Filed on behalf of Chestnut Hill Sound Inc.
By: Hamad H. Hamad
John Austin Curry *(pro hac pending)*
CALDWELL CASSADY CURRY, P.C.
2101 Cedar Springs Road, Suite 1000
Dallas, Texas 75201
Telephone: 214.888.4848
Facsimile: 214.888.4849
hhamad@caldwellcc.com
acurry@caldwellcc.com
chillsound@caldwellcc.com

Paper No. _____

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

CHESTNUT HILL SOUND INC.,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2016-00794
Patent No. 8,090,309

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

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction. 1
II. The Petition Should Be Rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d). 3
III. Overview of the '309 Patent. 10
A. The "first mode" 11
B. The "second mode" 12
IV. Claim Interpretation. 13
A. The "media source that, in turn, responds . . . by accessing . . . and sending . . . to a media output device" limitation of the "second mode" of independent claim 1. 14
B. The "remote media source that, in turn, responds . . . by accessing 18
C. The "mode" limitations in independent claims 1 and 9. 19
VI. The Petition fails to establish a reasonable likelihood that the claims are obvious over U.S. Patent App. No. 2005/0132405 ("AbiEzzi") in view of U.S. Patent No. 8,156,528 ("Baumgartner"). 25
A. Overview of AbiEzzi. 25
B. Overview of Baumgartner. 28
C. The Petition fails to identify a motivation to combine AbiEzzi and Baumgartner. 29
D. The Petition fails to show that AbiEzzi in view of Baumgartner renders claim 1 obvious 32
1. The Petition does not identify "a media device operable in first and second modes." 32
2. The Petition does not identify a "media source" that meets the limitations of the second mode of claim 1. 33
E. The Petition fails to show that AbiEzzi in view of Baumgartner renders claim 9 obvious. 35
F. The Petition fails to establish a reasonable likelihood that AbiEzzi in view of Baumgartner renders obvious the claims dependent on claims 1 and 9 ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

VII. The Petition fails to establish a reasonable likelihood that the claims are obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,563,769, Van Der Meulen ("VDM") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,728,729, Jawa ("Jawa") 37

A. Overview of VDM 37

B. Because VDM, just like AbiEzzi in view of Baumgartner, is directed to a virtual jukebox, the Petition's Ground 2 suffers from much the same failings as discussed with respect to Ground 1 40

C. The Petition fails to show that VDM discloses a media device operable in the "second mode" of claim 1 41

1. The Petition does not identify a "second mode." 41

2. The Petition does not address the correct interpretation of the "media source that, in turn, responds . . . by accessing . . . and sending . . . to a media output device" limitation of the "second mode" of claim 1 43

3. Even under the Petition's incorrect interpretation of the "media source that, in turn, responds . . . by accessing . . . and sending . . . to a media output device" , the Petition fails to show VDM discloses that limitation 44

4. The Petition does not identify metadata that is requested, received, displayed, and included in a signal identifying to the media source what media file to select and play 46

a. "transmitting . . . a request" limitation of the "second mode" of claim 1 47

b. The Petition fails to identify a motivation to combine VDM and Jawa 48

c. "displaying" in the "second mode" of claim 1 50

d. "generating a signal" & "sending a corresponding signal" limitation of the "second mode" of claim 1 52

D. The Petition fails to establish a reasonable likelihood that claim 9 is obvious over VDM in view of Jawa 53

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

E. The Petition fails to establish a reasonable likelihood that VDM in view of Jawa renders obvious the claims dependent on claims 1 and 9. 55

F. The Petition fails to specify where each element of the challenged claims are found in VDM, leaving Patent Owner and the Board guessing about the significance of the Petition's arguments and cited disclosures 56

VIII. Conclusion 57

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Apple Inc. v. Chesnut Hill Sound, Inc.
IPR2015-01463, slip op. (Jan. 13, 2016) 5, 48

Apple Inc. v. ContentGuard Holdings, Inc.
IPR2015- 00450, slip op. (Jun. 29, 2015).....34, 57

Apple Inc. v. Zilabs Inc.
IPR2015-00964, slip op. (Sept. 17, 2015) 13, 37, 44, 55

Arista Networks, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.
IPR2015-01710, slip op. (Mar. 29, 2016).....3

CallCopy v. Verint Americas, Inc.
IPR2013-00486, slip op. (Feb. 5, 2013) 35, 57

Epistar v. Trustees of Boston University
IPR2013-00298 (Nov. 15, 2013) 24

Graham v. John Deere Co.
383 U.S. 1 (1966).....23

InfoBionic, Inc. v. Braemar Mf'g, LLC
IPR2015-01704, slip op. (Feb. 16, 2016) 2

Jiawei Tech. (HK) Ltd. v. Richmond
IPR2014-00937, slip op. (Feb. 6, 2015) 14, 55

OSRAM Sylvania, Inc. v. Am. Induction Techs., Inc.
701 F.3d 698 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 24

Samsung Elec. Co. v. Rembrandt Wireless Techs., LP
IPR2015-00114, slip op. (Jan. 28, 2015).....4

Silicon Labs., Inc. v. Cresta Tech. Corp.
IPR2014-00809, slip op. (Oct. 24, 2014).....55

Symantec Corp. v. RPost Commc'ns Ltd.
IPR2014-00355, slip op. (July 15, 2014).....55

Unilever, Inc. v. The Procter & Gamble Co.
IPR2014-00506, slip. op. (July 7, 2014).....1, 3, 7, 8, 9

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.