

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

META PLATFORMS, INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

SITNET, LLC

Patent Owner

---

IPR2026-00101

U.S. Patent No. 12,245,325

**PATENT OWNER SITNET LLC'S  
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

|      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |    |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| I.   | INTRODUCTION .....                                                                                                                                                                                              | 1  |
| II.  | BACKGROUND .....                                                                                                                                                                                                | 2  |
| A.   | Brief Overview of SitNet’s Technology .....                                                                                                                                                                     | 2  |
| B.   | The Parallel Litigation .....                                                                                                                                                                                   | 4  |
| C.   | The Previous IPRs And Federal Circuit Appeals .....                                                                                                                                                             | 4  |
| D.   | Distinctions Between The ’325 Patent And Related ’454 Patent .....                                                                                                                                              | 5  |
| III. | Claim Construction.....                                                                                                                                                                                         | 7  |
| IV.  | Petition’s Ground 1 Combination of Amidon and Issa Fails to Show a Reasonable Likelihood of Prevailing .....                                                                                                    | 7  |
| A.   | The Petition’s Recycled Argument Fails to Show Transmitting An “Invitation To Establish A Link With The Event Node” (All Claims). .....                                                                         | 7  |
| B.   | The Petition Does Not Demonstrate That Amidon Teaches Identifying “A Subset Of The Member Nodes ... Based On Geographic Proximity To The Situation.” (All Claims).....                                          | 11 |
| C.   | The Petition Fails To Prove That A POSITA Would Have Been Motivated To Combine Amidon And Issa (All Claims). .....                                                                                              | 13 |
| 1.   | No Motivation to Add Issa’s Aggregation Node .....                                                                                                                                                              | 15 |
| 2.   | No Motivation to Add Issa’s Discoverable Nodes. ....                                                                                                                                                            | 16 |
| V.   | Petition’s Ground 2 Combination of Wong, Gogic, and Kraft Fails to Show a Reasonable Likelihood of Prevailing .....                                                                                             | 18 |
| A.   | The Petition Fails To Show That Wong and Gogic Render Obvious “Identifying A Subset Of Member Nodes ... Based On Geographic Proximity To The Situation Of ... Devices Corresponding To The Member Nodes.” ..... | 18 |

|     |                                                                                                                                               |    |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1.  | Gogic’s Indiscriminate Invitations Does Not Disclose Identifying A Subset of Member Nodes Based On Geographic Proximity To The Situation..... | 19 |
| 2.  | No Showing Of How Wong Could Be Modified To Meet The Limitation. ....                                                                         | 20 |
| VI. | CONCLUSION .....                                                                                                                              | 21 |

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**CASES**

|                                                                                                            |    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| <i>Belden v. Berk-Tek, LLC</i> ,<br>805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....                                   | 14 |
| <i>Henny Penny Corp. v. Frymaster LLC</i> ,<br>938 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2019) .....                        | 16 |
| <i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd.</i> ,<br>829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....                        | 14 |
| <i>In re Stepan Co.</i> ,<br>868 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....                                          | 10 |
| <i>Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge, Ltd.</i> ,<br>821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016) ..... | 14 |
| <i>Realtime Data, LLC v. Iancu</i> ,<br>912 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2019) .....                               | 7  |
| <i>Vivid Techs. v. Am. Sci. &amp; Eng’g</i> ,<br>200 F.3d 795 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....                       | 7  |

**AGENCY DECISIONS**

|                                                                                                                                               |    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| <i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Finjan, Inc.</i> ,<br>IPR2017-02155, Paper 11 (PTAB Apr. 3, 2018) .....                                                | 14 |
| <i>Innoscence (Zhuhai) Tech. Co., Ltd. et al. v. Efficient Power Conversion Corp.</i> ,<br>IPR2023-01383, Paper 39 (PTAB Mar. 18, 2025) ..... | 20 |
| <i>Reed Semiconductor Corp. v. Monolithic Power Sys., Inc.</i> ,<br>IPR2024-00871, Paper 6 (PTAB Nov. 26, 2024) .....                         | 21 |
| <i>Western Digital Techs., Inc. v. Longitude Licensing Limited</i> ,<br>IPR2023-01230, Paper 31 (PTAB Jan. 21, 2025) .....                    | 16 |

