See EX1001, 1:28-36; 1:62-63. Such “[d]eclining performance and/or complete failure of a storage device may result in lost data, time and money, not to mention frustration for anyone needing access to the data stored thereon.” *Id.*, 1:32-35.

Prior art methods of addressing these declines in performance were inadequate. For example, one method of addressing declining storage performance was defragmentation. “However, defragmenting operations often take time to perform, and may be interrupted if the storage device is accessed during the defragmenting operation.” EX1001, 1:41-44. Further, unfocused defragmenting operations are time-consuming, subject to interruption, and “typically group all similar or like files with one another, without first assessing the need to do [so].” *Id.*, 1:38-46. Consequently, “a time consuming defragmenting operation may not improve the performance of the storage device.” *Id.*, 1:46-48.

Other known methods for addressing potential storage device failures included data recovery and data backups. But data recovery operations can be costly, leave data inaccessible for significant periods, and carry risk that “the data may not even be recoverable.” *Id.*, 1:49-58. As for data backups, they rely extensively on users who may not know of potential vulnerabilities, and have the drawback of slowing overall computer performance while they are being performed. *Id.*, 2:15-18 (“Although more frequent back-ups may reduce the amount of lost data when the storage device fails, back-up operations take time to perform, and may slow other functions of the computer system while being performed.”). Consequently, there was a need for methods and systems of monitoring the performance of storage devices and ameliorating degraded performance in real-time.

The '832 patent met this need by providing methods and systems that intercept communications between a computer system and storage device and analyze those intercepted communications relative to a performance threshold value for the device. Unlike prior art methods, this analysis of intercepted communications between the computer and storage device allows for the system to identify degraded performance as it arises and take corrective action to optimize performance of the device.

1. The Claims of the '832 Patent

The three challenged independent claims of the '832 Patent are set forth below. For convenience, Patent Owner uses the same claim limitation identification convention used by Petitioners in the Petition.

Independent Claim 1

1[p] A method for monitoring performance of a storage device, comprising:

1[a] intercepting communications between a computer system and said storage device;

1[b] analyzing said intercepted communications relative to a threshold value for the performance of said storage device; and

1[c] responding to a decline in the performance of said storage device based on said analyzed intercepted communications by automatically reallocating at least some data on said storage device to enhance continued operation of the storage device.

Independent Claim 12

12[p] An apparatus for monitoring performance of a storage device, comprising:

12[a] computer readable storage media;

12[b] computer readable program code stored on said computer readable storage media, comprising;

12[c] program code for intercepting communications between a computer system and said storage device;

12[d] program code for analyzing said communications, wherein said communications are compared to a predicted decline in performance of said storage device; and

12[e] program code for responding to a decline in the performance of said storage device by backing up at least some data on said storage device prior to said predicted failure of said storage device to enhance continued operation of said storage device.

Independent Claim 25

25[p] A method for monitoring performance of a storage device, comprising:

25[a] intercepting communications between a computer system and said storage device;

25[b] analyzing said intercepted communications; and

25[c] reallocating at least some of said data on said storage device to enhance the performance of said storage device based on said analyzed communications.

B. The Parallel Proceedings

As explained in the Discretionary Denial Brief, there are six pending district court actions involving the '832 Patent. This multitude of district court proceedings is summarized below:

