

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TWITTER, INC.

Petitioner

v.

VIDSTREAM, LLC

Patent Owner

Case IPR2017-01133
U.S. Patent No. 8,601,506
(Claims 1, 4-8, 11, 13-15, 23-26, and 29-30)

VIDSTREAM LLC's PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE '506 PATENT	1
III.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	4
IV.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	5
	A. “predetermined constraints” (claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 13, 23, 2).....	6
	B. Other claim terms	8
V.	GROUNDS 1-2: LAHTI DOES NOT DISCLOSE A SERVER PROVIDING INSTRUCTIONS TO A CLIENT COMPUTING DEVICE TO CAUSE VIDEO DATA TO BE CAPTURED IN ACCORDANCE WITH PREDETERMINED CONSTRAINT(S) DEFINED BY THE INSTRUCTIONS	8
	A. Lahti does not say MobiCon impacts video-capture parameters	9
	B. Lahti discloses only one example of MobiCon functionality from the user perspective of typical usage scenarios.....	12
	C. Dr. Houh’s opinion relies on an unsupported assumption about the native capabilities of camera phones available in 2006	13
	D. Other publications suggest that Lahti’s recited video-capture parameters were standard for camera phones and therefore not impacted by MobiCon	15
VI.	GROUNDS 1-2: LAHTI TEACHES AWAY FROM LIMITING VIDEO LENGTH	22
	A. Artificially limiting video length is contrary to Lahti’s goal of giving the end user control of their videos.....	23
	B. Lahti already addresses the problems that Dr. Houh contends warrant artificially limiting the length of captured video	25
VII.	GROUNDS 1-2: CONWAY DOES NOT AND CANNOT SUPPLY THE ELEMENTS MISSING FROM LAHTI.....	28
	A. Conway discloses a viewer viewing streaming media on a media player and optionally using the media player to generate shortened media clips.....	29
	B. Applying Conway’s clipping approach to Lahti does not result in the claimed invention of the '565 Patent.....	33

C.	Petitioner’s reasons for combining Lahti and Conway are premised on a misunderstanding of Lahti and how it would be combined with Conway.....	36
D.	Conway never discloses shortening personal video.....	38
VIII.	GROUND 2: CURRENT TV DOES NOT DISCLOSE ANY LIMIT ON VIDEO LENGTH.....	41
A.	Dr. Houh does not identify any predetermined video length constraint defined at a server and applied when capturing video	41
B.	Dr. Houh’s reliance on Current TV conflicts with his own claim construction	45
IX.	GROUND 1-2: NOVAK SIMILARLY FAILS TO DISCLOSE LIMITING VIDEO LENGTH DURING CAPTURE.....	46
A.	The Petition and Dr. Houh do not contend Novak teaches capturing video according to a predetermined length constraint	46
B.	Novak teaches away from limiting video length.....	47
X.	GROUND 1: LAHTI COMBINED WITH CONWAY AND NOVAK.....	49
A.	The combination of references does not teach capturing video in accordance with predetermined constraints	49
B.	The combination of references does not teach capturing video in accordance with a predetermined video length constraint.....	51
XI.	GROUND 2: LAHTI IN VIEW OF NOVAK AND “CURRENT TV MOBILE” AND “CURRENT TV FAQ”	53
A.	Current TV does not teach capturing in accordance with predetermined constraints	53
B.	Current TV does not disclose a predetermined video length defined by instructions	54
XII.	CONCLUSION.....	55

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

In re Cuozzo Speed Techs.,
793 F.3d 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2015)5

*Ferguson Beauregard/Logic Controls, Div. of Dover Res., Inc. v.
Mega Sys., LLC*,
350 F.3d 1327 (Fed. Cir. 2003)6

Phillips v. AWH Corp.,
415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (*en banc*)5

Straight Path IP Grp., Inc. v. Sipnet EU S.R.O.,
806 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2015)6

TriVascular, Inc. v. Samuels,
812 F.3d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 2016)5, 6

Other Authorities

83 FR 212215

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

No.	Description
2001	Official Notice of Bankruptcy Case Filing, U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Western District of Oklahoma, Case No., 17-14849 (filed November 30, 2017)
2002	Declaration of James Olivier, Ph.D.
2003	Webpage entitled “Review GSM phone Nokia 6270” that was archived by the Wayback Machine at web.archive.org on February 5, 2006
2004	Webpage entitled “Nokia E50 Hands-on Preview” that was archived by the Wayback Machine at web.archive.org on May 30, 2006
2005	Nokia webpage listing specifications of the Nokia 6630 that was archived by the Wayback Machine at web.archive.org on December 29, 2004
2006	Webpage entitled “Nokia 6630 (Nokia Charlie) Detailed Tech Specs”
2007	CNET webpage entitled “Nokia 6630 – smartphone – GSM / UMTS Series Specs”
2008	Transcript of June 20, 2018 Deposition of Henry Houh, Ph.D.

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.