| EXHIBIT LIST |                                                                                                                      |
|--------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2001         | Complaint, <i>SitNet LLC v. Meta Platforms, Inc.</i> , No. 1:25-cv-06389-6185-JAV, (July 28, 2025).                  |
| 2002         | Amended Complaint, <i>SitNet LLC v. Meta Platforms, Inc.</i> , No. 1:25-cv-06389-6185-JAV, (Nov. 7, 2025).           |
| 2003         | Amended Complaint Exhibit 1, <i>SitNet LLC v. Meta Platforms, Inc.</i> , No. 1:25-cv-06389-6185-JAV, (Nov. 7, 2025). |
| 2004         | U.S. Patent No. 8,069,202 (“Cona”)                                                                                   |
| 2005         | Patent Center Continuity Data for Provisional Patent Application No. 60/887,843 (accessed on December 8, 2025)       |
| 2006         | U.S. Patent No. 9,412,136 (“Gertzfield”)                                                                             |
| 2007         | U.S. Patent No. 8,045,455 (“Agronow”)                                                                                |
| 2008         | U.S. Patent No. 12,336,052 (“Cona”)                                                                                  |
| 2009         | Meta Platforms, Inc. v. SitNet LLC, IPR2026-00113, Ex. 1002 (“Prosecution History of U.S. Patent No. 12,336,052”)    |

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

Institution should be denied as petitioner Meta Platforms, Inc. (“Meta” or “Petitioner”) recycles arguments from a different IPR against a different patent, without accounting for the meaningful distinctions in the patent-at-issue, SitNet LLC’s (“SitNet” or “Patent Owner”) U.S. Patent No. 12,245,325 (the “’325 Patent” or “Patent”).

The Petition is based on the misconception that the ’325 Patent is essentially the same as a related SitNet patent, U.S. Patent No. 8,332,454 (the “’454 Patent”). Petitioner largely copies arguments and evidence from its previous IPR challenging the ’454 Patent—particularly for the limitations Petitioner assumed were “nearly identical” to the ’454 Patent. But the claimed invention in the ’325 Patent has several distinct differences from its predecessor that Petitioner overlooks.

Petitioner’s first ground relies primarily on *Amidon*, just as it did in the previous IPR against the ’454 Patent. The Petition repeats the same arguments and evidence from this previous IPR but ignores the ’325 Patent’s unique requirements of an invitation to link to “an event node” and “identifying a subset” of nodes based on “geographic proximity to [a] situation.” *See* Sections IV.A-B. While the Petition attempts to cover some of the ’325 Patent’s distinct limitations with a new secondary reference, *Issa*, it fails to show that one of skill would have been motivated to combine *Issa* with *Amidon*. *See* Section IV.C.

The Petition’s second ground fares no better. Petitioner argues that the ’325 Patent’s requirement of “identifying a subset” of nodes based on “geographic proximity to [a] situation” is met by Gogic determining which users to invite to an ad-hoc communication group. But Gogic is clear that its invitation is broadcast indiscriminately to all users—not some identified subset. Petitioner also does not show how Gogic’s teachings would be implemented in the primary reference, Wong. *See* Section V.A.

## **II. BACKGROUND**

### **A. Brief Overview of SitNet’s Technology**

Nearly two decades ago, the inventors, including several affiliated with The Weather Channel in Atlanta, Georgia, began using networking and telecommunications equipment to address issues relating to weather and safety. In particular, mobile applications were developed to enable devices capable of determining a user’s location to receive highly pertinent information related to situations and events that could impact them (positively or negatively). Ex. 2001 ¶22.

The inventors describe a system in which an event or “situation” serves as the basis for dynamically creating a situational network that interconnects users and entities for the purpose of distributing situation-specific information and coordinating responses. As described in the specification, such situations include

weather-related emergencies, such as hurricanes and associated evacuation scenarios, in which targeted notifications, preparedness information, and resource availability may be communicated to different affected parties. The disclosure further contemplates that the same situational-network framework may be applied to other emergent events requiring rapid, controlled information sharing, including security-related incidents, such as airplane crashes, or public health crises. Ex. 1001 at 5:10–25. This situational network system identifies and interconnects parties that are potentially impacted by an event or situation, allowing them to acknowledge their safety, communicate with one another, and receive information items related to the event or situation. Ex. 2001 ¶22.

