

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 IPR2014-01184

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 EXAMINATION .....	2
III.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	5
	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” .....	8
IV.	THE REFERENCES.....	9
	A. Ohmura (U.S. Patent No. 6,937,732).....	9
	B. Ahn (U.S. Patent App. No. 2004/0214525).....	10
	C. Galensky (U.S. Patent No. 6,845,398) .....	10
V.	‘641 PATENT CLAIMS 1-3 AND 5-14 ARE PROPERLY SUPPORTED BY SUBJECT MATTER DISCLOSED IN THE PRIOR APPLICATIONS, AND ARE ENTITLED TO CLAIM PRIORITY TO THE MARCH 28, 2000 FILING DATE OF THE ‘812 APPLICATION.....	11
	A. Legal standard for claiming priority to an earlier application. ....	12
	B. The ‘812 application provides more than adequate support for the challenged claims.....	13
	1. The ‘812 application provides more than adequate support for the element in claim 1 of “communicat[ing] 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”. ....	14

2. The ‘812 application provides more than adequate support for the element in claim 8 of “in response to a selection of a selectable menu item presented on a recipient device display”. .....19

VI. THE CITED REFERENCES OF OHMURA AND AHN ARE NOT PRIOR ART REFERENCES BECAUSE THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE ENTITLED TO THE EARLIER PRIORITY DATE. ....22

VII. EVEN IF OHMURA AND AHN ARE PRIOR ART, THE CITED COMBINATIONS ARE NOTHING MORE THAN IMPERSSIBLE ATTEMPTS AT HINDSIGHT RECONSTRUCTION.....22

A. The Supreme Court and Federal Circuit Precedent Preclude the Use of Hindsight in an Obviousness Analysis. ....22

B. Petitioners Fail to Identify A Proper Motivation for Making the Proposed Combination Other Than Through The Use of Improper Hindsight.....24

C. Petitioners’ Combinations of Omhura, Ahn, Nokia, and Galensky are the Result of Improper Hindsight. ....26

VIII. 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.....29

IX. THE CITED REFERENCES ARE MERELY CUMULATIVE AND ANY TRIAL SHOULD ONLY BE INSTITUTED ON ONE GROUND, IF ANY.....34

X. CONCLUSION.....35

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Abbott Labs v. Cordis Corp.</i> , 710 F.3d 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	33
<i>Canon Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures I LLC</i> , IPR2014-00536, Paper 9, September 24, 2014.....	34
<i>Commodity Futures Trading Commission v. Schor</i> , 478 U.S. 833 (1986) .....	30
<i>Ford Motor Co. v. Lemelson</i> , 42 USPQ2d 1706 (D. Nev. 1997) .....	12
<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) .....	22, 23, 24
<i>Joy Techs., Inc. v. Manbeck</i> , 959 F.2d 226 (Fed. Cir. 1992) .....	31
<i>Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith &amp; Nephew, Inc.</i> , 688 F. 3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	25
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007) .....	22, 23, 24
<i>Liberty Mutual Insurance Co. v. Progressive Casualty Insurance Co.</i> , CBM2012-00003, Paper No. 8, Oct. 25, 2012.....	34
<i>Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.</i> , 107 F.3d 1565, 41 USPQ2d 1961 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	12
<i>McCormick Harvesting Machine Co. v. Aultman</i> , 169 U.S. 606 (1898) .....	31

*Ortho-McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Mylan Labs., Inc.*,  
520 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2008) ..... 23, 24

*Patlex Corp. v. Mossinghoff*,  
758 F.2d 594 (Fed. Cir. 1985) ..... 31, 32

*Phillips v. AWH Corp.*,  
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....6

*ScentAir Tech., Inc. v. Prolitec, Inc.*,  
IPR 2013-00179, Paper 9 (Apr. 16, 2013).....32

*Studiengesellschaft Kohle, M.B.H. v. Shell Oil Co.*,  
112 F.2d 1561 (Fed. Cir. 1997) .....15

*Takeda Chemical Industries, Ltd. v. Alphapharm Pty., Ltd.*,  
492 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....23

*Zimmer Holdings, Inc. v. Bonutti Skeletal Innovations LLC*,  
IPR2014-01080, Paper No. 17, October 31, 2014 .....34

**Statutes**

112 Cong. Rec. S1375 ..... 1

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) .....22

35 U.S.C. § 112..... 12, 15

35 U.S.C. § 120.....12

35 U.S.C. § 314.....1, 24, 36

**Other Authorities**

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) .....5

37 C.F.R. § 42.107 ..... 1

37 C.F.R. § 42.121 .....33

37 C.F.R. § 42.51(b)(l).....33

# 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.