

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

**In re Application of:** Darbee *et al.*

**Patent No.:** 6,587,067

**Filed:** February 23, 2001

**Issued:** July 1, 2003

**Assignee:** Universal Electronics, Inc.

**Title:** METHOD FOR SELECTING A  
REMOTE CONTROL  
COMMAND SET

**Amended Petition for *Inter  
Partes* Review under 35 U.S.C.  
§§ 311–319 and 37 C.F.R.  
§ 42.100 et seq.**

**Case IPR2013-00127**

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

**AMENDED PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT  
NO. 6,587,067**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>I. MANDATORY NOTICES</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>A. Real Party-In-Interest</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>B. Related Matters</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>D. Service Information</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>II. PAYMENT OF FEES</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>III. REQUIREMENTS FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>A. Grounds For Standing</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>B. Identification of Challenge</b> .....	<b>3</b>
1. Claims for which <i>inter partes</i> review is requested .....	<b>4</b>
2. The specific art and statutory ground(s) on which the challenge is based .....	<b>4</b>
3. How the challenged claims are to be construed.....	<b>7</b>
4. How the construed claims are unpatentable under the statutory grounds identified in 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(2). .....	<b>7</b>
5. Supporting evidence relied upon to support the challenge .....	<b>7</b>
<b>IV. SUMMARY OF THE '067 PATENT</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>A. Summary of the Prosecution History</b> .....	<b>9</b>
1. Prosecution and Issuance of the '067 patent.....	<b>9</b>
2. Reexamination Serial No. 90/007,876 .....	<b>11</b>
<b>V. DETAILED CLAIM CONSTRUCTION</b> .....	<b>12</b>

<b>VI. THERE IS A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT AT LEAST ONE CLAIM OF THE '067 PATENT IS UNPATENTABLE .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>A. Claims 1-6 are Unpatentable in view of Rumbolt and Magnavox.</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>B. Claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 are Unpatentable in view of Rumbolt, Magnavox, and Evans .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>C. Claims 1-6 are Unpatentable in view of Wozniak and CORE .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>D. Claims 1-6 are Unpatentable in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,703,359 and CORE .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>VII. DETAILED EXPLANATION OF HOW THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>A. Description of the Prior Art.....</b>	<b>18</b>
1. Rumbolt, U.S. Patent No. 4,774,511 (Ex. 1002) .....	18
2. Wozniak, U.S. Patent No. 4,918,439 (Ex. 1003) .....	19
3. Evans, U.S. Patent No. 4,825,200 (Ex. 1004) .....	19
4. CORE Reference Manual (Ex. 1005).....	20
5. Magnavox, PR Newswire Press Release (Ex. 1006) .....	21
6. Rumbolt U.S. Patent No. 4,703,359 (Ex. 1011) .....	21
<b>B. Detailed Grounds for Unpatentability Arguments .....</b>	<b>21</b>
1. Ground 1: Claims 1–6 are Rendered Obvious by Rumbolt in view of Magnavox Under 35 U.S.C. § 103.....	21
2. Ground 2: Claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 are Rendered Obvious by Rumbolt in view of Magnavox in further view of Evans Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 .....	32
3. Ground 3: Claims 1–6 are Rendered Obvious by Wozniak in view of CORE Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 .....	39
4. Ground 4: Claims 1-6 are Rendered Obvious by Rumbolt '359 in view of CORE Under 35 U.S.C. § 103.....	50
<b>VIII. CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>54</b>

**EXHIBIT LIST**

1001. U.S. Patent No. 6,587,067 to Darbee *et al.* (“the '067 patent”)
1002. U.S. Patent No. 4,774,511 to Rumbolt *et al.* (“Rumbolt”)
1003. U.S. Patent No. 4,918,439 to Wozniak *et al.* (“Wozniak”)
1004. U.S. Patent No. 4,825,200 to Evans *et al.* (“Evans”)
1005. Ron Karr, Robert Retzlaff, Tom Johnson, Chuck Van Dusen, and Meg Beeler, “CORE Reference Manual,” 1987, pp. i-91. (“CORE”)
1006. PR Newswire (April 9, 1987), Magnavox unveils Total Remote Tuning System and second generation Universal Remote Control. [Press Release], NAP Consumer Electronics Corp., Retrieved from DIALOG (“Magnavox”)
1007. *Whither Woz?*, Fortune, September 28, 1987, at 123.
1008. File History for Application Serial No. 09/791,354 which is now U.S. Patent No. 6,587,067 to Darbee *et al.*
1009. File History for *Ex Parte* Reexamination of U.S. Patent No. 6,587,067, Application Serial No. 90/007,876.
1010. Declaration of Alan J. Herr, Ph.D (“Herr Declaration”).
1011. U.S. Patent No. 4,703,359 to Rumbolt *et al.* (“Rumbolt '359”)
1012. Business Wire (January 9, 1987), CL9 : CL9 announces availability of first truly programmable master controller: Apple Computer cofounder Wozniak unveils CORE. [Press Release], Business Editors, Retrieved from DIALOG (“CL9”)
1013. U.S. Patent No. 4,623,887 to Welles
1014. U.S. Patent No. 4,626,848 to Ehlers

Petitioner Universal Remote Control, Inc. (“URC” or “Petitioner”) hereby submits this Amended Petition for *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 6,587,067 (the “’067 patent,” attached as Ex. 1001) to address the matters raised in the communication from the PTAB dated January 30, 2013. By this Amended Petition, Petitioner respectfully requests *inter partes* review of claims 1-6 of the ’067 patent in accordance with 35 U.S.C. §§ 311–319 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.100 et seq.

**I. MANDATORY NOTICES**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(1), URC provides the following mandatory disclosures.

**A. Real Party-In-Interest**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1), Petitioner certifies that URC is the real party-in-interest.

**B. Related Matters**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2), Petitioner states that claims 1-3 and 6 of the ’067 patent are involved in the litigation styled *Universal Electronics Inc., v. Universal Remote Control, Inc.*, Case No. SACV 12-00329 AG (JPRx) (C.D. Cal.), filed on March 2, 2012 (the “UEI Litigation”). The UEI Litigation remains pending. The patents-in-suit are U.S. Patent Nos. 5,414,426; 5,568,367; 5,614,906 and 6,587,067.

# 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.