- *Valtrus Innovations Ltd. et al v. The Home Depot, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 2:25-cv-00081-JRG (E.D. Tex., filed January 27, 2025) (the “Home Depot Action”).
 - o Nature of action: Patent infringement action alleging infringement of five patents, including the '832 patent.
 - o EX2005. Trial date: October 5, 2026. EX2006, 001.
- *Valtrus Innovations Ltd. et al v. FedEx Corporation et al.*, Case No. 2:25-cv-00516-JRG (E.D. Tex., filed May 9, 2025) (the “FedEx Action”).
 - o Nature of action: Patent infringement action alleging infringement of six patents, including the '832 patent. EX1016.
 - o Trial date: March 1, 2027. EX2007, 001.
- *Valtrus Innovations Ltd. et al v. NetApp, Inc.*, Case No. 2:25-cv-00517-JRG (E.D. Tex., filed May 9, 2025) (the “NetApp Action”).
 - o Nature of action: Patent infringement action alleging infringement of six patents, including the '832 patent. EX2008. Consolidated with Case No. 2:25-cv-00516 for discovery purposes.
 - o Trial date: March 1, 2027. EX2007, 001.
- *NetApp, Inc. v. Valtrus Innovations Ltd. et al.*, Case No. 1:25-cv-06138 (S.D.N.Y., filed July 25, 2025) (the “NetApp DJ Action”).

- o Nature of action: Declaratory judgment action alleging non-infringement of six patents, including the '832 patent. EX2009.
 - o Trial date: To be determined.
- *Valtrus Innovations Ltd. et al v. Lenovo Group Limited et al.*, Case No. 2:25-cv-00080-JRG (E.D. Tex., filed January 27, 2025) (the “Lenovo Action”).
 - o Nature of action: Patent infringement action alleging infringement of six patents, including the '832 patent. EX2011.
 - o Trial date: To be determined.
- *Starbucks Corporation v. Valtrus Innovations Ltd. et al.*, Case No. 2:25-cv-01859 (W.D. Wash., filed September 25, 2025) (the “Starbucks DJ Action”).
 - o Nature of Action: Declaratory judgment action alleging invalidity and non-infringement of 12 patents, including the '832 Patent. EX2012.
 - o Trial date: To be determined.

In addition to the foregoing district court proceedings, as discussed in the Discretionary Denial Brief, a request for *ex parte* reexamination is also pending before the Office. See Reexamination Control No. 90/015,602; EX2004. That pending *ex parte* reexamination request notably includes several alleged unpatentability grounds that rely as a primary reference on the same Wolf reference that is the only primary reference used in the Petition. EX2004, 029-036.

C. The IPR Petition’s Alleged Unpatentability Grounds

Grounds	Claims	Statutory Basis	Prior Art
---------	--------	-----------------	-----------

1	1-4, 7-10, 12-25	§103	Wolf ¹
2	5-6, 10, 26	§103	Wolf and Kamiyama ²
3	9, 11-21	§103	Wolf and Woods ³

III. PETITIONERS HAVE NOT SHOWN A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF PREVAILING ON ANY CHALLENGED CLAIMS

A. Petitioners’ Contrary Claim Construction Positions Before Different Tribunals Warrant Denial of the Petition

In the Petition, Petitioners take the position that they are capable of interpreting the challenged claims of the ’832 Patent under the *Phillips* standard. Specifically, while Petitioners do not propose any specific terms for construction, Petitioners only vaguely allege that “[t]he analysis below in §III [*i.e.*, Petitioners’ mapping of the prior art to the claims] proves the Challenged Claims obvious under any interpretation reasonably advanced according to the *Phillips* standard.” Pet. 6. And Petitioners’ expert attests to his understanding that “for purposes of my analysis in this inter partes review proceeding, the terms appearing in the patent claims should be interpreted according to their ‘ordinary and customary meaning.’” EX1003 ¶ 33.

¹ “Wolf” refers to U.S. Patent No. 5,287,363 (EX1004).

² “Kamiyama” refers to U.S. Patent No. 5,584,018 (EX1005).

³ “Woods” refers to U.S. Patent No. 5,881,311 (EX1006).

In short, the Petition hinges on Petitioners' position that Petitioners and their expert can interpret the claims under the *Phillips* standard and apply the prior art to the interpreted claims accordingly.

