

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SONY COMPUTER ENTERTAINMENT AMERICA LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

ROTHSCHILD DIGITAL MEDIA INNOVATIONS, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-01364
Patent 6,101,534

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

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

 A. Overview of the '534 Patent.....2

 B. Prior Reexamination of the '534 Patent7

 C. Concurrent District Court Litigation Against Petitioner.....10

II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION13

 A. access14

 B. auxiliary site addresses22

III. PROPOSED GROUNDS OF CHALLENGE23

 A. Ground 1 Fails23

 1. Batchelor Is Not Analogous Art.....24

 2. Claims 1, 6-9, 21 and 23-24 Are Not Obvious Over Mages in View of Batchelor.....26

 a. The Proposed Combination Fails to Disclose All Limitations in the Challenged Claims.....26

 b. Insufficient and Illogical Rationale to Combine31

 B. Ground 2 Fails35

 1. The Petition Fails to Establish That Exhibit 1006 (Mavrakis) Qualifies As Prior Art.....35

 2. Claims 1, 6-9, 21 and 23-24 Are Not Obvious Over the Proposed Combination of Mages in View of Exhibit 1006 (Mavrakis)40

 a. The Proposed Combination Fails to Disclose All Limitations in the Challenged Claims.....40

 b. Insufficient and Illogical Rationale to Combine44

C. Ground 3 Fails	46
1. Batchelor Is Not Analogous Art.....	46
2. Claims 1, 6-8 and 23 Are Not Obvious Over Batchelor in View of Freeman	46
a. The Proposed Combination Fails to Disclose All Limitations in the Challenged Claims.....	47
b. Insufficient and Illogical Rationale to Combine	53
D. Ground 4 Fails	55
1. Batchelor Is Not Analogous Art.....	55
2. Claim 22 Is Not Obvious Over Mages in View of Batchelor in Further View of Hughes	56
a. The Proposed Combination Fails to Disclose All Limitations in the Challenged Claim	57
b. Insufficient and Illogical Rationale to Combine	59
IV. CONCLUSION.....	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

ATD Corp. v. Lydall, Inc., 159 F.3d 534 (Fed. Cir. 1998)32

Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. Tyco Healthcare Group, LP, 616 F.3d 1249 (Fed. Cir. 2010)19

Bruckelmyer v. Ground Heaters, Inc., 445 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....36

Cheese Sys., Inc. v. Tetra Pak Cheese & Powder Sys., Inc., 725 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2013) 32, 53

Circuit Check Inc. v. QXQ Inc., 795 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....24

Cynosure, Inc. v. CoolTouch, Inc., 660 F. Supp. 2d 128 (D. Mass. 2006) 27, 40, 47, 57

Hughes Network Sys., LLC v. Cal. Inst. Tech., No. IPR2015-00067, Paper 18 (PTAB Apr. 27, 2015) 36, 37, 38, 39

In re Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC, 793 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....14

In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006) passim

In re Malik, No. 2009-008833, 2011 WL 2604854 (BPAI June 30, 2011)..... 24, 25

In re Swanson, 540 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2008)14

Insite Vision, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc., 783 F.3d 853 (Fed. Cir. 2015)..... passim

Integrated Global Concepts, Inc. v. Advanced Messaging Techs., Inc., No. IPR2014-01027, Paper 16 (PTAB Dec. 22, 2014) 28, 41

KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc., 550 U.S. 398 (2007) 31, 44, 53, 59

<i>Monarch Knitting Mach. Corp. v. Sulzer Morat GmbH</i> , 139 F.3d 877 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	passim
<i>Schoenhaus v. Genesco, Inc.</i> , 40 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	19
<i>SRI Int’l, Inc. v. Internet Sec. Sys., Inc.</i> , 511 F.3d 1186 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	36
<i>Transocean Offshore Deepwater Drilling, Inc. v. Maersk Drilling USA, Inc.</i> , 699 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	27, 40, 47, 57

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 103	passim
35 U.S.C. § 314.....	23
35 U.S.C. § 315(b)	13

Rules

37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b)	13
37 C.F.R. § 42.101(b)	13
37 C.F.R. § 42.107	1, 23
MPEP § 2128.II.B.....	39

Other Authorities

Webopedia, <i>protocol</i> , http://www.webopedia.com/TERM/P/protocol.html (last visited Sept. 16, 2015)	42
Wikipedia, <i>Modem</i> , https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Modem (last visited Sept. 16, 2015)	2

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.