

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. IPR2014-00766
U.S. Patent 8,214,873

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. RELATED <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW IPR2013-00598.....	1
III. PETITION IS UNTIMELY UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 315(b)	3
IV. PETITION SHOULD REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....	6
V. SUMMARY OF THE ‘873 PATENT	9
VI. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	15
1. Legal Standard	15
2. A Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	16
3. “Playlist”	16
VII. SUMMARY OF ALLEGED PRIOR ART	20
A. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0087996 to Bi et al. (“Bi”).....	20
B. U.S. Patent No. 6,502,194 to Berman et al. (“Berman”)	25
C. United States Patent 6,622,018 to Erekson (“Erekson”).....	28
D. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0080874 Yumoto et al. (“Yumoto”).....	32
E. U.S. Patent Publication 2001/0044321 to Ausems (“Ausems”)	35
F. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0173339 to Safadi et al. (“Safadi”).....	36
VIII. THERE IS NO REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE RENDERED OBVIOUS	39
A. Legal Standard.....	39

B.	Independent Claims 1 and 30 Are Not Obvious Over Bi and Erekson.....	41
1.	There Is No Motivation to Combine Bi with Erekson.....	41
2.	Bi and Erekson Do Not Render Obvious Claims 1 and 30.....	47
C.	Claims 5 and 34 Are Not Obvious In View Of Bi, Erekson, And Ausems	48
D.	Claims 4 and 33 Are Not Obvious In View Of Bi, Erekson and Safadi.....	49
E.	Claims 5 and 34 Are Not Obvious In View Of Bi And Yumoto	51
1.	There Is No Motivation To Combine Bi And Yumoto.....	51
2.	Claims 1 and 30 Are Not Obvious.....	53
3.	Claims 5 and 34Are Not Obvious.....	54
F.	Claims 5 and 34 Are Not Obvious In View Of Berman And Yumoto	55
1.	Claims 1 And 30 Are Not Obvious.....	55
2.	Claims 5 And 34 Are Not Obvious.....	59
IX.	CONCLUSION.....	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	43
<i>Anova Food, LLC v. Leo Sandau and William R. Kowalski</i> , IPR2013-00114	2, 3
<i>Apple Inc. v. Rensselear Polytechnic Institute</i> , IPR2014-00319	4, 5
<i>Bonneville Associates, Ltd. Partnership v. Baram</i> , 165 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	4
<i>Brennan v. Kulick</i> , 407 F.3d 603 (3d. Cir. 2005)	5
<i>Heart Failure Techs., LLC v. CardioKinetix, Inc.</i> , IPR2013-00183	40
<i>In re Am. Acad. Of Sci. Tech. Ctr.</i> , 367 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	15
<i>In re Bass</i> , 314 F.3d 57, (Fed. Cir. 2002)	15
<i>Intellectual Ventures Management, LLC v. Xilinx, Inc.</i> , IPR2012-00020	42
<i>InTouch Tech., Inc. v. VGO Comm's, Inc.</i> , 2014 U.S. App. LEXIS 8745 (Fed. Cir. May 9, 2014)	40
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	40, 43, 57
<i>Macauto U.S.A. v. BOS GmbH & KG</i> , IPR2012-00004.....	5
<i>Mintz v. Dietz & Watson, Inc.</i> , 679 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	42, 49
<i>Motorola Mobility LLC, et al. v. Arendi S.A.R.L.</i> , IPR2014-00203	40
<i>In re Nouvel</i> , 493 F. App'x 85 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	42, 49
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	15
<i>Unigene Labs., Inc. v. Apotex, Inc.</i> , 655 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	40
<i>Unilever, Inc. v. The Procter & Gamble Co.</i> , IPR2014-00506	8, 9

Wowza Media Systems, LLC et al. v. Adobe Systems Inc., IPR2013-0005440

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 315(b)1, 3, 6

35 U.S.C. §316(e)39

35 U.S.C. § 325(d)1, 6, 8

OTHER AUTHORITIES

37 C.F.R. §42.100(b)15

37 C.F.R. § 42.107 (c).....2

37 C.F.R. § 42.1212

77 Fed. Reg. 48,756, 48,766 (Aug. 14, 2012)15

157 Cong. Rec. S1041-42 (daily ed. Mar. 1, 2011).....8

Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(a).....4

Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a).....4

Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b)4

MPEP § 2141(II)(C) (8th Ed., Rev. 9, August 2012).....16

MPEP § 2141 (8th Ed., Rev. 9, August 2012).....40

MPEP §2143.0341

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.