The situational network forms a subset network within a larger network, allowing for increased efficiency and faster response times when interconnecting the parties within the subset network when compared to conventional network architectures. At the time of its invention, the situational network represented an unconventional architecture, implementing a dynamic connection between users which improved upon then-conventional network architectures that were only capable of maintaining static connections of users. Ex. 2001 ¶24.

To further this pioneering work, the inventors filed provisional patent application number 60/887,843 on February 2, 2007. Ex. 1001 at (60). Since then, numerous patent applications have been filed based on that original provisional

IPR2026-00101

U.S. Patent 12,245,325

application, resulting in a considerable portfolio of patents that includes the '325 Patent. *See* Ex. 2005; Ex. 2001 ¶25.

## **B. The Parallel Litigation**

On July 28, 2025, Patent Owner filed a complaint for patent infringement against Petitioner in the Southern District of New York (the “Parallel Litigation”), including the '325 Patent and other patents belonging to Patent Owner. Ex. 2001 ¶1.

On November 7, 2025, to streamline the Parallel Litigation, Patent Owner filed an amended complaint removing U.S. Patent No. 10,117,290 (the “'290 Patent”) from the Parallel Litigation. Ex. 2002 ¶1; Ex. 2003 ¶1 (showing redlined edits from original complaint).

Petitioner Meta has served invalidity contentions, and the Parties are preparing to exchange claim terms and constructions in March 2026.

## **C. The Previous IPRs And Federal Circuit Appeals**

In early 2024 Meta filed IPR petitions against several patents related to the '325 Patent, including:

- U.S. Patent No. 8,332,454 (the “'454 Patent”), challenged in IPR2024-00529 (the “-529 IPR”)
- U.S. Patent No. 9,877,345 (the “'345 Patent”), challenged in IPR2024-00530 (the “-530 IPR”)

- U.S. Patent No. 8,249,932 (the “’932 Patent”), challenged in IPR2024-00612 (the “-612 IPR”)

*See* Pet. at 83. SitNet is appealing the final written decisions in the -529 IPR, -530 IPR, and -612 IPR (the “SitNet Appeals”). Those appeals are currently pending before the Federal Circuit.<sup>1</sup>

#### **D. Distinctions Between The ’325 Patent And Related ’454 Patent**

The ’325 Patent is related to the ’454 Patent that was challenged by Petitioner in the -529 IPR. *See* Pet. at 1-3. As the Petition acknowledges, the claims of the ’325 Patent differ from the ’454 Patent, adding requirements that the “event node” is “discoverable by browsing the multi-dimensional personal information network” and steps regarding identifying a “target member node” and transmitting “information related to [a] situation” to that node. *See* Pet. at 2-3; Ex. 1001 at 34:1-54; *id.* at 35:28-36:9.

But the ’325 Patent also contains additional distinctions that were not expressly recognized by the Petition. For example, the ’325 Patent claims identifying a subset of member nodes “based on geographic proximity to [a]

---

<sup>1</sup> Meta also filed two IPRs against U.S. Patent No. 8,249,932. The decisions in those IPRs are not being appealed.

situation or a plurality of devices,” where the ’454 Patent involved forming a projection of nodes “using geographic locations” of devices.

| The ’325 Patent                                                                                                                                                                                                    | The ’454 Patent                                                                                                                                                            |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| identifying a subset of member nodes “ <b>based on geographic proximity to the situation</b> ” of a plurality of devices corresponding to the member nodes in the multi-dimensional personal information network.” | forming a projection of nodes “ <b>using geographic locations</b> of a plurality of devices corresponding to nodes in the multi-dimensional personal information network.” |

Ex. 1001 at 34:35-39, 35:41-46 (independent claims 1 and 10); Ex. 1017 at 33:24-27 (’454 Patent claim 1).<sup>2</sup>

Additionally, the claimed invention in the ’325 Patent requires transmitting invitations to establish links directly with an “event node,” while the ’454 Patent involved invitations to establish links with an “event node server.”

| The ’325 Patent                                                                                                                                               | The ’454 Patent                                                                                                                                                   |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| transmitting “an invitation to establish a respective link with the <b>event node</b> to devices corresponding to each node in the subset formed in step (b)” | transmitting “an invitation to establish a link with the <b>event node server</b> to the devices corresponding to each node in the projection formed in step (b)” |

---

<sup>2</sup> All emphasis herein is added unless otherwise noted.

Ex. 1001 at 34:40-43, 35:49-51 (independent claims 1 and 10); Ex. 1017 at 33:28-30 ('454 Patent claim 1).

