

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., and
SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

BLACK HILLS MEDIA, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2014-00737
Patent 8,050,652 B2

Before BRIAN J. McNAMARA, FRANCES L. IPPOLITO, and
TINA E. HULSE, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

IPPOLITO, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
On Request for Rehearing
37 C.F.R. § 42.71

I. INTRODUCTION

On November 18, 2014, Black Hills Media, LLC's ("Patent Owner") filed a Request for Rehearing (Paper 9, "Req.") of our Decision to Institute (Paper 7, "Dec."), dated November 4, 2014, which instituted *inter partes* review of claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 13, 42, 44, 45, 47, 48, 50, 52, and 55 of U.S. Patent No. 8,050,652 B2 (Ex. 1001, "the '652 patent").

In its Request, Patent Owner argues the Board (1) applied an erroneous legal standard for the construction of the term "playlist" recited in the challenged claims, (2) overlooked Patent Owner's evidence on the ordinary and customary meaning of "playlist," and (3) misapprehended Patent Owner's argument regarding playlist 1528 disclosed in the '652 patent. Req. 2.

For the reasons set forth below, the request for rehearing is *denied*.

II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(c), "[w]hen rehearing a decision on petition, a panel will review the decision for an abuse of discretion." An abuse of discretion may be determined if a decision is based on an erroneous interpretation of law, if a factual finding is not supported by substantial evidence, or if the decision represents an unreasonable judgment in weighing relevant factors. *See Star Fruits S.N.C. v. U.S.*, 393 F.3d 1277, 1281 (Fed. Cir. 2005); *Arnold P'ship v. Dudas*, 362 F.3d 1338, 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2004); *In re Gartside*, 203 F.3d 1305, 1315-16 (Fed. Cir. 2000). The request must identify, with specificity, all matters that the moving party believes the Board misapprehended or overlooked. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d).

III. DISCUSSION

For purposes of the Decision to Institute, we construed the term “playlist” as “a list of audio files.” Dec. 10–11. As we explained, the Specification of the ’652 patent describes a playlist as a list of audio files that may or may not include URLs. *Id.* In reaching this construction, we noted the Specification teaches playlist 1528 is “a list of audio files and associated URLs.” We further discerned URLs may not be included in a “playlist” where, for example, “all the songs in the playlist are already on the first device.” *See id.* (citing Ex. 1001, 28:9–43). Moreover, our decision referred to column 4, lines 50 through 67 of the ’652 patent where the Specification describes a “playlist of songs” and downloading songs in the form of audio files for the playlist. *Id.* at 11. Further, we considered the two different proposed constructions and supporting evidence provided by the Petitioner and Patent Owner for “playlist.” *Id.* at 10–11. Nonetheless, we did not adopt either proposed construction. With respect to Patent Owner’s proposal, we were not persuaded that the broadest reasonable construction of “playlist” is “a list referencing media items arranged to be played in a sequence.” *Id.*; *see* Prelim. Resp. 26.

Additionally, in the Decision to Institute, we provided the general principles governing our claim construction. Dec. 9. These general principles are that

- (1) claim terms in an unexpired patent are given their broadest reasonable construction in light of the specification of the patent in which they appear (*id.*);
- (2) claim terms are given their ordinary and customary meaning, as would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art in the context of the entire disclosure (*id.*); and

- (3) any special definition for a claim term must be set forth with reasonable clarity (*id.*).

In its Request for Rehearing, Patent Owner asserts we did not apply the broadest reasonable construction standard because we improperly focused on one aspect of playlists described in the '652 patent. Req. 3. Patent Owner adds our decision did not address the full meaning of the “playlist” and, further, ascribes a “special definition” limiting the claim construction to certain aspects of the claim term. *Id.* at 3–4. Patent Owner contends the term “playlist” should be construed as “a list of media items arranged to be played in a sequence (i.e., as a group, without having to select individual songs for playback).” *Id.* at 4–5.

As we wrote in the Decision to Institute, we reviewed more than one aspect of “playlist” described the '652 patent. As reflected in our decision, we considered Patent Owner’s arguments based on the portion of the Specification describing audio player 1792, shuffle button 1796, and repeat button 1798. Dec. 10–11. We further considered several examples of playlists described in the '652 patent, including at least playlist 1528 and others described in column 4, lines 50 through 67 and column 28, lines 9 through 43. *Id.* Our Decision to Institute also did not adopt a “special definition.” Rather, upon review of the Specification and evidence and arguments provided by both parties, we explained in the Decision to Institute that Patent Owner’s position was not persuasive in light of the Specification. *Id.* We continue to be persuaded that, for the purposes of the Decision to Institute, “playlist” would have been understood as “a list of audio files.”

Patent Owner further contends we overlooked the extrinsic evidence it provided on the ordinary and customary meaning of “playlist. Req. 5–10.

Patent Owner asserts the Petition did not include any substantive analysis or evidence on this issue and our Decision to Institute “focused on only *one aspect*” of “playlist.” *Id.* at 5–6. Patent Owner maintains the testimony (Ex. 2007) of its declarant, Mr. Ivan Zatkovich, and contemporaneous publications (Exs. 2008–2010) evidence the ordinary and customary meaning of “playlist” as “a list of media items arranged to be played in a sequence (i.e., as a group, without having to select individual songs for playback).” *See id.* at 5, 7–8, 10. Patent Owner also argues the testimony of Petitioner’s declarant, Dr. Jeffay, supports Patent Owner’s construction of “playlist.” *Id.* at 8–10.

Again, we disagree the Decision to Institute was focused on only one aspect of playlist. As discussed above, we considered several examples and aspects of playlist described in the ’652 patent, including those portions of the Specification cited by the Patent Owner. Dec. 10–11 (citing Ex. 1001, 4:50–67, 21:61–63, 24:31–43, 28:9–43). Additionally, we considered Patent Owner’s extrinsic evidence. *Id.* at 10 (citing Exs. 2007, 2008, 2010). Nevertheless, based on the current record, we were persuaded, and remain persuaded, that the Specification and claim language itself requires a broader construction than that espoused by Patent Owner’s arguments and extrinsic evidence. Accordingly, we are not persuaded that we abused our discretion on this basis.

Additionally, Patent Owner asserts that the Decision to Institute erroneously misapprehends Patent Owner’s argument regarding playlist 1528 because Patent Owner did not “acknowledge” the Specification discloses the contents of playlist 1528, but not a sequence or arrangement of the contents. Req. 10–11. Patent Owner contends that it did not “concede

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.