UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LG Electronics, Inc.,

Petitioner

V.

Papst Licensing GmbH & Co., KG,

Patent Owner

CASE: Unassigned Patent No. 9,189,437

PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW
UNDER 37 C.F.R. §42.100



TABLE OF CONTENTS

| I. | Introduction1 | | | | | |
|------|---|--|----|--|--|--|
| II. | Grou | rounds for Standing Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §42.104(a) | | | | |
| III. | '437 Patent Overview | | | | | |
| | A. | Summary | .2 | | | |
| | B. | Comparison of Independent Claims of the '437 Patent | .4 | | | |
| IV. | Identification of Challenge Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §42.104(b) | | .4 | | | |
| | A. | 37 C.F.R. §42.104(b)(1): Claims for Which IPR Is Requested | .4 | | | |
| | B. | 37 C.F.R. §42.104(b)(2): The Prior Art and Specific Grounds on Which the Challenge to the Claims Is Based | .4 | | | |
| | C. | 37 C.F.R. §42.104(b)(3): Claim Construction | .8 | | | |
| | D. | 37 C.F.R. §42.104(b)(4): How the Construed Claims are Unpatentable | | | | |
| | E. | 37 C.F.R. §42.104(b)(5): Supporting Evidence | 1 | | | |
| V. | Detailed Grounds for Unpatentability | | | | | |
| | A. | Aytac1 | 1 | | | |
| | B. | SCSI Specification | 15 | | | |
| | C. | Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art. | 20 | | | |
| VI. | Ground 1: Claims 1, 4-12, 14-16, 18, 19, 21-30, 33, 34, 36, 37, and 43 are unpatentable as obvious over Aytac in view of the SCSI Specification20 | | | | | |
| | A. | Aytac discloses every limitation of independent claim 1 with the possible exception of automatic recognition process (ARP) features. 2 | 22 | | | |
| | | 1. Limitations 1[preamble] and 1[a] – Analog data generating an processing device (ADGPD) and i/o port | | | | |
| | | 2. Limitation 1[b] – program memory | 24 | | | |
| | | 3. Limitation 1[c] – data storage memory | 26 | | | |
| | | 4. Limitation 1[d] – processor operatively interfaced with the i/o port, the program memory and the data storage memory2 | | | | |
| | | 5. Limitation 1[e(i)] – wherein the processor is adapted to implement a data generation process by which analog data is acquired from each respective analog acquisition channel of a plurality of independent analog acquisition channels | | | | |



TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT'D)

| 6. | Limitation 1[e(ii)] – the analog data from each respective channel is digitized, coupled into the processor, and is processed by the processor |
|-----|--|
| 7. | Limitation 1[e(iii)] – the processed and digitized analog data is stored in the data storage memory as at least one file of digitized analog data |
| 8. | Limitation 1[f(i)] – wherein the processor is adapted to be involved in an automatic recognition process (ARP)32 |
| 9. | Limitation 1[f(ii)] – ARP occurs when the i/o port is operatively interfaced with the host's multi-purpose interface |
| 10. | Limitation 1[f(iii)] – In ARP the processor executes at least one instruction set stored in the program memory and thereby causes at least one parameter [identifying it to be sent to the host] |
| 11. | Limitation 1[f(iv)] – In ARP the at least one parameter identifies the ADGPD, independent of analog source, as a digital storage device instead of as an ADGPD36 |
| 12. | Limitation 1[f(v)] – In ARP the at least one parameter is automatically sent through the i/o port and to the host's multipurpose interface |
| 13. | Limitation 1[f(vi)] – ARP occurs without requiring any end user to load any software onto the computer at any time37 |
| 14. | Limitation 1[f(vii)] – ARP occurs without requiring any end user to interact with the computer to set up a file system in the ADGPD at any time |
| 15. | Limitation 1[f(viii)] – ARP - Wherein the at least one parameter is consistent with the ADGPD being responsive to commands from a customary driver |
| 16. | Limitation 1[g] – wherein the at least one parameter provides information to the computer about the ADGPD's file transfer characteristics |
| 17. | Limitation 1[h(i)] – wherein the processor is further adapted to be involved in an automatic file transfer process (AFTP) |



TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT'D)

| | 18. | operatively interfaced with the host's multi-purpose interface 41 | | |
|----|---|---|--|--|
| | 19. | Limitation 1[h(iii)] – AFTP occurs after the at least one parameter has been sent from the i/o port to the host's multipurpose interface | | |
| | 20. | Limitation 1[h(iv)] – In AFTP the processor executes at least one other instruction set stored in the program memory to thereby cause [the data transfer] | | |
| | 21. | Limitation 1[h(v)] – AFTP transfers at least one file of digitized analog data acquired from at least one of the plurality of analog acquisition channels to be transferred to the computer | | |
| | 22. | Limitation 1[h(vi)] – AFTP occurs using the customary device driver for the digital storage device while causing the ADGPD to appear to the computer as if it were the digital storage device | | |
| | 23. | Limitation 1[h(vii)] – AFTP occurs without requiring any user-loaded file transfer enabling software to be loaded on or installed in the computer at any time | | |
| B. | Aytac in view of the SCSI Specification discloses every limitation of independent claim 43 | | | |
| C. | Combining Aytac and the SCSI Specification would have been obvious. | | | |
| D. | Dependent claims 4-16, 18-31, 33-37, 45 are unpatentable over Aytac in view of the SCSI Specification | | | |
| | 1. | Dependent Claim 4 | | |
| | 2. | Dependent Claim 5 | | |
| | 3. | Dependent Claim 6 | | |
| | 4. | Dependent Claim 7 | | |
| | 5. | Dependent Claim 8 | | |
| | 6. | Dependent Claim 9 | | |
| | 7. | Dependent Claim 10 | | |



TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT'D)

| | 8. | Dependent Claim 11 | .50 |
|-------|----------|--|-----|
| | 9. | Dependent Claims 12 and 33 | 51 |
| | 10. | Dependent Claims 13, 18, and 45 | 52 |
| | 11. | Dependent Claim 14 | 53 |
| | 12. | Dependent Claim 15 | .54 |
| | 13. | Dependent Claim 16 | .54 |
| | 14. | Dependent Claim 19 | 55 |
| | 15. | Dependent Claim 20 | .55 |
| | 16. | Dependent Claim 21 | .56 |
| | 17. | Dependent Claim 22 | .56 |
| | 18. | Dependent Claim 23 | 57 |
| | 19. | Dependent Claim 24 | .59 |
| | 20. | Dependent Claim 25 | .59 |
| | 21. | Dependent Claim 26 | .60 |
| | 22. | Dependent Claim 27 | .61 |
| | 23. | Dependent Claim 28 | .62 |
| | 24. | Dependent Claim 29 | .62 |
| | 25. | Dependent Claim 30 | .63 |
| | 26. | Dependent Claim 31 | .63 |
| | 27. | Dependent Claim 34 | .64 |
| | 28. | Dependent Claim 35 | .64 |
| | 29. | Dependent Claim 36 | .65 |
| | 30. | Dependent Claim 37 | .66 |
| VII. | | Aytac in view of the SCSI Specification and AAPA discloses tion of independent claim 41 | .66 |
| VIII. | | Claims 2, 3, 17, 39, 40, 42, and 44 are unpatentable as obvious in view of the SCSI Specification and Adaptec. | 67 |
| | A. Claim | ns 39 and 40 | 67 |
| | 1. | Aytac in view of the SCSI Specification and Adaptec disclos | ses |



DOCKET

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.