These differences between the '325 and '454 Patents illustrate the distinct claim scope covered by each patent.

### **III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION**

Patent Owner submits that no claim construction is necessary in order for the Director to deny institution on the merits. *Realtime Data, LLC v. Iancu*, 912 F.3d 1368, 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2019) (“The Board is required to construe ‘only those terms... that are in controversy, and only to the extent necessary to resolve the controversy.’” (quoting *Vivid Techs. v. Am. Sci. & Eng’g*, 200 F.3d 795, 803 (Fed. Cir. 1999))). Patent Owner reserves the right to present claim constructions if trial is instituted.

Additionally, as discussed above, the SitNet IPR Appeals are currently pending before the Federal Circuit. If those proceedings result in a decision that involves claim construction, Patent Owner reserves the right to address how those constructions impact this IPR.

### **IV. PETITION’S GROUND 1 COMBINATION OF AMIDON AND ISSA FAILS TO SHOW A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF PREVAILING**

#### **A. The Petition’s Recycled Argument Fails to Show Transmitting An “Invitation To Establish A Link With The Event Node” (All Claims).**

Contrary to Petitioner’s assertions, the '325 Patent’s claims contain meaningful distinctions from the '454 Patent. *See* Section II.D, *supra*. For example,

the '325 Patent claims transmitting invitations to “establish a link with the **event node**,” while the '454 Patent claims invitations to “establish a link with the **event node server**,” as shown below:

| The '325 Patent - All Claims                                                                                                                                  | The '454 Patent - Claims 1-9                                                                                                                                             |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| transmitting “an invitation to establish a respective link with the <b>event node</b> to devices corresponding to each node in the subset formed in step (b)” | transmitting “an invitation to establish a link with the <b>event node <u>server</u></b> to the devices corresponding to each node in the projection formed in step (b)” |

Ex. 1001 at 34:40-43, 35:49-51 (independent claims 1 and 10); Ex. 1017 at 33:28-30 ('454 Patent claim 1). As Petitioner recognizes the claimed “event node” and “event node server” are not the same. *See, e.g.*, Pet. at 17 (arguing “Amidon’s social network server” is the claimed “event node server,” and “Amidon’s social network conference” is the claimed “event node”); Ex. 1001 at 34:28-34 (cl. 1 “an event node” created “by an event node server”). Despite the clear differences in these two invitation limitations, Petitioner relies on the same argument it used in the -529 IPR ('454 Patent) to argue that Amidon discloses the '325 Patent’s limitation in this IPR.

In the -529 IPR, Petitioner argued that Amidon’s “invitation to participate in a conference” is an “invitation to establish a link with the event node server.” Ex. 1021 at 26 (*italics removed*). Petitioner based its argument on Amidon disclosing

that “for a user to participate in a conference, a link 116 (*a link*) is established between the user’s client devices, e.g., device 330, and the social network server 316 (*the event node server*).” *Id.* at 25-26 (citing Amidon at 20:1-7, 20:39-62, FIG. 6B).

In this IPR, however, Petitioner is now arguing that Amidon’s “invitation to participate in a conference” is an “invitation to establish a link with the event **node**.” Pet. at 27; *see also id.* at 37 (relying on Claim 1 arguments for matching limitation in Claim 10). Petitioner bases its new argument on the same alleged disclosure in Amidon, that “[f]or a user to participate in a conference, a link 116 (*a link*) is established between users’ devices, e.g., device 330, and the social network server 316 (*the event node server*).” Pet. at 27 (citing Amidon at 20:1-7, 20:39-62, FIG. 6B (*italics in original*)). Petitioner offers no explanation for how the same disclosure in Amidon now somehow teaches something different.

Petitioner’s previous arguments notwithstanding, this Petition provides no evidence or explanation for why a link being established between user devices and an alleged event node server teaches an invitation to establish a link with the event node. Pet. at 27. The Petition cites Dr. Cooperstock’s declaration, but this does not help. To the contrary, Dr. Cooperstock **contradicts** Petitioner’s new stance, stating that:

a POSA would have understood that in sending an invitation to participate in a conference, Amidon teaches sending an invitation to establish a link with the **event node server**.

Ex. 1003 ¶129 (*italics removed, emphasis added*).

