

---

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  
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §42.107(a)**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND..... 1

III. THE PETITION PRESENTS REDUNDANT GROUNDS ..... 4

IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ..... 5

    A. “portable media player” (all claims via claim 1) ..... 5

    B. “display screen” and “present sequentially a first, second, and third display screen” (all claims via claim 1) ..... 8

        1. Petitioners’ construction of “display screen” and “present sequentially a first, second, and third display screen” is inconsistent with the patent and other evidence ..... 8

        2. Creative’s construction of “display screen(s)” and “present sequentially a first, second, and third display screen” should be adopted ..... 12

V. THERE IS NO REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF PETITIONERS PREVAILING AS TO A CHALLENGED CLAIM OF THE ’433 PATENT ..... 15

    A. Ground 1: Petitioners Failed To Demonstrate That Looney Anticipates Claims 2, 3, 5, 7, or 17-18..... 15

        1. Looney does not disclose a “portable media player” (all claims) ..... 15

        2. Looney does not disclose “present[ing] sequentially a first, second, and third display screen” (all claims) ..... 18

        3. Looney does not disclose accessing multiple tracks or a “plurality of tracks” from the second display screen (claims 2, 3, and 17)..... 19

    B. Ground 2: Petitioners Failed To Demonstrate That Looney In View Of Proehl Renders Obvious Claims 2, 3, or 19-28 ..... 23

1.	The Looney-Proehl combination does not disclose a “portable media player” (all claims).....	23
2.	The Looney-Proehl combination does not disclose “present[ing] sequentially a first, second, and third display screen” (all claims).....	23
3.	The Looney-Proehl combination does not satisfy the “accessing” limitation because the alleged accessing occurs on a fourth screen rather than on the first, second, or third screen (claims 19-22, 25-28).....	24
4.	Petitioner’s Looney-Proehl theory for claims 23-24 fails to identify a third display screen and fails to satisfy the limitation requiring that the “accessing” be based on a selection of an album from the second screen.....	25
5.	Petitioners’ alternative Looney-Proehl theory for claims 2-3 fails to satisfy the limitation requiring displaying the items on a third display screen.....	26
6.	The Looney-Proehl combination fails to disclose use of “artist” or “album” categories, as required by claims 23-24 and 27-28.....	28
C.	Ground 3: Petitioners Failed To Demonstrate That Looney in View of Proehl and Johnson Renders Obvious Claims 23-24 and 27-28.....	31
1.	Johnson does not cure the deficiencies in Looney-Proehl.....	31
2.	Petitioners’ fail to provide an adequate reason for combining Johnson with Looney and Proehl.....	31
D.	Ground 4: Petitioners Failed To Demonstrate That Birrell in View of Seidensticker Renders Obvious Claims 2, 3, 5, 7, or 17-18.....	34
1.	Petitioners fail to adequately explain how or why Birrell would or could be combined with Seidensticker.....	34
a.	Petitioners fail to adequately explain why one of skill in the art would have been motivated to combine Birrell and Seidensticker.....	35

b.	Petitioners fail to adequately explain why one of skill in the art would have combined elements from Birrell and Seidensticker in the claimed manner .....	39
(1)	Petitioners do not explain why Birrell and Seidensticker would have been combined to practice three sequentially displayed screens.....	40
(2)	Petitioners do not explain why Birrell and Seidensticker would have been combined to practice “accessing” tracks based on a selection in one of the screens .....	41
2.	Petitioners fail to adequately explain how or why one of skill in the art would have combined Birrell and Seidensticker to practice “accessing” multiple tracks or a “plurality of tracks” as required by claims 2-3 and 17 .....	42
3.	Birrell and Seidensticker do not disclose “an active queue list of songs <i>that is currently being played</i> ” as required by claims 17-18.....	44
E.	Ground 5: Petitioners Failed To Demonstrate That Birrell in View of Seidensticker and Proehl Renders Obvious Claims 19-28 .....	45
1.	Proehl does not cure the deficiencies in the Birrell-Seidensticker combination .....	45
2.	Petitioners fail to adequately explain why Proehl would be combined with Birrell and Seidensticker .....	46
3.	Petitioners’ Birrell-Seidensticker-Proehl theory for claims 23-24 fails to identify three screens .....	49
4.	The Birrell-Seidensticker-Proehl combination fails to disclose use of “artist” or “album” categories, as required by claims 23-24 and 27-28.....	50
F.	Ground 6: Petitioners Failed To Demonstrate That Birrell in View of Seidensticker, Proehl and Johnson Renders Obvious Claims 23-24 and 27-28 .....	50

G.	Ground 7: Petitioners Failed To Demonstrate That Grounds 4-6, in Further View of Looney, Render Obvious Claims 17-18, 20, 22, 24, 26, or 28.....	52
H.	The Secondary Considerations of Non-Obviousness Support Denying Institution.....	56
1.	Industry praise supports a finding of nonobviousness.....	56
2.	Licensing of the '433 patent supports a finding of nonobviousness .....	60
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	62

# 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.