In the parallel district court litigation, however, Petitioners take a very different view of their ability to interpret the claims. Specifically, in invalidity contentions that Petitioners served on November 19, 2025, Petitioners allege that ***no fewer than ten terms of the '832 patent are indefinite***, claiming that each term is "invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 112 because [the term] fails to inform, with reasonable certainty, those skilled in the art about the scope of the invention." EX2019, 95-96. These include four terms that appear in challenged independent claim 1 and 12, and four that appear in challenged independent claim 25. In other words, in this proceeding Petitioners purport to be able to interpret the claims based on the *Phillips* standard with reasonable certainty, and Petitioners in fact implicitly map the claims to the prior art based on those interpretations. At the same time, in the district court litigation, Petitioners argue that the very same claim terms "fail[] to inform, with reasonable certainty, those skilled in the art about the scope of the invention." EX2019, 95-96

These positions are plainly inconsistent. "If a claim is indefinite, the claim, by definition, cannot be construed." *Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Applera Corp.*, 599 F.3d 1325, 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2010). Consequently, as a general rule a claim cannot be both

indefinite and invalidated by the prior art. *Id.* (“a claim cannot be both indefinite and anticipated”). And there is no indication whatsoever that one of the narrow exceptions to this general rule—such as the presence of *IPXL*-type⁴ indefiniteness (*i.e.*, ambiguity as to whether the claim recites a method or apparatus)—is applicable here. *See Samsung Elecs. Am., Inc. v. Prisia Eng'g Corp.*, 948 F.3d 1342, 1355 n.5 (Fed. Cir. 2020) (recognizing *IPXL*-type indefiniteness as a limited exception to the general rule that indefiniteness precludes mapping of the claims to the prior art).

On these facts, the Director’s recent informative decision in *Tesla, Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC*, IPR2025-00340, Paper 18 (Director Squires November 5, 2025) (“*Tesla*”) establishes that the Petition should be denied. In *Tesla*, the Director granted Director Review, vacated a grant of institution, and ordered that institution be denied because of Petitioners’ inconsistent positions regarding indefiniteness. *Tesla*, 2-4. As the Director explained in *Tesla*, “when a petitioner advances different positions before the Board and a district court, that petitioner is *required* to explain why those different positions are warranted.” *Id.*, 3 (emphasis in

⁴ “*IPXL*” refers to *IPXL Holdings, L.L.C. v. Amazon.com, Inc.*, 430 F.3d 1377, 1384 (Fed. Cir. 2005).

original). Here the Petition contains no explanation for the contrary claim construction positions.⁵

Further, in *Tesla* “Petitioner argued indefiniteness in the district court and then adopted Patent Owner’s plain and ordinary meaning construction from the district court litigation in its Petition.” *Id.*, 4. The facts are materially similar here. In the Petition, Petitioners applied *Phillips* and effectively adopted plain meaning constructions for all terms, while in district court Petitioners argued that the same claim terms were indefinite. As the Director pointed out in *Tesla*, “[a]llowing a petitioner to advance a claim construction before the Board when that petitioner has made inconsistent indefiniteness arguments in district court fails to further, but instead detracts from, the Office’s goal of providing greater predictability and

⁵ That Petitioners’ invalidity contentions were served after the Petition was filed should not change the analysis. Petitioners presumably were aware of their indefiniteness position when they filed the Petition. Further, the invalidity contentions in which Petitioner FedEx Office and Print Services, Inc. alleged indefiniteness were filed on November 19, 2025—16 days after the Director issued the *Tesla* decision. Thus Petitioners knew or should have known of the implications of their decision to argue indefiniteness in district court.

certainty in the patent system.” *Id.* (citation omitted). Consequently, the Director concluded that “denial of institution is appropriate in this case.” *Id.*

So too here. Petitioners are required by rule to identify “[h]ow the challenged claim is to be construed.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3). Here, however, Petitioners have failed to meet that requirement by conditioning their Petition on a *Phillips* interpretation, while simultaneously arguing that the same claim terms fail to provide reasonable notice of their scope and thus are indefinite. The Petition should be denied on this basis alone.