The Petition also cites its argument in limitation 1.5 (“establishing the respective link with each device...”). Pet. at 27. But this section simply relies on the same alleged teaching in Amidon of establishing a link between the user’s device and the alleged event node server. *Id.* at 29 (“Amidon teaches that a link 116 (*the respective link*) is established between the user’s client devices ... and the social network server 316 (*the event node server*)”).

The Petition also contends that Issa, its secondary reference, separately teaches this limitation through its own teaching of “invitations.” But the Petition does not even allege, much less prove that it would be obvious to add Issa’s “invitations” to Amidon’s system. Pet. at 27. Indeed, the Petition’s section arguing for the combination of Amidon and Issa (Section V.C) never mentions Issa’s “invitations,” much less explain why a POSITA would be motivated to combine Issa’s invitations with Amidon, or have a reasonable expectation of success in doing so. Pet. at 12-14; *In re Stepan Co.*, 868 F.3d 1342, 1345-46 (Fed. Cir. 2017) (prima facie case of obviousness requires showing “skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine the teachings of the prior art” and “would have had a reasonable expectation of success in doing so”).

Accordingly, the Petition’s Ground 1 fails to meet the claimed transmitting “an invitation to establish a respective link with the event node.”

**B. The Petition Does Not Demonstrate That Amidon Teaches Identifying “A Subset Of The Member Nodes ... Based On Geographic Proximity To The Situation.” (All Claims)**

The claims require identifying a subset of member nodes based on geographic proximity to the situation. This is yet another distinction between the '325 Patent and its predecessor, the '454 Patent, that Petitioner has overlooked and fails to meet in this IPR.

The '454 Patent claimed forming a projection of nodes “**using geographic locations** of a plurality of devices corresponding to node in the multi-dimensional personal information network.” Ex. 1017 at 33:24-27. In other words, the '454 Patent claims require use of the geographic location of the devices.

The '325 Patent further claims identifying a subset of the member nodes “**based on geographic proximity to the situation** of a plurality of devices corresponding to the member nodes in the multi-dimensional personal information network.” Ex. 1001 at 34:35-39, 35:41-46 (independent claims 1 and 10). Not only does this require use of the geographic location of the devices, but also the geographic location of the situation relative to those devices.

Once again, Petitioner recycles its argument from the '454 Patent (-529 IPR) but fails to account for the differences in the '325 Patent.

In this Petition, as in the -529 IPR petition, Petitioner argues Amidon discloses that “participation in a social network conference may be defined geographically,

such as limiting a conference to users within a particular locale or within a certain distance from one another” and Amidon recognizes that “user devices and/or the conferencing system may support location-based services such that the location of particular users can be determined.” Pet. at 25 (italics and brackets removed) (citing Ex. 1005 at 4:6-9, 12:37-65); Ex. 1021 at 24 (same argument in -529 IPR petition); *see also* Pet. at 37 (relying on Claim 1 arguments for matching limitation in Claim 10). But Petitioner does not explain how this teaches identifying users based on geographic proximity **to the situation**. *Id.* Neither of the cited disclosures in Amidon discuss identifying users based on their proximity to a situation. *See* Ex. 1005 at 4:6-9, 12:37-65. Instead, these portions of Amidon simply mention determining users’ locations, and limiting conferences to users “within a particular locale or within a certain distance **from one another**,” not within a certain distance **from a situation**. Ex. 1005 at 4:6-9, 12:37-65.

Again, Dr. Cooperstock’s declaration is no help. His discussion of this limitation and these portions of Amidon never mention geographic proximity to a “situation.” Ex. 1003 ¶124. Indeed, Dr. Cooperstock does not expressly assert that Amidon teaches identifying a subset of member nodes “based on geographic proximity **to the situation**.” *See id.* ¶¶124-125.

Nor does the Petition explain how anything in Amidon could be based on a user’s “geographic proximity to the situation” when Amidon’s alleged “situations”

do not have geographic locations. The '325 Patent discusses “situations” that physically occur in the real world (*e.g.*, earthquakes or airplane crashes) and accordingly have identifiable geographic locations (*e.g.*, earthquake epicenter or airplane crash site). Ex. 1001 at 5:10-25. The alleged “situations” in Amidon, however, are online activities such as users in a conversation on a social network, or sharing content on a particular topic, or listening to the same music. Pet. at 15 (citing Ex. 1005 at 13:57-14:29). Petitioner does not explain how any of these alleged online “situations” have a geographic location in the real world or how one would determine the geographic proximity of a user’s device to an online conversation.

