

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE INC.
Petitioner

v.

SUMMIT 6 LLC
Patent Owner

Case: IPR2015-00806
Patent No. 7,765,482

Title: Web-Based Media Submission Tool

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Procedural History	3
	A. Patenting of the Inventions.....	3
	B. Litigation of the Patents	7
III.	Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	8
IV.	Claim Construction.....	9
	A. “an amount of media data” and “an amount of digital content”	9
	B. “publication / publishing” and “distributing / distribution”	10
	C. “said identification”	12
	D. “digital content”	12
	E. “local device / client device”.....	12
	F. “electronic publishing / distribution”	12
	G. “encoding or otherwise converting”	13
V.	Response to Grounds of Challenge	13
	A. Overview Of Asserted Prior Art.....	13
	1. Overview of Creamer.....	13
	2. Aihara.....	15
	3. Mayle.....	15
	4. Narayan	16

B.	Petitioner Has Not Shown Motivation To Combine Asserted References.	17
1.	There Is No Motivation To Combine Creamer With Aihara....	17
2.	There is No Motivation to Combine Mayle with Narayan.	19
C.	Petitioner Has Not Shown That Claims 12, 13, 16, 18, 19, 21–25, 35– 38, 40–42, 44–46, and 49 are obvious in view of Creamer and Aihara.	22
1.	Claim 12 is Not Obvious in View of Creamer and Aihara.....	23
a.	Neither Creamer nor Aihara nor their combination teaches or suggests “receiving an identification of a group of one or more media objects for transmission.”	23
b.	Neither Creamer nor Aihara nor their combination teaches or suggests “pre-processing parameters including a specification of an amount of media data.”	25
c.	Neither Creamer nor Aihara nor their combination teaches or suggests “pre-processing said identified group of one or more media objects using said received pre- processing parameters.”	27
2.	Claims 13, 24, and 25 Are Not Obvious in View of Creamer and Aihara.	30
a.	Neither Creamer nor Aihara nor their combination teaches or suggests “receiving an identification of digital content” (claim 13) or “receiving an identification of a media object for transmission.” (claims 24, 25).....	30
b.	Neither Creamer nor Aihara nor their combination teaches or suggests “pre-processing said identified [digital content / media object] at said [client / local] device in accordance with one or more pre-processing parameters.” (claims 13, 24, 25).....	30

c.	Neither Creamer nor Aihara nor their combination teaches or suggests “pre-processing parameters controlling said client device in a placement of said digital content into a specified form in preparation for publication.” (claim 13).....	31
3.	Claims 35 and 38 Are Not Obvious Over Creamer and Aihara.	34
a.	Neither Creamer nor Aihara nor their combination teaches or suggests “pre-processing said selected digital content [at said client device] in accordance with one or more pre-processing parameters.” (claims 35, 38).....	34
b.	Neither Creamer nor Aihara nor their combination teaches or suggests “said one or more pre-processing parameters enabling said client device in a placement of said digital content into a specified form in preparation for publication.” (claims 35, 38).....	34
4.	Dependent Claims 16, 18, 19, 21–23, 40–42, 44–46, and 49 Are Not Obvious Over Creamer and Aihara.	35
D.	Petitioner Has Not Shown That Claims 12, 13, 16, 18, 19, 21–25, 35–38, 40–42, 44–46, and 49 are obvious in view of Mayle and Narayen.	35
1.	Claim 12 is Not Obvious in View of Mayle and Narayen.....	35
a.	Mayle does not teach or suggest “receiving pre-processing parameters from a remote device...including a specification of an amount of media data.” (claim 12)	35
b.	Mayle does not disclose “pre-processing . . . media objects using . . . pre-processing parameters.” (claim 12)	38

c.	Mayle does not disclose “transmitting said pre-processed group of one or more media objects to the remote device.” (claim 12).....	38
2.	Claims 13, 24, and 25 are Not Obvious in View of Mayle and Narayan.	39
a.	Neither Mayle nor Narayan nor their combination teaches or suggests “pre-processing said identified content/media object with [or in accordance with] one or more pre-processing parameters that are received from a device separate from said client device.” (claims 13, 24, and 25)	40
b.	Neither Mayle nor Narayan nor their combination teaches or suggests “placement of said digital content into a specified form in preparation for publication,” or “changing the file format of said media object,” or “encoding or otherwise converting said media object.” (claims 13, 24, and 25)	40
c.	Neither Mayle nor Narayan nor their combination teaches or suggests “said transmitted message including said pre-processed digital content/media object and said retrieved information.” (claims 13, 24, and 25).....	41
3.	Claims 35 and 38 are Not Obvious in View of Mayle and Narayan.	41
4.	Claims 36 and 37 are Not Obvious in View of Mayle and Narayan.	42
5.	Dependent Claims 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46 and 49 are Not Obvious in View of Mayle and Narayan.	42
E.	The Objective Secondary Factors Confirm that the Challenged Claims are Not Obvious.....	44
1.	Long-Felt but Unresolved Need	45

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.