
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SONY CORPORATION, SONY MOBILE COMMUNICATIONS (USA) INC.,
SONY MOBILE COMMUNICATIONS AB & SONY MOBILE
COMMUNICATIONS INC.
Petitioners

v.

CREATIVE TECHNOLOGY LIMITED
Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 6,928,433

Inter Partes Review Case No. 2016-01407

**CREATIVE TECHNOLOGY LTD'S PATENT OWNER
RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.120**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND 1

III. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART 4

IV. PETITIONERS HAVE NOT MET THEIR BURDEN TO SHOW
UNPATENTABILITY OF THE INSTITUTED CLAIMS..... 4

 A. Petitioners Failed to Demonstrate that Birrell in View of
 Seidensticker Renders any Claim Obvious 4

 1. Birrell and Seidensticker Do Not Disclose All of the Elements
 in Claim 1, and Therefore Cannot Render Any of the Claims
 Obvious 5

 a. Neither Birrell nor Seidensticker Discloses “Tracks Accessed
 According to a Hierarchy” 5

 b. Neither Birrell nor Seidensticker Discloses “Configured to
 Present Sequentially a First, Second, and Third Display
 Screen” Displaying “Categories,” “Subcategories,” and
 “Items” 8

 2. The Evidence Does Not Show That a Skilled Artisan Would
 Have Been Motivated to Select and Combine Birrell and
 Seidensticker in the Manner Claimed 14

 a. Petitioners’ Expert Failed to Analyze Why One of Skill in
 the Art Would Have Been Motivated to Select Birrell and
 Seidensticker for Combination 15

 b. Petitioners’ Proffered Reasons for Combining Birrell and
 Seidensticker are Inadequate for Showing Why One of Skill
 in the Art Would Have Been Motivated to Select Birrell and
 Seidensticker to Combine 18

 c. Petitioners’ Reason to Combine Analysis Failed to Consider
 and Address Important Differences 21

d.	Petitioners’ Analysis Is Based on Incorrect Assumptions Regarding How One of Skill in the Art Would Have Interpreted Birrell.....	23
e.	Because None of Petitioners’ Evidence Teaches, Suggests or Motivates Subdividing a Library of Media Content Using a Series of Sequential Screens, It Would Not Have Been Obvious to a POSITA to Combine Birrell and Seidensticker	28
f.	Petitioners Failed to Show a Reason to Modify Birrell’s User Interface as Implemented in the PJB-100 to Practice the Claimed Invention.....	33
3.	Neither Birrell nor Seidensticker Disclose or Suggest “Accessing” Multiple Tracks by Making a Selection in a Second Screen as Required by Claims 2-3 and 17	34
a.	Claims 2-3 and 17 Require that the Selection that Causes the “Accessing” of Multiple “Tracks” Occur on the Second Screen.....	34
a.	Petitioners Fail to Present Meaningful Evidence that the Birrell-Seidensticker Combination Discloses that a Selection on the Second Screen Causes the “Accessing” of Multiple “Tracks” and that the Third Screen is also Displayed	35
b.	The Alternative “Back Button” Theory Identified by the Board Fails Because Neither Reference Discloses a User Interface Element Which Can <i>Both</i> Cause a New Display Screen to be Presented <i>and</i> Cause an Accessing	37
B.	Petitioners Failed to Show that Birrell in View of Seidensticker and Proehl Renders Any Claim Obvious	40
1.	Proehl Does Not Cure the Above-Discussed Deficiencies in the Birrell-Seidensticker Combination	40
2.	The Evidence Does Not Show That One of Skill in the Art Would Have Been Motivated to Select Proehl to Combine with Birrell and Seidensticker in the Manner Claimed.....	40

C.	Petitioners Failed to Show that Birrell in View of Seidensticker, Proehl and Johnson Renders Any Claim Obvious	46
1.	Johnson Does Not Cure the Above-Discussed Deficiencies in the Birrell-Seidensticker Combination	46
2.	The Evidence Does Not Show That One of Skill in the Art Would Have Been Motivated to Select Johnson to Combine with Birrell, Seidensticker and Proehl in the Manner Claimed	46
D.	Petitioners Failed to Prove that the Combinations Based on Looney Render Any Claim Obvious	49
1.	Looney Does Not Cure the Above-Discussed Deficiencies in the Birrell-Seidensticker Combination	49
2.	The Evidence Does Not Show that One of Skill in the Art Would Have Been Motivated to Select Looney to Combine with Birrell, Seidensticker, Johnson and/or Proehl in the Manner Claimed.....	50
3.	Looney Does Not Disclose Adding Tracks to “An Active Queue List of Songs that is Currently Being Played”	54
E.	The Secondary Considerations of Non-Obviousness Compel a Finding of Non-Obviousness	57
1.	Industry Praise Supports a Finding of Nonobviousness	58
2.	Licensing of the ’433 Patent Supports a Finding of Nonobviousness	62
V.	CONCLUSION	64

Table of Authorities

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Communs., Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	14, 31, 50
<i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.</i> , 839 F.3d 1034 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	57
<i>Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC</i> , 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	46
<i>In re Carlson</i> , 983 F.2d 1032 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	33
<i>Free-Flow Packaging Int’l v. Automated Packing Sys., Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00350, Paper 7 (June 27, 2016).....	33
<i>In re Fulton</i> , 391 F.3d 1195 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	18
<i>Genentech, Inc. v. USITC</i> , 122 F.3d 1409 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	62
<i>Iron Grip Barbell Co., Inc. v. USA Sports, Inc.</i> , 392 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	63
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	28
<i>Mintz v. Dietz & Watson, Inc.</i> , 679 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	29
<i>Novartis Pharms. Corp. v. Watson Labs., Inc.</i> , 611 Fed. Appx. 988 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	29
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F.3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	34

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.