Thus, the Petition fails to demonstrate that Amidon teaches the claimed identification of “a subset of the member nodes ... based on geographic proximity to the situation of a plurality of devices corresponding to the member nodes.”

**C. The Petition Fails To Prove That A POSITA Would Have Been Motivated To Combine Amidon And Issa (All Claims).**

The Petition’s Ground 1 is built on a combination of Amidon and Issa. Pet. at 4. While Amidon is the primary reference, the ground also relies on Issa for numerous limitations. *See, e.g.*, Pet. at 17-24, 30-36 (citing Issa for limitations 1.1, 1.6); *id.* at 37 (relying on Claim 1 arguments for matching limitations in Claim 10). In fact, Petitioner relies exclusively on Issa for some limitations, including the “event node” being “discoverable by browsing the multi-dimensional personal information

network.” *Id.* at 24, 37. But the Petition fails to demonstrate that it would have been obvious to combine Amidon and Issa in the asserted manner.

“[O]bviousness concerns whether a skilled artisan not only could have made but *would have been motivated to make* the combinations or modifications of prior art to arrive at the claimed invention.” *Belden v. Berk-Tek, LLC*, 805 F.3d 1064, 1073 (Fed. Cir. 2015) (emphasis in original). In an IPR, petitioner bears the burden to demonstrate “that a skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine the teachings of the prior art references to achieve the claimed invention.” *Intelligent Bio-Systems, Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge, Ltd.*, 821 F.3d 1359, 1367-68 (Fed. Cir. 2016). As the Board has recognized, petitioners cannot satisfy this burden with “mere conclusory statements” and “must instead articulate specific reasoning, based on evidence of record, to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.” *Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Finjan, Inc.*, IPR2017-02155, Paper 11 at 10 (PTAB Apr. 3, 2018) (quoting *In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd.*, 829 F.3d 1364, 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2016).

The Petition argues that it would be obvious to modify Amidon to incorporate two aspects of Issa—its alleged “aggregation node framework and discoverable nodes.” Pet. at 12. But the Petition fails to show that a POSITA would have been motivated to add either of these alleged teachings to Amidon.

1. No Motivation to Add Issa's Aggregation Node

Petitioner contends that Issa describes “framework of using an ‘aggregation node’ and ‘virtual peer’ to gather messages from nodes of a network and to share content,” and that this content includes “video, audio, text, image, graphic, html, [and] metadata.” Pet. at 12-13 (citing Ex. 1018 at 13:40-59, 16:17-23, 13:60-63 (quotation edit in original)). Petitioner then argues that a POSITA “would have been motivated to incorporate Issa’s aggregation node framework to provide a process for aggregating, caching, and distributing shared content in Amidon’s social network conferences.” Pet. at 12.

But Amidon already aggregates, caches and distributes shared content in its social network conferences. As the Petition seems to realize, Amidon teaches that its conferences involve content including:

textual messages, such as instant message (IM) and short message service (SMS) messages ...[,] audio messages, such as voice chat via streamed audio content, shared audio files, telephone (including VoIP, cellular, or other telephonic communication), or other suitable technique ... [and,] video messages, such as video chat via streamed video, shared video files, or other suitable techniques.

Ex. 1005 at 3:4-15; *see also* Pet. at 12 (citing same). Amidon also teaches that this shared content can be cached and distributed to other users in the conferences. *See, e.g.*, Ex. 1005 at 15:27-46 (discussing “message caching” as an “additional feature”

of Amidon’s “social network conferencing system”); 17:56-18:13 (user may have different “distribution options” for messages). Petitioner fails to explain why one of skill would add Issa’s aggregation node to Amidon, when Amidon already achieves the alleged benefits on its own. *Henny Penny Corp. v. Frymaster LLC*, 938 F.3d 1324, 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2019) (affirming no motivation to add sensor to primary reference “especially because [the primary reference] already teaches a sensor that measures other indicia of oil quality.”); *Western Digit. Techs., Inc. v. Longitude Licensing Limited*, IPR2023-01230, Paper 31 at 41 (PTAB Jan. 21, 2025) (finding no motivation to combine where “the purported benefits described by Petitioner for modifying Zhang with Javanifard’s teaching ... can be achieved by Zhang, alone”).

