

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,
and
LG ELECTRONICS, INC., LG ELECTRONICS U.S.A., INC., and LG
ELECTRONICS MOBILECOMM U.S.A., INC.,
Petitioners

v.
BLACK HILLS MEDIA, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2014-00717
Case IPR2015-00335
Patent No. 6,108,686

PETITIONERS' REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit	Description
Ex. 1001	U.S. Patent No. 6,108,686 (“the ‘686 Patent”)
Ex. 1002	File History for U.S. Patent No. 6,108,686
Ex. 1003	U.S. Patent No. 5,740,549 (“the Reilly patent” or “Reilly”)
Ex. 1004	Weiss, “ <i>New Places to Go Online</i> ,” 14(8) <i>Technology & Learning</i> 109-115 (1994) (“the <i>Technology & Learning Article</i> ”)
Ex. 1005	Declaration of Kevin C. Almeroth, Ph.D. (“Almeroth Dec.”)
Ex. 1006	<i>Curriculum vitae</i> of Kevin C. Almeroth, Ph.D.
Ex. 1007	Motion to Intervene in Investigation and Supporting Memorandum of Google Inc., International Trade Commission Investigation No. 337-TA-882 (ITC Jul. 26, 2013).
Ex. 1008	Notice of Filing of Requests for Inter Partes Review of the Patents-in-Suit, filed in the Eastern District of Texas for Case 2:13-cv-00379-JRG on May 21, 2014.
Ex. 1009	Declaration of Mr. Sungil Cho
Ex. 1010	Black Hills Media, LLC’s Opposition To Google Inc.’s Motion to Intervene (Inv. No. 337-TA-882)
Ex. 1011	Order No. 17: INITIAL DETERMINATION Granting Google Inc.’s Motion to Intervene (Inv. No. 337-TA-882)
Ex. 1012	Final Initial Determination Distribution List (Inv. No. 337-TA-882)
Ex. 1013	Supplemental Declaration of Kevin C. Almeroth, Ph.D. (served as supplemental evidence on Dec. 4, 2014)
Ex. 1014	Updated curriculum vitae of Kevin Almeroth, Ph.D. (served, but not filed, on January 20, 2015)
Ex. 1015	Legal Engagements of Kevin Almeroth, Ph.D. (served, but not filed, on January 20, 2015)
Ex. 1016	Transcript of deposition of William O. Putnam, dated April 28, 2015.
Ex. 1017	Second Declaration of Kevin C. Almeroth, Ph.D.
Ex. 1018	<i>Search Engines</i> publication, archived on the Internet Archive Wayback Machine (http://www.archive.org/) on April 5, 1997, as shown in the following URL https://web.archive.org/web/19970405174547/http://www.webreference.com/content/search/features.html

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....1

II. BHM’s Discussion of “Push” and “Pull” Technology is Irrelevant and without Merit3

III. BHM’s Reliance on Unclaimed Features is Legally Incorrect.....5

 A. The Claims Do Not Require “Pull” Technology6

 B. The Claims Do Not Require an “Active Search”8

IV. BHM’s Newly Proposed and Implied Claim Constructions Are Erroneous9

 A. BHM’s Proposed Construction of “Search Agent” Should be Rejected9

 B. BHM’s Implied Construction of “Search,” “Search Criteria,” and “Search Rules” Should be Ignored13

V. BHM’s Anticipation Analysis Incorrectly Characterizes Reilly and Uses Incorrect Legal Principles14

 A. BHM’s Summary of Reilly Includes Characterizations that Are Irrelevant to the Challenged Claims and Characterizations that Confirm Anticipation of the Challenged Claims.....14

 B. BHM Incorrectly Characterizes Reilly’s Disclosure as a “Push” System.....15

 C. Reilly Discloses a Search Agent, Search Rules, and Search Criteria18

 D. BHM’s Characterization of Reilly’s Transmission of Information on Multiple Subjects is Irrelevant22

 E. Reilly Anticipates Claim 223

VI. BHM Concedes Obviousness of the Challenged Claims24

VII. BHM’s Allegation that the Petition is “Fatally Defective” is without Merit and Has Been Rejected by the Board’s Decision to Institute25

VIII. Conclusion25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	PAGE(S)
CASES	
<i>Deere & Co. v. Bush Hog, LLC</i> , 703 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	9
<i>GE Lighting Solutions, LLC v. AgiLight, Inc.</i> , 750 F.3d 1304 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	4
<i>In re Bond</i> , 910 F.2d 831 (Fed. Cir. 1990).....	18
<i>In re Graves</i> , 69 F.3d 1147 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	18
<i>In re Self</i> , 671 F.2d 1344 (C.C.P.A. 1982)	6
<i>In re Trans Texas Holdings Corp.</i> , 498 F.3d 1290 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	4
<i>Trebro Mfg., Inc. v. Firefly Equip., LLC</i> , 748 F.3d 1159 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	11
<i>Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar</i> , 935 F.2d 1555 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	5, 6
STATUTES	
35 U.S.C. §6(c)	25
35 U.S.C. §314(d)	25
OTHER AUTHORITIES	
37 C.F.R. § 1.7	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.1(a).....	1
37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d)	25

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.