

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AMAZON.COM, INC. AND AMAZON WEB SERVICES, LLC

Petitioners

v.

PERSONALIZED MEDIA COMMUNICATIONS LLC

Patent Owner

Case No.: IPR2014-01532

Patent No.: 7,801,304

For: Signal Processing Apparatus and Methods

**RESPONSE OF PATENT OWNER PERSONALIZED MEDIA
COMMUNICATIONS LLC TO PETITION**

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD

Patent Trial and Appeal Board

United States Patent and Trademark Office

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. GROUNDS AT ISSUE	2
III. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	3
IV. THE INVENTION.....	4
V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	7
A. “Decryptor”/ “Decrypt”	9
B. “Processor”	16
VI. PETITIONERS FAIL TO SHOW THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE OBVIOUS	18
A. Guillou ’483 in view of Block and Guillou ’011, Fails to Render Claim 22 Obvious.....	20
1. Block Does Not Teach or Suggest the Query and Response to the Query	25
2. Guillou ’011 Does Not Teach or Suggest the Query and Response to the Query	28
3. No Motivation to Modify Based on Block’s Discussion of the Prior Art	30
4. No Motivation to Combine.....	31
B. Guillou ’483 Fails to Render Claim 23 Obvious	35
1. Guillou ’483 Fails To Teach Or Suggest Detecting Encrypted Digital Data In Accordance with a Varying Pattern of Timing or Varying Location	37
2. Guillou ’483 Fails To Teach Or Suggest The Controller.....	41
3. Guillou ’483 Fails To Teach Or Suggest The Decryptor for Decrypting The Encrypted Digital Data.....	44
C. Guillou ’483 Fails to Render Claim 24 Obvious	46
1. Guillou ’483 Fails To Teach Or Suggest	

Decrypting a Unit of Digital Television or Computer Programming in Response to an Instruct-to-Decrypt Signal	47
2. Guillou '483 Fails To Teach Or Suggest a Processor.....	48
3. Guillou '483 Fails To Teach Or Suggest Storing a Procedure	50
D. The Prior Art Fails to Render Claims 1, 11, 16 and 18 Obvious	51
VII. OBJECTIVE EVIDENCE OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS	55
A. Commercial Success: Licensing.....	55
B. Industry Praise: Ocean Tomo.....	56
C. Industry Praise: Citations by Others	57
D. Long Felt Need & Failure of Others: Deficiencies of Teletext	58
VIII. CONCLUSION.....	60

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Broadcast Innovation, LLC v. Echostar Comm’s Corp.</i> , No. OI-WY-2201 (D. Col. Sept 11, 2002)	13
<i>CCS Fitness, Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.</i> , 288 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	8
<i>Ex Parte Burgess</i> , No. 2008-2820, 2009 WL 291172 (B.P.A.I. Feb. 6, 2009).....	19, 26
<i>Ex Parte Personalized Media Commc’ns</i> , No. 2008-4228, 2008 WL 5373184 (B.P.A.I. Dec. 19, 2008).....	12
<i>Ex. Parte Personalized Media Commc’ns, LLC</i> , No. 2009-6825, 2010 WL 200346 (B.P.A.I. Jan. 19, 2010.)	12
<i>Geo. M. Martin Co. v. Alliance Mach. Sys. Intern. LLC</i> , 618 F.3d 1294 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	56
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> , 383 U.S. 1 (1966).....	18, 55
<i>In re Lowry</i> , 32 F.3d 1579 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	19
<i>In re Ratti</i> , 270 F.2d 810 (CCPA 1959)	32
<i>In re Skvorecz</i> , 580 F.3d 1262 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	42
<i>In re Suitco Surface, Inc.</i> , 603 F.3d 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	42
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	18, 19
<i>Normal v. Andrew Trust</i> , IPR2014-00283, Paper 51 (June 18, 2015).....	31

<i>PharmaStem Therapeutics, Inc. v. ViaCell, Inc.</i> , 491 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	57
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (<i>en banc</i>)	8
<i>SIBIA Neurosciences, Inc. v. Cadus Pharm. Corp.</i> , 225 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	56
<i>St. Jude Med., Inc. v. Access Closure, Inc.</i> , 729 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	19
<i>Star Scientific, Inc. v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.</i> , 655 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	20
<i>Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.</i> , 713 F.2d 1530 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	55
<i>Tec Air, Inc. v. Denso Mfg. Michigan Inc.</i> , 192 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	30
<i>Transocean Offshore Deepwater Drilling, Inc. v. Maersk Contractors USA, Inc.</i> , 699 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	55, 56
<i>W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.</i> , 721 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	20
 Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 103	3, 19

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.