

---

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

---

Case No. IPR2017-00595

---

**CREATIVE TECHNOLOGY LTD.'S PATENT OWNER  
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107(a)**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. THE BOARD SHOULD DENY INSTITUTION OF THE PETITION IN ITS ENTIRETY AS AN IMPROPER SECOND BITE AT THE APPLE ..... 1

    A. The Board Has Discretion to Deny Institution Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) Because the First Petition Involved the Same Prior Art and Arguments ..... 1

    B. The Board Should Exercise its Discretion Under Section 325(d) to Deny Institution Because Petitioners Used the First IPR Decision as a Road Map to Present Arguments They Could Have Made in Their First Petition ..... 3

    C. The Cases Cited by Petitioners Regarding Section 325(d) Are Distinguishable ..... 8

III. TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND ..... 12

IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ..... 15

    A. “portable media player” (all claims via claim 1) ..... 15

    B. “display screen” and “present sequentially a first, second, and third display screen” (all claims via claim 1) ..... 19

V. PETITIONERS FAILED TO SHOW THAT THERE IS A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF PREVAILING ON A CHALLENGED CLAIM ..... 22

    A. Ground 1: Petitioners Failed to Demonstrate that Looney Anticipates Claims 2, 3, 5, 7, or 17-18 ..... 22

        1. Looney does not disclose “present[ing] sequentially a first, second, and third display screen” (all claims) ..... 22

        2. Looney does not disclose a “portable media player” (all claims) ..... 27

3.	Looney does not disclose accessing multiple tracks or a “plurality of tracks” from the second display screen (claims 2, 3, and 17).....	28
a.	The correct interpretation of the scope of claims 2-3 and 17 require a group of tracks be “accessed” “based on a selection made” in the second display screen, not merely repeatedly selecting individual songs on a third screen .....	28
b.	Petitioners and their expert fail to present credible evidence of invalidity under the proper interpretation of claims 2-3 and 17 .....	31
4.	Looney does not disclose adding tracks to “an active queue list of songs that is currently being played” (claims 17-18) .....	33
B.	Ground 2: Petitioners Failed to Demonstrate that Looney in view of Proehl Renders Obvious Claims 2, 3, 17 or 19-28.....	36
1.	The Looney-Proehl combination does not disclose a “portable media player” (all claims) .....	36
2.	Petitioners fail to provide evidence that a POSA would have been motivated to combine Proehl with Looney in a manner that cures Looney’s failure to disclose “present[ing] sequentially a first, second, and third display screen” (all claims) .....	36
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 under Petitioners’ theory (claims 19-22 and 25-28) .....	39
4.	Petitioners’ Looney-Proehl theory for claims 23-24 fails to satisfy the limitation requiring that the “accessing” be based on a selection of an album from the second screen .....	40
5.	The Looney-Proehl combination fails to disclose use of “artist” or “album” categories, as required by claims 23-24 and 27-28.....	41

6.	Petitioners’ alternative theory for claims 2-3 and 17 under the Looney-Proehl combination is unsupported by evidence.....	45
C.	Ground 3: Petitioners Failed to Demonstrate that Looney in view of Proehl and Johnson Renders Obvious Claims 23-24 and 27-28 .....	46
1.	Johnson does not cure the deficiencies of the Looney-Proehl combination.....	46
2.	Petitioners fail to provide an adequate reason for combining Johnson with Looney and Proehl .....	47
D.	The Secondary Considerations of Non-Obviousness Support Denying Institution.....	49
1.	Industry praise supports a finding of nonobviousness.....	50
2.	Licensing of the ’433 patent supports a finding of nonobviousness .....	54
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	56

**EXHIBIT LIST**

<b>Exhibit No.</b>	<b>Description</b>
Creative-2001	[Intentionally Omitted]
Creative-2002	[Intentionally Omitted]
Creative-2003	Excerpts from Oxford English Dictionary (2006)
Creative-2004	Computer Desktop Encyclopedia online entry for “portable media player”
Creative-2005	Excerpts from Computer Desktop Encyclopedia (2001)
Creative-2006	Java2 Platform Std. Ed. version 1.3.1 - Application Programming Interface Documentation for java.awt.Component class (2001)
Creative-2007	Xbit.com, “Creative NOMAD Jukebox Digital Audio Player Review” (Nov. 7, 2000)
Creative-2008	MP3Newswire.net, “We Test Drive the Creative Nomad Jukebox” (Nov. 21, 2000)
Creative-2009	Excerpts from PCMagazine, “Gadget of the Month” (Oct. 17, 2000)
Creative-2010	MacWorld.com, “MP3 Jukeboxes” (May 1, 2001)
Creative-2011	Excerpts from PCWorld, “100 Plus Hours of Digital Music on the Go” (Nov. 2000)
Creative-2012	Apple Press Release, “Apple & Creative Announce Broad Settlement Ending Legal Disputes Between the Companies” (Aug. 23, 2006)
Creative-2013	Excerpts from American Intellectual Property Law Association – Report of the Economic Survey (2007)
Creative-2014	[Intentionally Omitted]
Creative-2015	Declaration of Tan Shao Mieng
Creative-2016	Creative Press Release, Apple & Creative Announce Broad Settlement Ending Legal Disputes Between the Companies (Aug. 24, 2006)
Creative-2017	Deposition Transcript of Dr. Benjamin B. Bederson (Feb. 16, 2017)

# 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.