B. The Petition Should Be Denied Because it Relies on Unreliable Expert Testimony to Supply A Key Limitation

All challenged independent claims include a limitation requiring “analyzing said intercepted communications” or “program code for analyzing said communications.” See Cl. 1[b], Cl. 12[d], Cl. 25[b]. The Petition, however, fails to explain how the disclosures of Wolf teach this limitation. And since the Petition does not include any alternative theories for supplying this limitation from other references, this defect dooms all grounds in the Petition.

Petitioners point to two different “aspects” of Wolf as allegedly disclosing the “analyzing said intercepted communications” limitation. The “first aspect” that Petitioners point to are Wolf’s “disk-call interceptor” and “disk-read timer.” Pet. 15-16. But Petitioners’ contentions in this regard suffer from multiple core defects.

First, Petitioner relies on the Declaration of Dr. Nenad Medvidovic (EX1003) to support its contention that these structures in Wolf disclose the claimed analysis of intercepted communications. The paragraph of the Medvidovic Declaration that Petitioners cite for this proposition, however, is ***verbatim identical to the attorney argument contained in the Petition***. Compare Pet. 15-16 with EX1003 ¶54. This is reflected in the redline comparison of the text of the Petition’s analysis of Wolf’s “First Aspect” with the corresponding language (paragraph 54) of the Medvidovic Declaration:

Wolf discloses that the disk-call interceptor (DCI) gathers “information indicative of disk data read problems,” including “the data transfer time measurements from the disk-read timer [(DRT)],” and from the time measurements, “detects data transfers that took an excessive amount of time which would indicate that the data was not successfully read on a first attempt, and one or more retries at reading the data was conducted by the disk controller and/or the operating system’s low-level interface to the disk.” ~~FEDEX-1004~~EX1004, 6:65-7:11, 15:51-16:14, 17:56-20:50. As Wolf explains in detail, the DCI intercepts “a call for a disk read operation” and interfaces with the DRT across shared memory blocks to determine the “the actual data transfer time.” *Id.*, 12:20-28. The DCI further analyzes the intercepted communications to determine whether an error condition has occurred by comparing the time information against a table of acceptable times (relative to a threshold value for the performance of said storage device). *Id.*, 20:24-41, 21:38-43, 24:1-11, 24:22-27, 25:19-24, 27:47-56, 28:10-15; ~~FEDEX-1003, ¶54~~. Wolf explains the table of acceptable times may be created “at setup time...by performing several series of successive reads” of a number of sectors in the storage device “and logging in the table the average times for each of these read operations.” ~~FEDEX-1004~~EX1004, 20:28-33. “Thus, when the operating system issues a call for a read operation containing one of those numbers of sectors stored in the table, a simple comparison can determine if a reasonable time has been taken for the read.” *Id.*; see also *id.*, 20:37-41 (“no more than one standard deviation greater than the mean, or no more than fifty-percent greater than the mean”), 21:31-44.

As illustrated above, the words of the Medvidovic Declaration are completely identical to the corresponding portion of the Petition that cites it. The PTAB has harshly criticized such brazen parroting of the Petition by expert declarants, and has denied institution on that basis. *See Xerox Corp. v. Bytemark Inc.*, IPR2022-00624, Paper 12, at 2 (PTAB Feb. 10, 2023) (designated precedential) (denying institution when expert declaration merely parroted petition and “was conclusory and added little to the assertions the testimony was offered to support”); *TikTok Inc. v. NTech Properties, Inc.*, IPR2024-01339, Paper 9 at 16 (PTAB Feb. 25, 2025) (giving “little or no weight” to the testimony of the petitioner’s expert as the declaration was wholly “conclusory,” “repeat[ing], almost verbatim, the language in the Petition without any further explanation or supporting reasoning or evidence”); *American Airlines, Inc. et al. v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC*, IPR2025-01055, Paper 11 at 18 (PTAB November 21, 2025) (“Petitioner’s only cited support for this conclusory statement is testimony of its own declarant, Dr. Easttom, which merely repeats the conclusory statement verbatim, without any explanation or additional citations to evidence. We give such conclusory, unsupported assertions by Petitioner’s declarant little or no weight.”). The Director should do the same here.

