

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD; SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS

AMERICA, INC.; SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS

AMERICA, LLC

PETITIONERS

V.

AFFINITY LABS OF TEXAS, LLC

PATENT OWNER

CASE IPR2014-01181

PATENT 8,532,641

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO
PETITIONERS' CORRECTED PETITION FOR INTER PARTES
REVIEW OF UNITED STATES PATENT NO. 8,532,641**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	THE ‘641 PATENT WAS WELL-VETTED DURING PROSECUTION	2
III.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	6
	A. “wireless telephone device”	6
	B. “stream a signal”/”streaming audio signal”	7
	C. “a signal representing at least a portion of a song”/ “signal that represents a playing of the song”	8
	D. “portable electronic device”	9
IV.	OVERVIEW OF CITED ART.....	9
	A. U.S. Patent No. 6,990,334 (“Ito”)	9
	B. U.S. Patent No. 6,728,531 (“Lee”)	10
	C. U.S. Patent No. 6,772,212 (“Lau”).....	12
	D. The Nokia 9000/9000i (“Nokia”).....	12
	E. U.S. Patent No. 6,973,067 (“Haartsen”)	13
	F. U.S. Patent No. 7,123,936 (“Rydbeck”)	14
	G. U.S. Patent No. 6,845,398 (“Galensky”).....	14
V.	THE COMBINATION OF PRIOR ART REFERENCES CITED BY	15
	A. The Supreme Court and Federal Circuit Precedent Preclude the Use.....	15
	B. Petitioners Fail to Identify A Proper Motivation for Making the.....	17
	C. Petitioners’ Combinations of Ito, Nokia, Haartsen, Rydbeck, and Galensky are the Result of Improper Hindsight.....	19
	D. Petitioners’ Combinations of Lee, Haartsen, Lau, Nokia, Rydbeck, and Galensky are the Result of Improper Hindsight.....	22
VI.	ITO FAILS TO DISCLOSE A WIRELESS TELEPHONE DEVICE, OR A PORTABLE ELECTRONIC DEVICE, WITH EACH OF THE CLAIMED FEATURES	27

A.	Ito does not disclose a “physical interface operable to communicate data” via a first and second conductive path.....	27
B.	Ito does not disclose a “rechargeable power supply	28
C.	Ito does not disclose a “collection of instructions” that are “operable when executed to communicate a collection of information about media content available from the wireless telephone device to a recipient device such that the recipient device can use the collection of information to generate a graphical menu comprising a selectable menu item associated with the available media content.”	30
D.	Ito does not disclose a wireless telephone/portable electronic device with email, voicemail, or web browsing.....	32
VII.	LEE FAILS TO DISCLOSE A WIRELESS TELEPHONE DEVICE, OR	33
A.	Lee fails to disclose a wireless telephone device having the claimed display, housing, and enclosure required by the ‘641 patent claims.....	33
B.	Lee does not disclose a “portable device.”	34
C.	Lee does not disclose does not disclose a “collection of instructions” that are “operable when executed to communicate a collection of information about media content available from the wireless telephone device to a recipient device such that the recipient device can use the collection of information to generate a graphical menu comprising a selectable menu item associated with the available media content.”	36
D.	Lee does not disclose a “rechargeable power supply.”	37
E.	Lee does not disclose a “physical interface operable to communicate data” via a first and second conductive path.....	39
F.	Lee does not disclose a wireless telephone/portable electronic device with email, voicemail, or web browsing.....	40
VIII.	THE CITED REFERENCES FAIL TO DISCLOSE A “STREAMING”	41
IX.	THE CITED REFERENCES FAIL TO DISCLOSE A PROCESSOR	42

X. THE *INTER PARTES* REVIEW INITIATED IN RELATION TO U.S. PATENT NO. 8,532,641 DEPRIVES PATENT OWNER OF ITS RIGHT TO A JURY TRIAL PURSUANT TO THE SEVENTH AMENDMENT OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.....43

XI. THE CITED REFERENCES ARE MERELY CUMULATIVE AND ANY TRIAL SHOULD ONLY BE INSTITUTED ON ONE GROUND, IF ANY.....48

XII. CONCLUSION.....49

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
Cases	
<i>Abbott Labs v. Cordis Corp.</i> , 710 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	47
<i>Canon Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC</i> , IPR2014-00536, Paper 9, September 24, 2014.....	49
<i>Commodity Futures Trading Commission v. Schor</i> , 478 U.S. 833 (1986)	45
<i>In re Suitco Surface, Inc.</i> , 603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	6
<i>Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 512 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	15, 16, 17
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F. 3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	19
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007)	16
<i>Liberty Mutual Insurance Co. v. Progressive Casualty Insurance Co.</i> , CBM2012-00003, Paper No. 8, Oct. 25, 2012	49
<i>McCormick Harvesting Machine Co. v. Aultman</i> , 169 U.S. 606 (1898)	45
<i>Ortho-McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Mylan Labs., Inc.</i> , 520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	16, 17
<i>Patlex Corp. v. Mossinghoff</i> , 758 F.2d 594 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	46
<i>Philips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	6
<i>ScentAir Tech., Inc. v. Prolitec, Inc.</i> , IPR 2013-00179, Paper 9 (Apr. 16, 2013).....	46
<i>Takeda Chemical Industries, Ltd. v. Alphapharm Pty., Ltd.</i> , 492 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	16, 23
<i>Zimmer Holdings, Inc. v. Bonutti Skeletal Innovations LLC</i> , IPR2014-01080, Paper No. 17, October 31, 2014.....	49
Statutes	
112 Cong. Rec. S1375.....	1
35 U.S.C. § 103.....	33
35 U.S.C. § 103 (a).....	16

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.