2. No Motivation to Add Issa’s Discoverable Nodes.

Petitioner argues that after the addition of Issa’s aggregation nodes to Amidon, POSITA would have further been “motivated to implement Issa’s teaching of listing an aggregation node and virtual peer in a ‘directory for discovery by other nodes or web users’ or a ‘meta-directory about virtual peers that is searchable by member and/or non-member peers.’” Pet. at 13 (citing Ex. 1018 at 15:17-23). Petitioner argues that a POSITA would have been motivated to make this modification in order to “further Amidon’s functionality” of making its conferences “accessible publicly.” *Id.* at 13.

The Petition, however, fails to show that Amidon teaches making its conferences accessible to the general public. Petitioner cites Amidon's background discussion of websites like MySpace or Facebook making pages accessible to the public, but this simply discusses existing systems, not Amidon's proposed social network conferences. *See* Ex. 1005 at 1:41-49; Pet. at 13 (citing same). Petitioner also cites Amidon's teaching of editing privacy settings, but this says nothing about its conferences being available to the public at large. Ex. 1005 at 15:36-39; Pet. at 13 (citing same). Finally, Petitioner cites Amidon's discussion of making some messages "publicly available" to the "whole group" in the conference, or limit distribution to "only to certain members of the group." Ex. 1005 at 17:36-42. But this still does not teach Amidon's conferences being made available for anyone and everyone to join.

Moreover, according to Petitioner, Amidon's system carefully selects users for inclusion on a participant list for the conference and sends invitations to those users. Pet. at 24-26 (citing Ex. 1005 at 3:22-25, 3:33-36, 10:37-39, 21:3-8, 19:54-67, 21:18-38, FIG. 6B). Indeed, Petitioner relies on Amidon's alleged disclosures of assembling a "participant list" for a conference and then "inviting" each user on that list in its argument for other limitations of the '325 Patent's claimed invention. *Id.* (discussing limitations 1.2 and 1.3). Petitioner does not explain why one of skill would want to list Amidon's conferences in a directory available to the general

public when Amidon already selects and invites the appropriate users for the conference.

## **V. PETITION’S GROUND 2 COMBINATION OF WONG, GOGIC, AND KRAFT FAILS TO SHOW A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF PREVAILING**

### **A. The Petition Fails To Show That Wong and Gogic Render Obvious “Identifying A Subset Of Member Nodes ... Based On Geographic Proximity To The Situation Of ... Devices Corresponding To The Member Nodes.”**

The Claims require “identifying a subset of the member nodes based on geographic proximity to the situation of a plurality of devices corresponding to the member nodes in the multi-dimensional personal information network.” Ex. 1001 at 34:35-39 (Claim 1); *see also id.* at 35:41-46 (Claim 10, similar).

The Petition does not contend that Wong or Kraft teach “identifying a subset of member nodes ... based on geographic proximity to the situation.” Pet. at 65-66. Instead, it relies on Gogic, arguing that “Gogic identifies a subset of member nodes based on geographic proximity of a plurality of devices to the situation when determining which users to invite to the ad-hoc communication group.” Pet. at 65 (*italics removed*); *see also id.* at 73 (relying on Claim 1 arguments for matching limitation in Claim 10). But Gogic does not identify a subset of member nodes when inviting users to its communication groups. On the contrary, Gogic sends a broad, indiscriminate invitation to all users. The Petition also fails to show how Gogic’s alleged teachings could be implemented in Wong to meet the limitation.

1. Gogic's Indiscriminate Invitations Does Not Disclose Identifying A Subset of Member Nodes Based On Geographic Proximity To The Situation

The Petition contends that Gogic “identifies a subset of member nodes based on geographic proximity” when its system “determin[es] which users to invite to the ad-hoc communication group.” Pet. at 65. But Gogic contradicts this, teaching that when an emergency is detected:

[Communications Manager] 404 transmits 420 **a broad or indiscrimina[te] or generalized invitation** to join a group **to all recipient [Communication Devices]** with their invitation acceptance being conditional upon the [Communication Device] qualifying according to the location criteria also transmitted in the broad indiscrimina[te] invitation.

Ex. 1007 at 10:45-50. Indeed, the Petition relies on Gogic broadcasting this indiscriminate invitation for the '325 Patent's subsequent limitation (“transmitting an invitation ... to devices corresponding to each node in the subset formed in step (b)”). Pet. at 66-67 (citing Ex. 1007 at 10:45-50).

