

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.
Petitioner

v.

PERSONALIZED MEDIA COMMUNICATIONS, LLC
Patent Owner

Case No.: IPR2016-01520
Patent No.: 8,559,635

**PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO
PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. The Instituted Claims Are Not Entitled To Priority To the 1981 Specification.1

A. Claims 3, 4, and 7 Are Not Supported By the 1981 Specification.....3

1. “programming” (claims 3, 4, 7).....3

2. “receiving a control signal...and communicating said control signal to said remote transmitter station” (claim 3).....6

B. Claim 13 Is Not Supported By the 1981 Specification.....6

C. Claims 18, 20, 32, and 33 Are Not Supported By the 1981 Specification.....8

1. receiving an “encrypted digital information transmission...unaccompanied by any non-digital information transmission” (claims 18, 20, 32, 33)8

2. “code” / “downloadable code” (claims 18, 33).....17

II. Claim Construction17

A. “decrypt”-related terms (all claims)17

B. “executable instructions” (claim 13).....20

C. “encrypted digital information transmission unaccompanied by any non-digital information transmission” (claims 18, 20, 32, 33).....20

III. The Instituted Claims Are Unpatentable.20

A. Claims 13, 18, 20, and 32 Are Invalid Based on Chandra.....20

1. Chandra discloses a “processor” and “controlling a decryptor...” (claim 18).....20

2. Chandra discloses receiving an “encrypted digital information transmission...unaccompanied by any non-digital information transmission” (claims 18, 20, 32)21

3. Chandra discloses “passing said decrypted second of said plurality of signals to a controllable device” (claim 13).....21

B.	Claim 33 Is Invalid Based On Chandra and Nachbar	22
1.	Chandra in view of Nachbar suggests “selecting, by processing selection criteria...”	22
2.	Chandra discloses an “encrypted digital information transmission...unaccompanied by any non-digital information transmission”	22
3.	It would have been obvious to a PHOSITA to modify Chandra in view of Nachbar	22
C.	Claims 4 and 7 Are Invalid Based On Seth-Smith.....	23
D.	Claim 3 Is Invalid Based on Campbell	24
1.	Campbell discloses “one or more second instruct signals...”	24
2.	Campbell discloses “receiving a control signal...”; “said one or more first instruct signals being transmitted in accordance with said control signal”	24
3.	Campbell teaches “a code or datum identifying a unit of programming...”	25
4.	It would have been obvious to a PHOSITA to modify Campbell	26
E.	Secondary Considerations Do Not Support Nonobviousness.....	27

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly and Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	6
<i>Chiron Corp. v. Genentech, Inc.</i> , 363 F.3d 1247 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	4, 5
<i>Crown Operations Int'l, Ltd. v. Solutia Inc.</i> , 289 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	8
<i>Genentech Inc. v. Novo Nordisk A/S</i> , 108 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	9
<i>Hyatt v. Boone</i> , 146 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	7, 8, 17
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	26
<i>Lockwood v. Am. Airlines</i> , 107 F.3d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	4, 17
<i>Martin v. Mayer</i> , 823 F.2d 500 (Fed. Cir. 1987)	7, 8, 17
<i>Novozymes A/S v. DuPont Nutrition Biosciences APS</i> , 723 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	7
<i>PowerOasis, Inc. v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.</i> , 522 F.3d 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	3, 4
<i>Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar</i> , 935 F.2d 1555 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	4
<i>X2Y Attenuators, LLC v. Int'l Trade Comm'n</i> , 757 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	5

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (CONT'D)

Page(s)

Statutes

37 C.F.R. §42.642

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.