

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FRIENDFINDER NETWORKS INC., STREAMRAY INC., WMM, LLC,
WMM HOLDINGS, LLC, MULTI MEDIA, LLC, AND
DUODECAD IT SERVICES LUXEMBOURG S.À.R.L.

Petitioners

v.

WAG ACQUISITION, LLC
Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 8,122,141

Inter Partes Review Case No. 2015-01037

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....1

II. THE SU MASTER’S THESIS RELIED UPON BY THE PETITION IS NOT “PRINTED PUBLICATION” PRIOR ART.....4

A. Petitioners’ Evidence.....5

B. Patent Owner’s Additional Evidence15

III. BACKGROUND OF THE ’141 PATENT AND THE ALLEGED PRIOR ART20

IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....23

A. 6 “said server does not maintain a pointer into a buffer established within said server” - Claims 6 and 15.....24

B. 8 “streaming media from a live source” - claims 8, 17, and 21.....25

C. 1(h) “a sufficient number of media data elements in the media player for uninterrupted playback” - Claims 1-10, 24-27, and 2828

D. “serial identifier” (All Claims)28

E. 24(c) “next sequential media data element following said last sequential media data element” - Claims 24-2728

F. 19 “format capable of being served to users by said server.”29

G. 19(b) - “said server responds to user requests for media data elements” - Claims 19-2329

H. 19(c) - “a routine to store and serially identify sequential data elements comprising said streaming media content” - Claims 19-23.....30

V. PETITIONERS’ EXPERT DECLARATION CANNOT BE RELIED ON TO DO THE JOB OF THE PETITION30

VI. EACH ALLEGED GROUND OF PATENTABILITY FAILS THE “REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD” TEST.....31

VII. GROUND 1, AS TO CLAIMS 1-2, 5-7, 9-11, 14-16, 18-20, 24, AND 27-2831

A. Pull By Serial Identifier31

B. Media Data Elements Sent Faster than Playback Rate.....36

C. Pull Requests as Required to Maintain Client Buffer for Uninterrupted Playback37

D. Client Maintains Record of the Identifier of Last Data Element It Has Received.....40

E. 24(c) a routine that requests transmission of the next sequential media data elements following said last sequential media data element - Claims 24-2742

F. “said server does not maintain a pointer into a buffer established within said server, for each said user” - Claims 6 and 15.....43

VIII. GROUND 2.....44

IX. GROUND 3.....44

A. Live Source.....44

X. GROUND 4.....47

A. 19(b) - “said server responds to user requests for media data elements identified by a serial identifier” - Claims 19-2347

B. 19(c) – “a routine to store and serially identify sequential data elements comprising said streaming media content”48

XI. CONCLUSION49

EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit Number	Description
2001	Copy of the Su thesis microfiche from the National Library of Canada.
2002	National Library of Canada envelope in which microfiche indexes of bibliographic information on Canadian writings are stored.
2003	Copy of an index microfiche containing bibliographic information for Canadian works from April 1999 ordered alphabetically by titles and authors beginning with the letter "C."
2004	Copy of an index microfiche containing bibliographic information for Canadian works from April 1999 ordered alphabetically by titles and authors beginning with the letter "S."
2005	Black-on-white reversed image blowup of the bibliographic entry for the Su thesis, which appears on the index microfiche of Exhibit 2003.
2006	Black-on-white reversed image blowup of the bibliographic entry for the Su thesis, which appears on the index microfiche of Exhibit 2004.

Patent Owner WAG Acquisition, L.L.C. (“Patent Owner” or “WAG”)

respectfully submits this Preliminary Response in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 313 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.107, responding to the Petition for *inter partes* review (the “Petition”) filed by Friendfinder Networks, Inc, *et al.* (“Petitioners”) regarding the claims of U.S. Patent No. 8,122,141 (the “141 Patent”).

I. Introduction and Summary of Argument

While the patent owner is not required to file a Preliminary Response (37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a)), WAG takes this limited opportunity to point out the shortcomings of the Petition and the reasons why the Board should not institute trial.

By statute, the Board must decide whether to institute a trial based on “the information presented in the petition.” 35 U.S.C. § 314(a). Petitioners bear the burden of demonstrating a reasonable likelihood that they would prevail in showing unpatentability on the grounds asserted in the Petition. 37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c).

Petitioners’ burden includes, *inter alia*, explaining in the Petition how each challenged claim is construed and how the prior art teaches that claim. *World Bottling Cap, LLC v. Crown Packaging Tech., Inc.*, Case IPR2015-00296, slip op. at 5 (PTAB May 27, 2015) (Paper 8); *see also* 37 CFR § 42.104(b)(3)-(4).

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.