Unlike the claimed invention, Gogic simply sends invitations to every user device, and then lets the individual devices themselves check whether they meet the location criteria and can be added to the group. Ex. 1007 at 10:62-66 (communication device calculates its location and “determine[s] qualification for acceptance of the invitation”).

Thus, Gogic does not teach identifying nodes “based on geographic proximity to the situation of a plurality of devices corresponding to the member nodes in the multi-dimensional personal information network.”

2. No Showing Of How Wong Could Be Modified To Meet The Limitation.

Even if Gogic did teach “identifying a subset of member nodes” based on the proximity of “devices corresponding to those member nodes” to a situation—and it does not—the Petition would still fail to show how that could be implemented in Wong’s system.

The Petition does not point to any disclosure in Wong of user nodes “corresponding to” particular devices, much less tracking the location of those devices. Pet. at 65-66, 47-48. Petitioner does not explain how Wong could possibly identify a subset of member nodes based on proximity of the “devices corresponding to those member nodes” to a situation, without both knowing what devices correspond to what users, and the having the ability to determine the locations of those devices. *Id.* at 65-66.

The Petition does not contend that it would be obvious to modify Wong to associate each user with specific devices and keep track of the location of each user’s device(s), much less explain how this would be done. Pet. at 65-66, 51-54; *Innoscence (Zhuhai) Tech. Co., Ltd. et al. v. Efficient Power Conversion Corp.*, IPR2023-01383, Paper 39 at 27 (PTAB Mar. 18, 2025) (“Petitioner fails [to]

sufficiently explain why or how a POSITA would have modified Yoshida’s process to incorporate Beach’s single mask, self-aligned gate process to form Yoshida’s device using the method recited in claim 1”); *see also Reed Semiconductor Corp. v. Monolithic Power Sys., Inc.*, IPR2024-00871, Paper 6 at 32 (PTAB Nov. 26. 2024) (denying institution where “Petition does not explain adequately how or why Galinski would be modified so as to arrive at the claimed invention”). Nor does the Petition even attempt to explain why Wong’s users would agree to let Wong constantly track where they are and what devices they are using. Pet. at 65-66, 51-54

For this additional reason, the Petition fails to show that its Ground 2 combination meets the claimed “identifying a subset of the member nodes based on geographic proximity to the situation of a plurality of devices corresponding to the member nodes in the multi-dimensional personal information network.”

## **VI. CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, Patent Owner requests that the Director deny institution of the Petition.

Dated: February 19, 2026

Respectfully submitted by,

/s/ David L. Hecht

David L. Hecht (Lead Counsel)

(Reg. No. 61,618)

dhecht@hechtpartners.com

HECHT PARTNERS LLP

125 Park Avenue, 25th Floor

IPR2026-00101  
U.S. Patent 12,245,325

New York, NY 10017  
P: (212) 851-6821

IPR2026-00101  
U.S. Patent 12,245,325

**CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH TYPE-VOLUME LIMITS**

This Patent Owner Preliminary Response (the “POPR”) consists of 4,589 words, excluding table of contents, table of authorities, certificate of service, this certificate, 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 the paper (Microsoft Word).

Date: February 19, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ David L. Hecht  
David L. Hecht (Lead Counsel)  
(Reg. No. 61,618)  
dhecht@hechtpartners.com  
HECHT PARTNERS LLP  
125 Park Avenue, 25th Floor  
New York, NY 10017  
P: (212) 851-6821

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that the following documents were served by electronic service on the date signed below:

**PATENT OWNER SITNET LLC'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

The names and addresses of the parties being served are as follows:

Jonathan Tuminaro - jtuminar-PTAB@sternekessler.com  
Michael D. Specht - mspecht-PTAB@sternekessler.com  
Jennifer Meyer Chagnon - jchagnon-PTAB@sternekessler.com  
Steven M. Pappas - spappas-PTAB@sternekessler.com  
Timothy L. Tang - ttang-PTAB@sternekessler.com  
PTAB@sternekessler.com

Dated: February 19, 2026

Respectfully submitted by,

/s/ David L. Hecht

David L. Hecht (Lead Counsel)  
(Reg. No. 61,618)  
dhecht@hechtpartners.com  
HECHT PARTNERS LLP  
125 Park Avenue, 25th Floor  
New York, NY 10017  
P: (212) 851-6821