

EXHIBIT B

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TRILLER, INC.
Petitioner

v.

TIKTOK PTE. LTD.
Patent Owner

Case No. _____
U.S. Patent No. 9,992,322
Issue Date: June 5, 2018

Title: Method Of Enabling Digital Music Content To Be Downloaded To And Used
On a Portable Wireless Computing Device

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 9,992,322
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.100 *ET SEQ.***

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(1).....1

II. PAYMENT OF FEES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.1032

III. REQUIREMENTS FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.1042

A. Standing - 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)2

B. Challenge and Relief Requested - 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b).....3

1. Challenged Claims - 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(1).....3

2. Specific Statutory Grounds - 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(2).....3

3. Claim Construction - 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3).....5

4. Explanation of Unpatentability - 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4)5

5. Supporting Evidence - 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(5).....5

IV. THE SPECIFICATION AND CLAIMS OF THE '322 PATENT5

V. CLAIMS 30, 31, 32, 35, 51, 55, AND 56 ARE UNPATENTABLE.....11

A. Claims 30, 51, and 55 Are Anticipated or Rendered Obvious By Abrams or, Alternatively, Would Have Been Obvious In View of Abrams, CNET Reviews, and Collins and/or Monas11

1. Overview of Abrams11

2. Claim 30 Is Anticipated Or Rendered Obvious By Abrams, or, Alternatively, Would Have Been Obvious In View of Abrams, CNET Reviews, and Collins and/or Monas20

a) Limitation 30.120

b) Limitation 30.221

c) Limitation 30.322

d) Limitation 30.422

e) Limitation 30.525

f)	Limitation 30.6	28
g)	Limitation 30.7	28
h)	Limitation 30.8	29
3.	Claim 51 Is Anticipated By Or Rendered Obvious By Abrams, or, Alternatively, Would Have Been Obvious In View of Abrams, CNET Reviews, and Collins and/or Monas.....	31
4.	Claim 55 Is Anticipated By Or Rendered Obvious By Abrams, or, Alternatively, Would Have Been Obvious In View of Abrams, CNET Reviews, and Collins and/or Monas.....	32
B.	Claims 31 and 56 Would Have Been Obvious In View of Abrams and The Knowledge of a POSITA, or Alternatively, Obvious In View of Abrams, CNET Reviews, Collins and/or Monas, and The Knowledge of a POSITA About Multitasking and Multithreading....	32
1.	Claim 31	32
2.	Claim 56.....	36
C.	Claims 32, 35, and 56 Are Not Entitled to Their Claimed Priority In May 2007 Because Their Subject Matter Is Not Disclosed In the May 2007 Priority Document, And Therefore The Applicants’ Own Disclosure In Knight 2010 Anticipates, Or At Least Renders Obvious, Claims 32, 35, and 56	36
1.	Knight Anticipates, Or At Least Renders Obvious, Claim 32.....	40
a)	Claim 30, Limitation 30.1.....	41
b)	Claim 30, Limitation 30.2.....	41
c)	Claim 30, Limitation 30.3.....	42
d)	Claim 30, Limitation 30.4.....	42
e)	Claim 30, Limitation 30.5.....	42
f)	Claim 30, Limitation 30.6.....	43
g)	Claim 30, Limitation 30.7.....	43

- h) Claim 30, Limitation 30.8.....43
 - i) Additional Limitations of Claim 31.....44
 - a) Additional Limitations of Claim 32.....44
 - 2. Knight Anticipates, Or At Least Renders Obvious, Claim 35.....45
 - 3. Knight Anticipates, Or At Least Renders Obvious, Claim 56.....46
 - D. If The Subject Matter of Claim 35 Is Disclosed In The May 2007 Priority Document, The Subject Matter of Claim 35 Would Have Been Obvious In Light of Adams And Khedouri or, Alternatively, Obvious In View of Abrams, Khedouri, CNET Reviews, and Collins and/or Monas47
 - 1. Overview of Khedouri49
 - 2. Obviousness Analysis for Claim 35.....54
 - a) Khedouri Discloses “A Music Application”55
 - b) Khedouri Discloses That the Music Application Uses Track Meta-Data That Defines Attributes of Tracks.....55
 - c) Khedouri Discloses Track Meta-Data External to A Music Track.....56
 - d) Under Potential Interpretations Derived From Patent Owner’s Positions In The Related Litigation, Khedouri Discloses “Track Meta-Data That Is Formed As A Separate Meta-Data Layer”57
 - e) The Combination of Khedouri and Abrams Would Have Been Obvious58
 - E. Claim 32 Would Have Been Obvious In View of Abrams, Khedouri, and The Knowledge of a POSITA About Multitasking and Multithreading, or, Alternatively, Obvious In View of Abrams, Khedouri, CNET Reviews, Collins and/or Monas, and The Knowledge of a POSITA About Multitasking and Multithreading60
 - F. If The Subject Matter of Claim 35 Is Disclosed In The May 2007 Priority Document, The Subject Matter of Claim 35 Would Have

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.