

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

GOOGLE INC.,  
HTC CORPORATION, HTC AMERICA, INC.,  
Petitioners

v.

SUMMIT 6 LLC,  
Patent Owner

---

Case:  
Patent 7,765,482

---

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW  
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.100 *ET SEQ.***

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Formalities .....	1
	A. Real Party in Interest .....	1
	B. Related Matters.....	3
	C. Fee .....	4
	D. Designation of Lead Counsel and Back-up Counsel .....	4
	E. Service Information.....	4
	F. Power of Attorney .....	4
	G. Standing.....	5
III.	Statement of Relief Requested .....	5
IV.	Summary of the Prior Art .....	6
	A. Background of Relevant Technology.....	6
	B. Summary of Creamer .....	6
	C. Summary of Aihara .....	8
	D. Summary of Mayle.....	9
	E. Summary of Narayen.....	10
V.	Motivations to Combine .....	10
	A. Motivation to Combine Creamer with Aihara .....	11
	B. Motivation to Combine Mayle with Narayen .....	14
	C. Summary of the '482 Patent.....	16
VI.	Factual Background.....	17
	A. Declaration Evidence .....	17

B.	Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art .....	17
VII.	Claim Construction .....	17
A.	Proposed Constructions .....	18
1.	The broadest reasonable construction of the terms “an amount of media data” and “an amount of digital content” is at least “quantity or size of digital content, as defined by one or more of physical dimensions, pixel count, or kilobytes” .....	18
2.	The broadest reasonable construction of the terms “publication,” “distribution,” “distributing,” and “publishing” is at least “making available to at least one person other than the user” ....	19
3.	The broadest reasonable construction of the term “said identification” is at least “said identification of digital content”	20
B.	Similar / Related Claim Terms .....	21
VIII.	Full Statement of the Reasons for the Relief Requested .....	23
A.	Claims 12, 13, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, and 49 should be cancelled as obvious under 35 U.S.C § 103 in view of Creamer and Aihara .....	23
1.	Claim 12 should be cancelled as obvious in view of Creamer and Aihara .....	23
2.	Claims 13, 24, and 25 should be cancelled as obvious in view of Creamer and Aihara.....	28
3.	Claims 35 and 38 should be cancelled as obvious in view of Creamer and Aihara.....	31
4.	Claims 36 and 37 should be cancelled as obvious in view of Creamer and Aihara.....	35
5.	Dependent claims 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, and 49 should be cancelled in view of Creamer and Aihara .....	36
B.	Claims 12, 13, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, and 49 should be cancelled as obvious under 35 U.S.C § 103 in view of Mayle and Narayen.....	40

1. Claim 12 should be cancelled as obvious in view of Mayle and Narayen.....	41
2. Claims 13, 24, and 25 should be cancelled as obvious in view of Mayle and Narayen.....	47
3. Claims 35 and 38 should be cancelled as obvious in view of Mayle and Narayen.....	50
4. Claims 36 and 37 should be cancelled as obvious in view of Mayle and Narayen.....	53
5. Dependent claims 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, and 49 should be cancelled in view of Mayle and Narayen.....	54
IX. Conclusion .....	59

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC</i> , No. 2014-1301, 2015 WL 448667 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 4, 2015).....	17
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007) .....	11, 12, 14, 16
<i>Summit 6 LLC v. Apple Inc.</i> , Case No. 7:14-cv-00106 (N.D. Tex. Feb. 18, 2014).....	3
<i>Summit 6 LLC v. HTC Corp., et al.</i> , No. 7:14-cv-00014 (N.D. Tex. Feb. 18, 2014).....	3
<i>Summit 6 LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co., et al.</i> , No. 2013-1648 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 13, 2013).....	3

### Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 102.....	5, 6, 8
35 U.S.C. § 103.....	5, 23, 40
35 U.S.C. § 311.....	5
35 U.S.C. § 312.....	4

### Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 1.42.104.....	17
37 C.F.R. § 42.1.....	5
37 C.F.R. § 42.100.....	17
37 C.F.R. § 42.15.....	4
37 C.F.R. § 42.8.....	1
77 Fed. Reg. 48699 (2012) .....	17

# 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.