Further, even if Petitioners’ “first aspect” analysis otherwise met its burden (it does not), Petitioners’ mapping is still flawed because Petitioners’ do not connect the “first aspect” to the limitations that follow. Specifically, as discussed above the

“first aspect” of Wolf that Petitioners rely on is the “disk-call interceptor” and “disk-read timer,” which the Petition treats as “independently” disclosing limitation 1[b]. Pet., 15. The “second aspect” is Wolf’s “analysis program.” Pet., 16-18. But for the limitation 1[c] that follows, Petitioners rely solely on the operation of the “analysis program”—*i.e.*, the “second aspect” for limitation 1[b]. Pet. 18-21. Petitioners thus never meet their burden of connecting the “first aspect” to the method steps that follow, thus rendering the “first aspect” an effective dead-end.

As for the “second aspect,” Petitioners contend that analysis of Wolf’s “log file” satisfies the limitation requiring “analyzing said intercepted communications.” Pet., 16. Seemingly recognizing that neither the log file itself nor its contents are in fact “intercepted communications,” Petitioners rely on the alleged knowledge of a POSITA, arguing that “because the log file contains information gleaned from communications intercepted by the DCI, a POSITA would have understood Wolf to disclose (and/or found obvious from Wolf’s disclosure) that the analysis program **analyzes the intercepted communications.**” Pet. 16-17 (emphasis in original).

Petitioners only citation for this assertion is paragraph 55 of the Medvidovic Declaration. But that paragraph once again largely parrots the Petition, right down to the use of the non-technical word “gleaned.” EX1003 ¶ 55 (“Thus, because the log file contains information gleaned from communications intercepted by the DCI, and the analysis program builds a history of the events recorded by the DCI on the

log file and applies algorithms to the historical data to determine defects, a POSITA would have understood Wolf to disclose (and/or found obvious from Wolf's disclosure) that the analysis program analyzes the intercepted communications.""). Indeed, apart from one phrase, every sentence and phrase of paragraph 55 is present in the Petition.⁶ This is grounds for denial as explained above. *See Xerox*, IPR2022-00624, Paper 12, at 2.

Accordingly, since all grounds in the Petition hinge on conclusory expert opinion that merely parrots the Petition, the Petition fails to establish a reasonable likelihood of success as to any ground and should be denied.

IV. CONCLUSION

For all of the reasons explained in the Discretionary Denial Brief and this POPR, Patent Owner respectfully submits that the Director deny institution of the Petition.

⁶ Dr. Medvidovic (or, more likely, Petitioners' counsel) grafted the first sentence of the first full paragraph of page 17 of the Petition to the beginning of the preceding paragraph to create paragraph 55 of the Declaration.

Dated: December 5, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/Richard J. Botos/

Richard J. Botos (Reg. No. 32,016)

Counsel for Patent Owner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that the foregoing PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO THE PETITION and Exhibit 2019 were served on December 5, 2025, via electronic mail upon counsel of record for Petitioner at the following email addresses:

IPR39898-0051IP1@fr.com
Kenneth W. Darby, Jr.
David Hoffman

Dated: December 5, 2025

/Richard J. Botos /

Richard J. Botos (Reg. No. 32,016)
Counsel for Patent Owner

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I hereby certify that the foregoing PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO THE PETITION consists of 3227 words, excluding the table of contents, certificate of service, this certificate of compliance, or table of exhibits. The POPR complies with the type-volume limitation of 14,000 words as mandated in 37 C.F.R. § 42.24. In preparing this certificate, counsel has relied on the word count of the word-processing system used to prepare this paper (Microsoft Word).

Dated: December 5, 2025

/Richard J. Botos /

Richard J. Botos (Reg. No. 32,016)
Counsel for Patent Owner