

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

Applicant:	Dresti et al.	Universal Remote Control, Inc.
Case No.:	IPR2014-01109	v.
Filing Date:	November 6, 2002	Universal Electronics, Inc.
Patent No.:	7,831,930	Trial Paralegal: Cathy Underwood
Title:	SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR DISPLAYING A USER INTERFACE FOR A REMOTE CONTROL APPLICATION	Attorney Doc.: 059489.143600

**PRELIMINARY RESPONSE OF PATENT OWNER
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Certificate of Filing: I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically filed with the USPTO on this 8th day of October 2014.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PATENT OWNER’S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107	1
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND OF THE ’930 PATENT	3
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	6
IV. THE PETITION DOES NOT MEET THE STATUTORY REQUIREMENT OF 35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	8
A. The Petition Does Not Establish that Realistic and ProntoEdit Are Prior Art to the ’930 Patent Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)	9
B. There Is No Reasonable Likelihood that Claim 1 Is Obvious in View of Realistic and Evans (Ground 1)	12
1. The Petition’s Obviousness Analysis under Ground 1 Does Not Apply the Requisite Graham Factors at least Because the Petition Does Not Identify Any Differences Between the Claim Limitations and the Alleged Prior Art.....	12
2. The Petition Does Not Identify Why One Having Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Have Been Motivated to Combine Realistic and Evans	14
3. Realistic and Evans Do Not Teach or Suggest Various Elements of Claim 1	18
a. Realistic and Evans Do Not Describe Displaying At Least One of the Plurality of Lists of Favorite Channels in the Display of the Hand Held Device.....	18
b. Realistic and Evans Do Not Describe A Hand Held Device that Permits a User to Interact with A Favorite Channel List	24
C. There Is No Reasonable Likelihood that Claim 1 Is Obvious in View of ProntoEdit and Realistic (Ground 2).....	28
1. The Petition’s Obviousness Analysis under Ground 2 Does Not Apply the Requisite <i>Graham</i> Factors at least Because the Petition Does Not Identify Any Differences Between the Claim Limitations and the Alleged Prior Art.....	28

2.	The Petition Fails to Identify Why One Having Ordinary Skill in the Art Would Be Motivated to Combine ProntoEdit and Realistic	30
3.	ProntoEdit and Realistic Fail to Teach or Suggest Various Elements of Claim 1	34
a.	The Petition Fails to Explain How the Combination of ProntoEdit and Realistic Describe the Whereby Clause of Claim 1	34
b.	Neither ProntoEdit nor Realistic Describe An Electronically Readable Media Having Instructions that Allow a Plurality of Lists of Favorite Channels to Be Defined for Display in a Display of a Hand Held Device	37
V.	CONCLUSION.....	40

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Federal Cases

<i>Bruckelmyer v. Ground Heaters, Inc.</i> , 445 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	11
<i>CCS Fitness, Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.</i> , 288 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	6
<i>Graham v. John Deere</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	12, 13
<i>In ResQNet.com, Inc. v. Lansa, Inc.</i> , 594 F.3d 860 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	11
<i>In re Klopfenstein</i> , 380 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	10, 11
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	13
<i>Kyocera Wireless Corp. v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 545 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	10
<i>Mahurkar v. C.R. Bard, Inc.</i> , 79 F.3d 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1996)	10
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	7
<i>In re Robertson</i> , 169 F.3d 743 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	9
<i>Texas Digital Sys., Inc. v. Telegenix, Inc.</i> , 308 F.3d 1193 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	7
<i>Therasense, Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson & Co.</i> , 560 F. Supp. 2d 835 (N.D. Cal. 2008).....	10

P.T.A.B. Decisions

<i>3D-Matrix, Ltd. v. Menicon Co.</i> , IPR2014-00398, Paper No. 11 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 1, 2014).....	9
<i>Dominion Dealer Solutions, LLC v. AutoAlert, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00222, Paper No. 12 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 12, 2013).....	16, 32

<i>eBay, Inc. v. Paid, Inc.</i> , CBM2014-00125, Paper 15 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 30, 2014).....	13
<i>Eizo Corp. v. Barco N.V.</i> , IPR2014-00358, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. July 23, 2014).....	13
<i>Fidelity Nat’l Info. Servs., Inc. v. DataTreasury Corp.</i> , IPR2014-00489, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 13, 2014).....	38
<i>Heart Failure Techs., LLC v. CardioKinetix, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00183, Paper No. 12 (P.T.A.B. July 31, 2013).....	16
<i>Moses Lake Indus., Inc. v. Enthone, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00243, Paper 6 (P.T.A.B. June 18, 2014).....	13
<i>OpenTV, Inc. v. Cisco Technology, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00329, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 29, 2013).....	17
<i>Printing Indus. of Am. v. CTP Innovations, LLC</i> , IPR2013-00474, Paper 16 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 31, 2013).....	27
<i>SAS Institute, Inc. v. ComplementSoft, LLC</i> , IPR2013-00581, Paper No. 15 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 30, 2013).....	16
<i>Synopsis v. Mentor Graphics Corp.</i> , IPR2012-00042, Paper No. 16 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 22, 2013).....	10
<i>TRW Auto. US LLC v. Magna Elecs. Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00296, -297, -298, Papers 15, 15, 19 (P.T.A.B. July 3, 2014).....	32, 33, 37

Federal Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102.....	12
35 U.S.C. § 102(a).....	10
35 U.S.C. § 102(a) – (b).....	11
35 U.S.C. § 102(b).....	10
35 U.S.C. § 313.....	1
35 U.S.C. § 314(a).....	8

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(3).....	38
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b).....	6, 7

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.