

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

Inventor: Hair	§	Attorney Docket No.:
United States Patent No.: 5,966,440	§	104677-5005-803
Formerly Application No.: 08/471,964	§	Customer No. 28120
Issue Date: October 12, 1999	§	
Filing Date: June 6, 1995	§	Petitioner: Apple Inc.
Former Group Art Unit: 2785	§	
Former Examiner: Hoa T. Nguyen	§	

For: System and Method for Transmitting Desired Digital Video or Digital Audio Signals

MAIL STOP PATENT BOARD  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Post Office Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

**PETITION FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD PATENT REVIEW OF  
UNITED STATES PATENT NO. 5,966,440 PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 321,  
37 C.F.R. § 42.304<sup>1</sup>**

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 321 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.304, the undersigned, on behalf of and acting in a representative capacity for petitioner, Apple Inc. (“Petitioner” and the real party in interest), hereby petitions for review under the transitional program for covered business method patents of claims 1, 64, and 95 of U.S. Patent No. 5,966,440 (“the ’440 Patent”), issued to Arthur R. Hair and currently assigned to SightSound LLC (“SightSound,” also referred to as “Applicant,” “Patent Owner,” or “Patentee”). Petitioner hereby asserts that it is more likely than not that at least one

---

<sup>1</sup> As directed by the Board in Paper No. 7, Petitioner hereby resubmits the Petition and accompanying Exhibits to address formality issues identified therein.

of the challenged claims is unpatentable for the reasons set forth herein and respectfully requests review of, and judgment against, claims 1, 64, and 95 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and for obviousness-type double patenting.

As discussed in Section I, *infra*, Petitioner has concurrently filed a Petition seeking covered business method review of the '440 Patent, requesting judgment against these same claims under §§ 102 and 103. Petitioner has additionally filed Petitions seeking covered business method reviews of the (related) '573 Patent requesting judgment against claims in that patent under §§ 101 and 112 in one Petition, and under §§ 102 and 103 in a second concurrent Petition. Petitioner notes that the Director, pursuant to Rule 325(c), may determine at the proper time that merger or other coordination of these proceedings, including at minimum coordination of proceedings involving the same patent, is appropriate.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	OVERVIEW OF FIELD OF THE CLAIMED INVENTION .....	4
III.	PETITIONER HAS STANDING.....	8
	A.    The '440 Patent Is a Covered Business Method Patent.....	8
	B.    Related Matters; Petitioner Is a Real Party In Interest Sued for and Charged With Infringement.....	14
IV.	OVERVIEW OF SPECIFIC GROUNDS FOR WHICH IT IS MORE LIKELY THAN NOT THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS (1, 64, and 95) OF THE '440 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE .....	15
V.	BACKGROUND INFORMATION FOR THE '440 PATENT .....	15
	A.    The '440 Patent and Its Prosecution History .....	16
	1.    The '440 Patent Family .....	16
	2.    File History of the Parent '573 Patent .....	17
	3.    File History of the '440 Patent.....	20
	B.    Reexamination History of the '440 Patent and Related Patents.....	24
	1.    Reexamination of the Parent '573 Patent.....	24
	2.    Reexamination of the '440 Patent.....	27
VI.	DETAILED EXPLANATION OF REASONS FOR RELIEF REQUESTED, SHOWING IT IS MORE LIKELY THAN NOT THAT AT LEAST ONE OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS IS UNPATENTABLE.....	31
	A.    Claim Construction.....	31
	B.    The Challenged Claims Are Invalid Under § 101 .....	37
	1.    The Challenged Claims Are Directed To An Abstract Idea With No Inventive Concept.....	37
	2.    The Challenged Claims Are Directed to An Abstract Idea that Preempts the Field of Electronic Sale of Digital Music.....	39
	3.    The Internet and General Purpose Computer Features in the Challenged Claims Do Not Render Them Patentable .....	44
	4.    The Challenged Claims Do Not Satisfy the Machine or Transformation Test.....	49

C.	Obviousness-Type Double Patenting.....	52
1.	Obviousness-Type Double Patenting May Be Raised Here.....	52
2.	ODP Applies to the Challenged Claims.....	54
3.	The Challenged Claims Are At Most Obvious Variants of Claim 3 of the '573 Patent and of Claim 3 of the '734 Patent .....	56
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	79

<b>EXHIBIT LIST</b>	
Exhibit 1201	United States Patent No. 5,966,440
Exhibit 1202	United States Patent No. 5,966,440 File History
Exhibit 1203	Application No. 90/007,407 (?440 Patent Reexamination)
Exhibit 1204	United States Patent No. 5,191,573
Exhibit 1205	United States Patent No. 5,191,573 File History
Exhibit 1206	Application No. 90/007,402 (?573 Patent Reexamination).
Exhibit 1207	United States Patent No. 5,675,734 File History
Exhibit 1208	Application No. 90/007,403 (?734 Patent Reexamination)
Exhibit 1209	United States Patent No. 5,675,734
Exhibit 1210	10/10/1985 CompuSonics Letter from David Schwartz to Shareholders
Exhibit 1211	International Patent Application WO85/02310, filed on Nov. 14, 1984, and published on May 23, 1985 (“Softnet”)
Exhibit 1212	United States Patent No. 4,506,387, filed on May 25, 1983, issued on Mar. 19, 1985 (“Walter”)
Exhibit 1213	United States Patent No. 4,124,773, filed on Nov. 26, 1976, issued on Nov. 7, 1978 (“Elkins”)
Exhibit 1214	2/13/13 Order re Claim Construction (D.I. 175), <i>SightSound Techs., LLC v. Apple Inc.</i> , No. 11-1292 (W.D. Pa.)
Exhibit 1215	11/19/12 Special Master’s Report and Recommendation on Claim Construction (D.I. 142), <i>SightSound Techs., LLC v. Apple Inc.</i> , No. 11-1292 (W.D. Pa.)
Exhibit 1216	Excerpt from Benjamin Krepack and Rod Firestone, Start Me Up! the music biz meets the personal computer, pages 126-127 (Mediac Press May 1986)
Exhibit 1217	David Needle, “From the News Desk: Audio/digital interface for the IBM PC?,” <i>InfoWorld</i> , vol. 6, no. 23, p. 9, June 4, 1984

# 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.