

By: Cono A. Carrano (ccarrano@akingump.com)  
David C. Vondle (dvondle@akingump.com)  
Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP  
1333 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036  
Tel: (202) 887-4000  
Fax: (202) 887-4288  
Email: ccarrano@akingump.com,  
dvondle@akingump.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

VIZIO, Inc.  
Petitioner

v.

Personalized Media Communications, LLC  
Patent Owner

---

*Inter Partes* Review No.: Unassigned

---

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW  
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,752,650**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I.</b>	IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE - 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(B)	1
<b>A.</b>	37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(1): Claims for Which IPR Is Requested	1
<b>B.</b>	37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(2): The Specific Art and Statutory Ground(s) on Which the Challenge Is Based	1
<b>C.</b>	37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3): Claim Construction	2
	<b>(1)</b> “digital television signals” (claims 1, 2, 4, 18, 32, 33)	2
	<b>(2)</b> “digital video signals” (claims 18, 32, 33)	5
	<b>(3)</b> “processor” (all Challenged Claims)	6
<b>D.</b>	37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4): How the Claims are Unpatentable	7
<b>E.</b>	37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(5): Evidence Supporting Challenge	7
<b>II.</b>	THERE IS A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THE CLAIMS OF THE ’650 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE	8
<b>A.</b>	Description of the Alleged Invention of the ’650 Patent	8
<b>B.</b>	Summary of the Prosecution History of the ’650 Patent	10
<b>C.</b>	Summary of Grounds of Unpatentability	10
<b>D.</b>	Claim-By-Claim Explanation of Grounds of Unpatentability	11
	Ground 1: The Challenged Claims Are Invalid Over Mustafa	12
	<b>(1)</b> Claim 1 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	12
	<b>(2)</b> Claim 2 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	19
	<b>(3)</b> Claim 4 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	20
	<b>(4)</b> Claim 18 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	21
	<b>(5)</b> Claim 32 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	26
	<b>(6)</b> Claim 33 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	27
	Ground 2: In the Alternative to Ground 1, the Challenged Claims are Obvious Based on Mustafa in View of Iijima	27
	<b>(1)</b> The Challenged Claims Are Obvious Based on Mustafa in View of Iijima	30
	Ground 3: The Challenged Claims Are Invalid Over Campbell in View of the Knowledge of A POSITA	31
	<b>(1)</b> Claim 1 Is Invalid Over Campbell	31
	<b>(2)</b> Claim 2 Is Invalid Over Campbell	37
	<b>(3)</b> Claim 4 Is Invalid Over Campbell	38
	<b>(4)</b> Claim 18 Is Invalid Over Campbell	39

	(5)	Claim 32 Is Invalid Over Campbell .....	42
	(6)	Claim 33 Is Invalid Over Campbell .....	43
	Ground 4:	In the Alternative to Ground 3, the Challenged Claims are Obvious Based on Campbell in View of Widergren .....	43
	(1)	The Challenged Claims Are Obvious Based on Campbell in View of Widergren .....	45
<b>III.</b>		<b>MANDATORY NOTICES - 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(A)(1) AND (B) .....</b>	<b>46</b>
	<b>A.</b>	37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1): Real Party-In-Interest .....	46
	<b>B.</b>	37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2): Related Matters .....	46
	<b>C.</b>	37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3) Lead and Back-Up Counsel.....	47
	<b>D.</b>	37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4): Service Information.....	47
	<b>E.</b>	Certification of Compliance with Word Count Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.24.....	47
<b>IV.</b>		<b>PAYMENT OF FEES - 37 C.F.R. § 42.103 .....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>V.</b>		<b>GROUNDS FOR STANDING - 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(A) .....</b>	<b>48</b>

VIZIO, Inc. (“VIZIO”) requests *Inter Partes* Review (IPR) of Claims 1, 2, 4, 18, 32, and 33 (“the Challenged Claims”) of U.S. Patent No. 7,752,650 (“the ’650 Patent”) (Ex. 1002).

In 1981, the named inventors of the ’650 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. 1003. In 1987, PMC filed a continuation-in-part of that application, which discarded the original 22-column specification filed in 1981 and substituted a new specification that extended over 300 columns. Ex. 1002. 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. 1004 at 2; Ex. 1005; Ex. 1002 at 1-30; Ex. 1006 at 9. The ’650 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**

VIZIO requests IPR of the Challenged Claims of the ’650 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 below.

PMC asserts that the Challenged Claims are entitled to the Sept. 11, 1987 priority

date. Ex. 1008 at 6. For the purposes of this IPR only, VIZIO assumes the Sept. 11, 1987 priority date.

- U.S. Patent No. 4,789,895 to Mustafa, *et al.* (“Mustafa”) (Ex. 1009), filed April 30, 1987, and prior art at least under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).<sup>1</sup>
- U.S. Patent No. 4,215,369 to Iijima (“Iijima”) (Ex. 1010), issued July 29, 1980, and prior art at least under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).
- U.S. Patent No. 4,536,791 to Campbell, *et al.* (“Campbell”) (Ex. 1011), issued Aug. 20, 1985, and prior art at least under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).
- U.S. Patent No. 4,302,775 to Widergren, *et al.* (“Widergren”) (Ex. 1012), issued Nov. 24, 1981, and prior art at least under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

VIZIO requests IPR of the Challenged Claims on the following grounds:

Ground	Proposed Statutory Rejections for the '650 Patent
1	Mustafa renders obvious the Challenged Claims under § 103.
2	Mustafa, in view of Iijima, renders obvious the Challenged Claims under § 103.
3	Campbell renders obvious the Challenged Claims under § 103.
4	Campbell, in view of Widergren, renders obvious the Challenged Claims under § 103.

**C. 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3): Claim Construction**

A claim in an IPR is given its broadest reasonable interpretation (“BRI”) in light of the specification. 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b).

**(1) “digital television signals” (claims 1, 2, 4, 18, 32, 33)**

<sup>1</sup> Cites to 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 are to the pre-AIA versions applicable here.

# 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.