

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

UNIFIED PATENTS INC.,
Petitioner

v.

QURIO HOLDINGS, INC.,
Patent Owner

IPR2015-01991
Patent No. 7,787,904

DECLARATION OF JON WEISSMAN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction..... 1

II. Qualifications..... 2

III. Materials Reviewed 4

IV. Overview of the '904 Patent and Prosecution History 4

V. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art..... 8

VI. Claim Construction..... 8

VII. Certain References Disclose or Suggest all of the Elements Claimed in the '904 Patent. 9

 A. Claims 1-3, 12, and 16-17 would have been obvious over *Lambourne* in view of *Elabbady*..... 11

 1. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the teachings of *Lambourne* and *Elabbady*..... 14

 B. Claims 1-3, 12, and 16-17 would have been obvious over *Chen* in view of *Plastina 2007* 25

 1. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the teachings of *Plastina 2007* and *Chen*..... 28

 2. One of ordinary skill would have recognized that the control device of *Chen* communicates with the video device 30

 3. One of ordinary skill would have recognized that the control device of *Chen* communicates to obtain information describing content residing at the video device 32

 C. Claims 4 and 7 would have been obvious over *Lambourne/Elabbady* or *Chen/Plastina 2007* in further view of *Meade* 43

| | | |
|----|--|----|
| 1. | It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine <i>Meade</i> with either the <i>Lambourne/Elabbady</i> device or the <i>Chen/Plastina 2007</i> device | 44 |
| D. | Claims 5 and 8 would have been obvious over <i>Lambourne/Elabbady/Meade</i> or <i>Chen/Plastina 2007/Meade</i> in view of <i>Plastina 2003</i> | 47 |
| 1. | It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine <i>Plastina 2003</i> with either the <i>Lambourne/Elabbady/Meade</i> device or the <i>Chen/Plastina 2007/Meade</i> device | 48 |
| E. | Claim 9 would have been obvious over <i>Lambourne/Elabbady</i> or <i>Chen/Plastina 2007</i> in further view of <i>Dwek</i> | 50 |
| 1. | It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine <i>Dwek</i> with either the <i>Lambourne/Elabbady</i> device or the <i>Chen/Plastina 2007</i> device | 50 |
| F. | Claims 10 and 18 would have been obvious over <i>Lambourne/Elabbady</i> or <i>Chen/Plastina 2007</i> in view of <i>Meade</i> | 52 |
| 1. | It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine <i>Meade</i> with either the <i>Lambourne/Elabbady</i> device or the <i>Chen/Plastina 2007</i> device | 52 |
| G. | Claims 10 and 18 would have been obvious over <i>Lambourne/Elabbady</i> or <i>Chen/Plastina 2007</i> in further view of <i>Melpignano</i> | 55 |
| 1. | It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine <i>Melpignano</i> with either the <i>Lambourne/Elabbady</i> device or the <i>Chen/Plastina 2007</i> device | 56 |
| H. | Claim 14 would have been obvious over <i>Lambourne/Elabbady</i> or <i>Chen/Plastina 2007</i> in further view <i>Weinans</i> | 59 |

| | | |
|-------|--|----|
| 1. | It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine <i>Weinans</i> with either the <i>Lambourne/Elabbady</i> device or the <i>Chen/Plastina 2007</i> device | 60 |
| I. | Claim 15 would have been obvious over <i>Lambourne/Elabbady</i> or <i>Chen/Plastina 2007</i> in further view of <i>Willson</i> | 62 |
| 1. | One of ordinary skill would have found it obvious to combine <i>Willson</i> with the <i>Lambourne/Elabbady</i> device or the <i>Chen/Plastina 2007</i> device | 63 |
| VIII. | Conclusion | 65 |

I, Jon Weissman, declare as follows:

I. Introduction

1. I have been retained by Unified Patents Inc. (“Unified” or “Petitioner”) as an independent expert consultant in this proceeding before the United States Patent and Trademark Office. Although I am being compensated at my hourly rate for the time I spend on this matter, no part of my compensation depends on the outcome of this proceeding, and I have no other interest in this proceeding.

2. I understand that this proceeding involves U.S. Patent No. 7,787,904 (“the ’904 patent”) (attached as EX1001 to Unified’s petition). I understand the application for the ’904 patent was filed on November 9, 2005, as U.S. Patent Application No. 11/270,293, and the patent issued on August 31, 2010.

3. I have been asked to consider whether one of ordinary skill in the art of the ’904 patent would understand that certain references disclose or suggest the features recited in the claims of the ’904 patent, or that the features would have been obvious based on the combination of the references. My opinions are set forth below.

4. I have been advised that a patent claim may be obvious if the differences between the subject matter of the claim and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention

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.