

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

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.  
Petitioner,

v.

BLACK HILLS MEDIA, LLC  
Patent Owner.

Case No. To Be Assigned  
Patent No. 8,050,652

---

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,050,652  
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.100 *et seq.***

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**I. MANDATORY NOTICES (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(A)(1))** ..... 1

**A. Real Party-In-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1))** ..... 1

**B. Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2))**..... 1

**C. Lead and Backup Counsel (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3))** ..... 2

**D. Service Information (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4))**..... 2

**II. FEES (37 C.F.R. § 42.103)**..... 2

**III. REQUIREMENTS FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104** ..... 3

**A. Grounds for Standing (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a))** ..... 3

**B. Citation of Prior Art** ..... 3

**C. Claims and Statutory Grounds (37 C.F.R. §§ 42.104(b)(1) & (b)(2))**..... 5

**D. Claim Construction (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3)) and Effective Filing Date** ..... 5

**1. Claim Construction** ..... 5

**2. Effective Filing Date** ..... 6

**E. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art**..... 7

**F. Unpatentability of the Construed Claims (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4))** ..... 7

**G. Supporting Evidence (37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(5))**..... 7

**IV. SUMMARY OF THE ‘652 PATENT** ..... 8

**A. Overview of the ‘652 Patent**..... 8

**B. Prosecution History Summary of the ‘652 Patent** ..... 10

**V. THERE IS A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT PETITIONER WILL PREVAIL WITH RESPECT TO AT LEAST ONE CLAIM OF THE '652 PATENT** ..... 11

**A. Prior Art** ..... 12

**1. U.S. Patent No. 7,187,947 to White *et al.* (Ex. 1003)** ..... 15

**2. U.S. Patent No. 6,199,076 to Logan *et al.* (Ex. 1004)**..... 19

**3. U.S. Patent No. 7,020,704 to Lipscomb *et al.* (Ex. 1005)**.....23

**B. Ground I: White Renders Obvious Each Of Claims 1, 3-4, 6-7, 10, 13, 42, 44-45, 47-48, 50, 52 and 55 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103** .....29

**C. Ground II: The Combination of Logan and Lipscomb Renders Each of Claims 1, 3-4, 6-7, 10-11, 13, 42, 44-45, 47-50, 52 and 55 Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**.....41

**VI. CONCLUSION** ..... 59

## LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit	Description
Ex. 1001	U.S. Patent No. 8,050,652
Ex. 1002	File History for U.S. Patent No. 8,050,652
Ex. 1003	U.S. Patent No. 7,187,947 to White <i>et al.</i> (“White”).
Ex. 1004	U.S. Patent No. 6,199,076 to Logan <i>et al.</i> (“Logan”)
Ex. 1005	U.S. Patent No. 7,020,704 to Lipscomb <i>et al.</i> (“Lipscomb”)
Ex. 1006	U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/157,736 (“the ‘736 application” or “the ‘736 app.”)
Ex. 1007	U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/176,829 (“the ‘829 application” or “the ‘829 app.”)
Ex. 1008	U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/176,830 (“the ‘830 application” or “the ‘830 app.”)
Ex. 1009	U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/176,833 (“the ‘833 application” or “the ‘833 app.”)
Ex. 1010	U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/177,063 (“the ‘063 application” or the “063 app.”)
Ex. 1011	U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/177,783 (“the ‘783 application” or “the ‘783 app.”)
Ex. 1012	U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/177,867 (“the ‘867 application” or “the ‘867 app.”)
Ex. 1013	U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/177,884 (“the ‘884 application” or “the ‘884 app.”)
Ex. 1014	Decision on Institution of <i>Inter Partes</i> Review Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.108 in <i>Yamaha Corp. of America v. Black Hills Media, LLC</i> , Case IPR2013-00594 (March 20, 2014)
Ex. 1015	Declaration of Kevin Jeffay, Ph.D.
Ex. 1016	<i>Curriculum vitae</i> of Kevin Jeffay, Ph.D.
Ex. 1017	U.S. Patent No. 5,168,481 to Culbertson <i>et al.</i> (“Culbertson”)
Ex. 1018	U.S. Patent No. 5,616,876 to Cluts (“Cluts”)
Ex. 1019	Nielsen, J., Desurvire, H., Kerr, R., Rosenberg, D., Salomon, G., Molich, R., and Stewart, T., “Comparative Design Review: An Exercise in Parallel Design,” Proc. ACM INTERCHI’93 Conf. (Apr. 24-29, 1993) (“Nielsen”)
Ex. 1020	Hacker, S. “MP3: The Definitive Guide by Scot Hacker” March, 2000 (Springer) (“Hacker”)

**I. MANDATORY NOTICES (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(A)(1))**

**A. Real Party-In-Interest (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1))**

The real parties in interest for this Petition for *Inter Partes* Review (“IPR”) are Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.; Samsung Electronics America, Inc.; and Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC.

**B. Related Matters (37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2))**

U.S. Patent No. 8,050,652 (“the ‘652 Patent”) is currently the subject of *inter partes* review proceeding IPR2013-00594 that was filed on September 18, 2013, by Yamaha Corporation of America (“the ‘594 IPR Petitioner”). *Yamaha Corp. of America v. Black Hills Media, LLC*, Case IPR2013-00594 (instituted March 20, 2014). After a preliminary response filed on December 26, 2013, by Black Hills Media, LLC, the owner of the ‘652 Patent, the Board on March 20, 2014, instituted *inter partes* review of claims of the ‘652 Patent. Decision on Institution of *Inter Partes* Review Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.108 in *Yamaha Corp. of America v. Black Hills Media, LLC*, Case IPR2013-00594 (March 20, 2014).

The ‘652 Patent is currently the subject of litigation against multiple defendants in the Eastern District of Texas, the District of Delaware and the Central District of California, including the action captioned *Black Hills Media, LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. et al.* (Civil Action No. 2-13-cv-00379 (E.D. Tex.); the “Samsung Litigation”). Other defendants in the litigations include LG Electronics, Inc.; LG Electronics U.S.A, Inc.; LG Electronics Mobilecomm U.S.A.,

# 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.