

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent of: Harvey et al.
U.S. Patent No.: 7,752,649 Attorney Docket No.: 39843-0029IP1
Issue Date: July 6, 2010
Appl. Serial No.: 08/449,097
Filing Date: May 24, 1995
Title: SIGNAL PROCESSING APPARATUS AND METHODS

Mail Stop Patent Board

Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF UNITED STATES PATENT
NO. 7,752,649 PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319, 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.1-
42.123**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<u>I. MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R § 42.8.....</u>	<u>2</u>
A. Real Party-In-Interest	2
B. Related Matters.....	2
C. Counsel	2
D. Service Information.....	3
E. Payment	3
F. Requirements for IPR.....	3
1. Grounds for Standing.....	3
2. Challenge and Relief Requested	3
<u>II. INTRODUCTION</u>	<u>5</u>
A. OVERVIEW OF THE ‘649 PATENT	5
3. Description of the Alleged Invention.....	5
B. Summary of the Prosecution History	7
C. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art as of the Critical Date.....	8
<u>III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....</u>	<u>8</u>
A. “digital television signals” (claims 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 11, 13, 26, 27, 28, 29, 39, 41, 42, 45, 48, 49, 50, 51, 67, 78, 82, 83, 84, 88, 90, 91, 92, 93, and 94).....	9
B. “digital video signals” (claims 62 and 97).....	11
C. “processor” (all Challenged Claims).....	12
D. 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4): How the Claims are Unpatentable	13
E. 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(5): Evidence Supporting Challenge.....	14
<u>IV. THERE IS A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT AT LEAST ONE CLAIM OF THE ‘649 PATENT IS UNPATENTABLE.....</u>	<u>14</u>
A. Overview of References Relied Upon.....	14

B.	GROUND 1: The Challenged Claims Are Invalid Over Mustafa	15
1.	Claim 1 is Invalid Over Mustafa.....	15
2.	Claim 2 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	22
3.	Claim 3 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	22
4.	Claim 7 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	23
5.	Claim 8 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	24
6.	Claim 11 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	24
7.	Claim 13 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	24
8.	Claim 26 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	25
9.	Claim 27 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	26
10.	Claim 28 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	26
11.	Claim 29 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	27
12.	Claim 39 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	28
13.	Claim 41 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	36
14.	Claim 42 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	36
15.	Claim 45 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	37
16.	Claim 48 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	37
17.	Claim 49 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	38
18.	Claim 50 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	39
19.	Claim 51 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	39
20.	Claim 62 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	39
21.	Claim 63 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	42
22.	Claim 64 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	43
23.	Claim 67 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	43
24.	Claim 78 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	46
25.	Claim 82 Is Invalid Over Mustafa.	51
26.	Claim 83 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	52
27.	Claim 84 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	52
28.	Claim 88 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	53
29.	Claim 90 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	53
30.	Claim 91 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	54
31.	Claim 92 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	54
32.	Claim 93 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	55
33.	Claim 94 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	55
34.	Claim 97 Is Invalid Over Mustafa	56
C.	Ground 2: In the Alternative to Ground 1, the Challenged Claims are Obvious Based on Mustafa in View of Iijima.....	60

..

1. The Challenged Claims Are Obvious Based on Mustafa in
View of Iijima63

V. CONCLUSION63

...

EXHIBITS

SAMSUNG-1001	Declaration of Stuart Lipoff Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.68 in Support of Petition for Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,752,649
SAMSUNG-1002	U.S. Patent No. 7,752,649 to Harvey, et al.
SAMSUNG-1003	U.S. Patent No. 4,694,490 to Harvey, et al
SAMSUNG-1004	U.S. Patent Appl. No. 08/449,097: 8/27/1996 Non-Final Rejection
SAMSUNG-1005	Continuity Data of U.S. Patent Appl. No. 07/096,096
SAMSUNG-1006	U.S. Patent No. 7,752,650 to Harvey, et al.
SAMSUNG-1007	U.S. Patent Appl. No. 08/449,097: 4/2/1998 Non-Final Rejection
SAMSUNG-1008	Plaintiff's Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions, <i>Personalized Media Communications, LLC v. Samsung Electronics America, Inc. et al.</i> , Civil Action No. 2:15-cv-01754-JRG-RSP (E.D. Texas Feb. 8, 2016)
SAMSUNG-1009	U.S. Patent No. 4,789,895 to Mustafa, et al.
SAMSUNG-1010	U.S. Patent No. 4,215,369 to Iijima
SAMSUNG-1011	U.S. Patent Appl. No. 08/449,097: 10/2/1998 Amendment
SAMSUNG-1012	U.S. Patent No. 8,559,635 to Harvey, et al.
SAMSUNG-1013	Claim Construction Order in Apple v. PMC IPR2016-00753 re 649 patent

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.