

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In the *Inter Partes* Review of:

Trial Number: To Be Assigned

U.S. Patent No. 8,559,635

Filed: May 24, 1995

Issued: October 15, 2013

Inventor(s): John Christopher Harvey, James
William Cuddihy

Assignee: Personalized Media Communications

Title: Signal Processing Apparatus and Methods Panel: To Be Assigned

Mail Stop *Inter Partes* Review

Commissions for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF
U.S. PATENT NO. 8,559,635
UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 311 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.100**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE – 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b).....	1
A.	37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(1): Claims for Which IPR Is Requested	1
B.	37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(2): The Specific Art and Statutory Ground(s) on Which the Challenge Is Based.....	1
C.	37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3): Claim Construction	2
	(1) “decrypting”-related terms (all Challenged Claims).....	3
	(2) “processor” (Claims 18, 21, 33)	4
	(3) “encrypted digital information transmission ... unaccompanied by any non-digital information transmission” (Claims 18, 20, 32, 33)	5
D.	37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4): How the Claims are Unpatentable	6
E.	37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(5): Evidence Supporting Challenge.....	7
II.	THERE IS A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT THE CLAIMS OF THE '635 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE.....	7
A.	Description of the Alleged Invention of the '635 Patent	7
B.	Summary of the Prosecution History of the '635 Patent	9
C.	Summary of Grounds of Unpatentability.....	9
D.	Claim-By-Claim Explanation of Grounds of Unpatentability	10
	Claims 1-4, 7, 13, 18, 20-21, 28-30, and 32-33 Are Invalid Based on Guillou	11
	(1) Claim 2 Is Anticipated By Guillou.....	11
	(2) Claim 4 Is Obvious Over Guillou.....	16
	(3) Claim 7 Is Anticipated By Guillou.....	16
	(4) Claim 1 is Anticipated by Guillou.....	17

(5)	Claim 21 Is Anticipated By Guillou	18
(6)	Claim 28 Is Obvious Over Guillou.....	20
(7)	Claim 29 Is Anticipated By Guillou	21
(8)	Claim 30 Is Obvious Over Guillou.....	22
(9)	Claim 13 Is Obvious Over Guillou.....	22
(10)	Claim 18 Is Obvious Over Guillou.....	26
(11)	Claim 33 Is Obvious Over Guillou.....	30
(12)	Claim 20 Is Obvious Over Guillou.....	33
(13)	Claim 32 Is Obvious Over Guillou.....	34
(14)	Claim 3 Is Anticipated By Guillou	36
Claims 1-4, 7, 18, 20-21, 28-30, and 33 Are Invalid Based on Aminetzah.....		40
(1)	Claim 2 Is Obvious Over Aminetzah in View of Bitzer.....	40
(2)	Claim 4 Is Obvious Over Aminetzah in View of Bitzer.....	45
(3)	Claim 7 Is Obvious Over Aminetzah in View of Bitzer.....	45
(4)	Claim 1 Is Obvious Over Aminetzah in View of Bitzer.....	45
(5)	Claim 21 Is Obvious Over Aminetzah	47
(6)	Claim 28 Is Obvious Over Aminetzah	49
(7)	Claim 29 Is Obvious Over Aminetzah	49
(8)	Claim 30 Is Obvious Over Aminetzah	49
(9)	Claim 18 Is Obvious in Over Aminetzah in View of Bitzer	50

(10)	Claim 33 Is Obvious in Over Aminetzah in View of Bitzer	52
(11)	Claim 20 Is Obvious in Over Aminetzah in View of Bitzer	54
(12)	Claim 3 Is Obvious Over Aminetzah	55
III.	MANDATORY NOTICES – 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(A)(1) AND (B)	59
A.	37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1): Real Party-In-Interest	59
B.	37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2): Related Matters	59
C.	37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3): Lead and Back-Up Counsel	60
D.	37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4): Service Information.....	60
IV.	PAYMENT OF FEES – 37 C.F.R. § 42.103.....	60
V.	GROUND FOR STANDING – 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a)	60

Apple Inc. (“Apple”) requests *inter partes* review (“IPR”) of Claims 1-4, 7, 13, 18, 20, 21, 28-30, 32, and 33 (“the Challenged Claims”) of U.S. Patent No. 8,559,635 (“the ’635 patent”) (Ex. 1003).

In 1981, the named inventors of the ’635 patent filed U.S. Patent Appl. No. 06/317,510, which issued as U.S. Patent No. 4,694,490 (“the ’490 patent”) to Personalized Media Communications, LLC (“PMC”). Ex. 1004. In 1987, PMC then filed a continuation-in-part of that application, which discarded the original 22-column specification filed in 1981 and substituted a new specification that spanned over 300 columns. Ex. 1003. In the months leading up to June 8, 1995, PMC filed 328 continuations from that 1987 application, having tens of thousands of claims and deluging the Patent Office with thousands of prior art references. Ex. 1005; Ex. 1032. The ’635 patent is one of the patents that issued from that flurry of activity.

I. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE – 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(B)

A. 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(1): Claims for Which IPR Is Requested

Apple requests IPR of the Challenged Claims of the ’635 patent.

B. 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(2): The Specific Art and Statutory Ground(s) on Which the Challenge Is Based

IPR of the Challenged Claims is requested in view of the prior art listed below. In the district court (and during prosecution), PMC has asserted the Challenged Claims are entitled to the Nov. 3, 1981 priority date. Ex. 1019 at 6.

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.