

Case IPR2015-00389  
Corrected Petition for *Inter Partes* Review

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

AT&T MOBILITY LLC  
AND  
CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS,  
Petitioners

v.

SOLOCRON MEDIA, LLC,  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2015-00389  
Patent No. 8,594,651 B2

---

**CORRECTED PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF  
U.S. PATENT NO. 8,594,651  
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.100 *ET SEQ.***

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND .....	1
II. NOTICES, STATEMENTS AND PAYMENT OF FEES .....	4
A. Real Party In Interest Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1).....	4
B. Related Matters Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2) .....	4
C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3) .....	5
D. Service Information Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4).....	5
E. Grounds for Standing Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a) .....	6
F. Fees Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.103 .....	6
III. THE '651 PATENT .....	6
A. Background.....	6
B. The Asserted Priority Chain of the '651 Patent .....	9
C. Prosecution History of the '651 Patent .....	10
IV. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(B).....	11
V. HOW THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE TO BE CONSTRUED UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104 (B) (3).....	12
VI. DETAILED EXPLANATION AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.104(B)(4) AND (B)(5).....	16
A. The Challenged Claims Are Not Entitled to a Filing Date Prior To December 21, 2012. ....	16
1. Legal Standards Relevant to Priority .....	17
a. To Evaluate Invalidity Under Anticipation Or Obviousness, The Priority Date Must Be Determined Based Upon The Written Description Requirement .....	17
b. Adequate Written Description Requires Express Or Inherent Disclosure And Identification Of The “Blaze Marks” Of Later- Claimed Characteristics. ....	20

2. The Priority Applications Do Not Reasonably Convey That the Inventor Possessed “a Digital Camera of the First Wireless Communications Device” .....	22
a. The Priority Applications Lack Actual or Inherent Written Description for “A Digital Camera of the First Wireless Communications Device” .....	22
b. The Inventor Did Not Provide The Requisite Blaze Marks For a Digital Camera of a Wireless Communications Device. ....	24
3. The Priority Applications Do Not Reasonably Convey That the Inventor Possessed “the Format Compatible with the Second Wireless Communications Device Compris[ing] a Different File Size than the Format of the Selected Video File” .....	25
a. The Priority Applications Lack Actual or Inherent Written Description for a Change in File Size .....	25
b. The Inventor Did Not Provide The Requisite Blaze Marks For “the Format Compatible with the Second Wireless Communications Device Compris[ing] a Different File Size Than the Format of the Selected Video File” .....	26
4. The Priority Applications Do Not Reasonably Convey That the Inventor Possessed “the Format Compatible with the Second Wireless Communications Device Compris[ing] a Different Resolution Than the Format of the Selected Video File” .....	27
a. The Priority Applications Lack Actual or Inherent Written Description for a Change in Resolution.....	27
b. The Inventor Did Not Provide The Requisite Blaze Marks For “the Format Compatible with the Second Wireless Communications Device Compris[ing] a Different Resolution Than the Format of the Selected Video File” .....	29
5. The Priority Applications Do Not Reasonably Convey That the Inventor Possessed “Sending a Link That Identifies the Converted File” .....	29

a. The Priority Applications Lack Actual or Inherent Written Description for “Sending a Link That Identifies the Converted File” .....	29
b. The Inventor Did Not Provide The Requisite Blaze Marks For a Format Compatible with the Second Wireless Communications Device Comprising a Different Resolution Than the Format of the Selected Video Files.....	32
B. The Challenged Claims Are Anticipated by <i>Le Bodic</i> .....	33
C. The Challenged Claims are Rendered Obvious by the <i>Shanahan PCT</i> Application in view of <i>Le Bodic</i> .....	52
D. Claims 10, 21, 23, 31, 32, and 40 are Rendered Obvious by <i>Lev</i> in view of <i>Le Bodic</i> and the <i>Shanahan PCT</i> Application .....	57
VII. CONCLUSION .....	60

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Agilent Techs., Inc. v. Affymetrix, Inc.</i> , 567 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....	22, 24, 32
<i>Anascape, Ltd. v. Nintendo of Am., Inc.</i> , 601 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	20
<i>Carnegie Mellon University v. Hoffman-La Roche Inc.</i> , 541 F.3d 1115 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	1
<i>Chiron Corp. v. Genentech, Inc.</i> , 363 F.3d 1247 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	19
<i>Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Gen-Probe Inc.</i> , 323 F.3d 956 (Fed. Cir. 2002) .....	18
<i>Hitzeman v. Rutter</i> , 243 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2001) .....	23
<i>Hollmer v. Harari</i> , 681 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	18
<i>Hyatt v. Boone</i> , 146 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 1998) .....	20
<i>In re NTP</i> , 654 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2011) .....	17
<i>Kennecott Corp. v. Kyocera Int'l, Inc.</i> , 835 F.2d 1419 (Fed. Cir. 1987) .....	21
<i>Lockwood v. Am. Airlines, Inc.</i> , 107 F.3d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1997) .....	18
<i>PowerOasis, Inc. v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.</i> , 522 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2008) .....	4, 19, 20

# 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.