

Filed on behalf of:

Patent Owner SightSound Technologies, LLC

By: David R. Marsh, Ph.D.
Kristan L. Lansbery, Ph.D.
ARNOLD & PORTER LLP
555 12th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004
Tel: (202) 942-5068
Fax: (202) 942-5999

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

Patent of SIGHTSOUND TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,

Patent Owner.

Case CBM2013-00020
Patent 5,191,573

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO THE PETITION

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF DEFINITIONS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Term	Meaning
The '391 Application	U.S. Patent Application No. 07/586,391
The '440 Patent	U.S. Patent No. 5,966,440
The '497 Application	U.S. Patent Application No. 07/206,497
The '573 Patent	U.S. Patent No. 5,191,573
The '573 Reexamination	<i>Ex Parte</i> Reexamination Application No. 90/007,402
The '734 Patent	U.S. Patent No. 5,675,734
Board	Patent Trial and Appeal Board
BPAI	Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences
CompuSonics	CompuSound, Inc.; CompuSonics Corp.; and CompuSonics Video Corp.
ITMS	iTunes Music Store
Patent Owner	SightSound Technologies, LLC
Petitioner	Apple Inc.
PTO	United States Patent and Trademark Office

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
FACTUAL BACKGROUND	6
I. The “CompuSonics System”	6
II. The Prosecution of the ‘573 Patent	8
A. The Claims at Issue in the Current Proceeding.....	10
B. The Asserted “CompuSonics System” was Previously Considered..	13
C. SightSound and the Advent of Digital Media Distribution	14
D. Patent Owner Informed Petitioner of the ‘573 Patent in 1993 and Disclosed its System to Petitioner in 1999	16
E. Petitioner Enters Music/Media Business in 2001	18
F. The ITMS Embodies the Claims of the ‘573 Patent	19
ARGUMENT	21
III. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 of the ‘573 Patent Are Not Anticipated Under 35 U.S.C. § 102	21
A. The Legal Framework for an Anticipation Analysis.....	21
B. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 Are Not Anticipated by CompuSonics’ Use of Removable Memories and Vague Allusions to Payment.....	22
C. Alleged Public Use	34
D. Exhibits 4112 and 4117 Are Not “Printed Publications”	35
E. The Experimental Uses of the CompuSonics System Do Not Anticipate the Asserted Claims	38
F. Independent Claim 4 Is Not Anticipated	39
G. Dependent Claims 2 and 5 Are Not Anticipated.....	40

H.	Response to Petitioner’s Invalidity Contentions.....	42
IV.	The ‘573 Patent Is Not Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103	56
A.	The Board Lacks Jurisdiction to Conduct a Review of the Patents Under § 103 Regarding the CompuSonics Publications	56
B.	The “CompuSonics System” Does Not Render Obvious Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5	59
C.	Dependent Claims 2 and 5 Are Not Obvious	65
D.	Secondary Considerations of Nonobviousness Are Overwhelming..	66
1.	The Patented Invention Has Been Commercially Successful .	68
a.	Digital Downloads Have Been Commercially Successful as Compared to Other Methods of Obtaining Digital Audio and Video Signals	69
b.	The ITMS Has Been Commercially Successful	70
c.	There Is a Nexus Between the ‘573 Patent, the Commercial Success of Digital Downloads, and the ITMS	71
2.	Petitioner and Others Have Copied the Patented Invention	77
3.	Patent Owner’s Invention Received Praise.....	78
4.	There Was a Long-Felt Need for the Invention	79
	CONCLUSION	80

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Abbott Labs. v. Geneva Pharm., Inc.</i> , 182 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	41
<i>Advanced Display Sys., Inc. v. Kent State Univ.</i> , 212 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	77
<i>Akzo N.V. v. ITC</i> , 808 F.2d 1471 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	68
<i>Alco Standard Corp. v. Tenn. Valley Auth.</i> , 808 F.2d 1490 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	67
<i>Allen Archery, Inc. v. Browning Mfg. Co.</i> , 819 F.2d 1087 (Fed. Cir. 1987).....	79
<i>Apple Inc. v. ITC</i> , 725 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	71
<i>Atlas Powder Co. v. Ireco Inc.</i> , 190 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	41
<i>Atofina v. Great Lakes Chem. Corp.</i> , 441 F.3d 991 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	33, 34
<i>Cheese Sys., Inc. v. Tetra Pak Cheese & Powder Sys., Inc.</i> , 725 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	22
<i>Crocs, Inc. v. ITC</i> , 598 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	71, 72, 77
<i>DeMaco Corp. v. F. Von Langsdorff Licensing Ltd.</i> , 851 F.2d 1387 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	71
<i>E.I. Du Pont De Nemours & Co. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.</i> , 656 F. Supp. 1343 (D. Del. 1987), <i>rev'd in part on other grounds</i> , 849 F.2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	68, 76

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.