

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.
Petitioner

v.

VIRGINIA INNOVATION SCIENCES, INC.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2013-00571
Patent 8,135,398

**PATENT OWNER VIRIGINA INNOVATION SCIENCE, INC.'S
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT7

 A. CORRECTED PETITION AND DECLARATION ARE DEFECTIVE9

 B. SAMSUNG'S EXPERT DECLARATION IS DEFECTIVE AND ENTITLED TO LITTLE OR NO WEIGHT11

 C. PROPOSED GROUNDS OF REJECTION ARE HORIZONTALLY AND VERTICALLY REDUNDANT12

 D. PROPOSED REJECTIONS IN GROUND 3 ASK THE BOARD TO PICK AND CHOOSE FROM OVER 500 POSSIBLE COMBINATIONS WITHOUT ANY GUIDANCE13

 E. PALIN FAILS TO DISCLOSE THE LIMITATION "CONVERTING THE MULTIMEDIA CONTENT ITEM FOR REPRODUCTION ACCORDING TO A DETERMINED SIGNAL FORMAT OF THE DESTINATION DEVICE"14

 F. KARAOGUZ FAILS TO DISCLOSE A "WIRELESS TERMINAL APPARATUS" WHICH RECEIVES A MULTIMEDIA CONTENT ITEM THROUGH A WIRELESS COMMUNICATION NETWORK AND CONVERTS THE MULTIMEDIA CONTENT ITEM FOR REPRODUCTION ACCORDING TO A DETERMINED SIGNAL FORMAT OF A DESTINATION DEVICE16

III. STANDARD FOR GRANTING *INTER PARTES* REVIEW17

IV. VIOLATIONS OF INTER PARTES REVIEW STATUTES AND REGULATIONS19

 A. NO SUBSTANTIVE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION PRESENTED19

 B. GROUND 2 IS HORIZONTALLY REDUNDANT TO GROUND 1 AND NOT ENTITLED TO CONSIDERATION22

 C. GROUND 3 IS VERTICALLY REDUNDANT TO GROUNDS 1 AND 2 AND NOT ENTITLED TO CONSIDERATION23

 D. EXPERT TESTIMONY IS ENTITLED TO LITTLE OR NO WEIGHT26

 1. *No explanation for claim interpretation conclusions* 27

 2. *Incorrect legal standard of claim construction applied*..... 28

 3. *No explanation of the process of arriving at the interpretation* 29

V. TECHNICAL OVERVIEW OF FILE TRANSFER SYSTEMS AND VIDEO SIGNAL FORMATS30

 A. TRANSMISSION PROTOCOLS30

 B. VIDEO SIGNAL FORMATS AND BANDWIDTH REQUIREMENTS31

 C. VIDEO SIGNAL COMPRESSION FORMATS32

 D. FILE TRANSFER SYSTEMS33

 E. WIRELESS TRANSMISSION BANDWIDTHS34

VI.	DEFICIENCIES OF REFERENCES CITED IN PROPOSED GROUNDS OF REJECTION	35
A.	ALLEGED ANTICIPATION REJECTIONS BASED ON PALIN	35
1.	<i>Legal Standard of Anticipation</i>	35
2.	<i>Palin does not disclose converting a multimedia content item.</i>	38
B.	ALLEGED ANTICIPATION REJECTIONS BASED ON KARAOGUZ	41
1.	<i>Karaoguz does not disclose a wireless terminal apparatus that performs a conversion.</i>	42
2.	<i>Karaoguz does not disclose a wireless terminal apparatus that receives and converts a multimedia content item.</i>	44
C.	ALLEGED OBVIOUSNESS REJECTIONS	49
1.	<i>Ground 3 is defective</i>	49
2.	<i>Ground 4 is defective</i>	51
D.	CONCLUSION.....	53
VII.	RELIEF REQUESTED – DENIAL OF TRIAL.....	54

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Advanced Display Sys., Inc. v. Kent State Univ., 212 F.3d 1272 (Fed. Cir. 2000) 37
Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 722 F.2d 1542 (Fed. Cir. 1983) 36, 37
Estee Lauder, Inc. v. L'Oreal, S.A., 129 F.3d 588 (Fed. Cir. 1997) 18
Gechter v. Davidson, 116 F.3d 1454 (Fed. Cir. 1997) 36
Graham v. John Deere, 383 U.S. 1, 17 (1966) 7, 25, 49, 53
In re Arkley, 455 F.2d 586 (C.C.P.A 1972) 37
Lemelson v. United States, 752 F.2d 1538, 224 USPQ 526 (Fed. Cir. 1985) 38
Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. Am. Hoist & Derrick Co., 730 F.2d 1452
(Fed. Cir. 1984)..... 36
Phillips v. AWH Corp., 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) 28
Rohm & Haas Co. v. Brotech Corp., 127 F.3d 1089 (Fed. Cir. 1997)..... 5, 29
Sanofi-Synthelabo v. Apotex, Inc., 550 F.3d 1075 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... 37
Schenck v. Nortron Corp., 713 F.2d 782, 218 USPQ 698 (Fed. Cir. 1983)..... 9
Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp., 713 F.2d 1530, 218 USPQ 871 (Fed. Cir. 1983)
..... 9
Therasense, Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson and Co., 593 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2010). 16,
36
Zund Systemtechnik Ag & Zund Am., Inc. Requester, No. 2011-013537, 2012 WL
527411 (Bd. Pat. App. & Interf. Feb. 16, 2012)..... 18

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102 37, 40
35 U.S.C. § 132 8
35 U.S.C. § 313 1
35 U.S.C. § 314 passim

Rules

37 C.F.R. § 42.100 19
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3)..... 3, 9, 20
37 C.F.R. § 42.107..... i, 1
37 C.F.R. § 42.108 7, 18
37 C.F.R. § 42.20(c)..... 2, 7, 14, 53
37 C.F.R. § 42.65 5, 19, 31
Fed. R. Evid. 705..... 19

Other Authorities

Board Decision in CBM2012-00003 13, 14, 24, 27
Changes to Implement *Inter Partes* Review Proceedings, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,680.... 19
MPEP 2141.02 10, 29
Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,756 (Aug. 14, 2012)... 18, 19,
23

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.