

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

YAMAHA CORPORATION OF AMERICA
Petitioner

v.

BLACK HILLS MEDIA, LLC
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2013-00594
U.S. Patent 8,050,652

DECLARATION OF IVAN ZATKOVICH

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION..... 1

2. BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS 2

3. LEGAL STANDARDS..... 5

3.1. Anticipation..... 5

3.2. Obviousness 6

4. SUMMARY OF MY STUDY 10

5. ONE OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART 11

6. OVERVIEW OF THE ‘652 PATENT..... 12

6.1. A Network-Enabled Electronic Device 17

6.2. Receiving a playlist assigned to the electronic device..... 18

6.3. Identifying ones of the plurality of songs in the playlist that are not stored on the electronic device..... 21

6.4. Receiving information enabling the electronic device to obtain the ones of the plurality of songs from a remote source and obtaining the songs..... 22

6.5. Personal audio network server for managing playlists and devices 24

6.6. Receiving and playing Internet radio broadcasts 25

6.7. Requesting supplemental information related to a song in real time while the song is playing..... 26

7. OPINIONS AS TO CLAIM CONSTRUCTION..... 27

7.1. Playlist..... 27

7.1.1. The Media File Sharing Art Uses Playlist to Denote A List of Media Items Arranged To Be Played In A Sequence 27

7.1.2. The ‘652 Patent Uses “Playlist” Consistent with Its Meaning in the Media File Sharing Art 35

7.1.3. A List of URLs is Not a Playlist 39

7.2. Receiving a Playlist “Assigned to the Electronic Device” 47

7.3. “Receiving” a Playlist Assigned to the Electronic Device 50

8. OPINIONS AS TO QURESHEY AND BERMAN 51

8.1. Summary of Qureshey 51

8.2. Summary of Berman 51

8.3. Petitioner’s Arguments Regarding Qureshey in view of Berman 58

8.4. Berman does not cure the deficiencies of Qureshey 60

8.4.1. The Song List Sent from the DUL is Not Arranged to be Played in a Sequence 61

8.4.2. Neither the DUL Server Nor Audio Material Server Maintain Playlist Information..... 62

9. OPINIONS AS TO QURESHEY, BERMAN, AND LEEKE 65

10. OPINIONS AS TO WHITE..... 68

10.1. Summary of White 68

10.2. Petitioner’s Arguments Regarding White..... 75

10.3. Claims 1, 21, and 42 are not obvious over White..... 77

10.3.1. White teaches a system clearly distinct from that of claims 1, 21, and 42..... 79

10.3.2. No electronic device of White that plays and/or selects a song receives information from a central system enabling the electronic device to obtain a song..... 81

10.3.3. No electronic device of White obtains the songs from a remote source 86

10.3.4. No electronic device of White receives a playlist..... 87

10.4. Claims 13 and 34 are not obvious over White..... 89

I, Ivan Zatkovich, hereby declare:

1. INTRODUCTION

1. I have been retained by Counsel for Patent Owner to provide opinions on certain issues concerning *Inter Partes* Review No. IPR2013-00594 of U.S. Patent No. 8,050,652 (“the ‘652 Patent”).

2. I am aware that the Petition filed in the above-identified proceeding asserted various grounds and that the Board instituted this proceeding on a subset of the asserted grounds. I am also aware that Petitioner submitted with the Petition a declaration of V. Michael Bove, Jr., Ph.D. (“the Bove Report”) opining on claim construction and the validity of the challenged claims.

3. I have been asked to analyze the ‘652 Patent, the art cited by the Petitioner, the Bove Report, and the Institution Decision dated March 20, 2014 (“the Institution Decision”), as they relate to the particular grounds instituted by the Board. My opinions are set forth below. I make these statements based upon facts and matters within my own knowledge or on information provided to me by others. All such facts and matters are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

4. I am a Principal Consultant of eComp Consultants. My firm is compensated at a standard rate of \$475 per hour for my work on this matter. This

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.