
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BARCO, INC.,
Petitioner

v.

T-REX PROPERTY AB,
Patent Owner

U.S. Patent No. 6,430,603

Issue Date: August 6, 2002

Title: SYSTEM FOR DIRECT PLACEMENT OF
COMMERCIAL ADVERTISING, PUBLIC SERVICE
ANNOUNCEMENTS AND OTHER CONTENT
ON ELECTRONIC BILLBOARD DISPLAYS

Inter Partes Review Case No. 2017-01915

**T-REX PROPERTY AB PATENT OWNER'S
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 CFR §42.107**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. BACKGROUND1

III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION4

 1. “means for scheduling the presentation of video or still-image content at selected time slots on selected electronic displays of said network and receiving said video or still-image content from a content provider” (claim 13 and dependents)5

 2. “means for enabling split screen images to be displayed at the electronic display” (claim 42 and dependents)10

 3. “time slot” (claims 13, 48 and dependents)12

IV. THERE IS NO REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF PETITIONER PREVAILING AS TO A CHALLENGED CLAIM OF THE ’603 PATENT14

 A. Petitioner Fails to Demonstrate That the Prior Art Discloses “means for scheduling the presentation of video or still-image content at selected time slots on selected electronic displays of said network and receiving said video or still-image content from a content provider” (claims 13-16, 23, 42-43)14

 1. Nakamura does not disclose or render obvious “means for scheduling the presentation of video or still-image content at selected time slots on selected electronic displays of said network and receiving said video or still-image content from a content provider” (Grounds 1 and 2)15

 2. Hylin does not disclose or render obvious “means for scheduling the presentation of video or still-image content at selected time slots on selected electronic displays of said network and receiving said video or still-image content from a content provider” (Grounds 3-5).....18

 B. Petitioner Fails to Demonstrate That the Prior Art Discloses

“means for enabling split screen images to be displayed at the electronic display” (claims 42-43)20

1. Nakamura does not disclose or render obvious “means for enabling split screen images to be displayed at the electronic display” (Grounds 1, 2, 5).....21

C. Petitioner Fails to Demonstrate That the Prior Art Discloses “enabling a content provider to schedule presentation of video or still-image content at selected time slots” (claim 48)23

1. Nakamura does not disclose or render obvious “enabling a content provider to schedule presentation of video or still-image content at selected time slots” (Ground 1)23

2. Hylin does not disclose or render obvious “enabling a content provider to schedule presentation of video or still-image content at selected time slots” (Ground 3).....26

V. CONCLUSION.....28

EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit No.	Description
2001	Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement Pursuant To Local Patent Rule 4-3, filed in <i>T-Rex Property AB v. Regal Entertainment Group, et al.</i> , Case No. 6:16-cv-00927-RWS, Dkt. No. 84 (E.D. Tex.)
2002	Entry in Oxford English Dictionary Online for “time” and related terms, including “time slot,” available at http://www.oed.com/viewdictionaryentry/Entry/202100 (last accessed December 20, 2017)

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Blackboard, Inc. v. Desire2Learn, Inc.</i> , 574 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	6, 11, 21
<i>Broadsign International, LLC v. T-Rex Property AB</i> , Case No. CBM2017-00008 (filed Oct. 28, 2016).....	2
<i>In re Donaldson Co.</i> , 16 F.3d 1189 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	5
<i>IPCom GmbH & Co. v. HTC Corp.</i> , 861 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	5, 7, 21
<i>Med. Instrumentation & Diagnostics Corp. v. Elekta AB</i> , 344 F.3d 1205 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	11
<i>Noah Sys. Inc. v. Intuit Inc.</i> , 675 F.3d 1302 (Fed. Cir. Apr. 9, 2012)	9
<i>TecSec, Inc. v. Int’l Bus. Machs.</i> , 731 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	8
<i>Typhoon Touch Techs., Inc. v. Dell, Inc.</i> , 659 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	8
<i>WMS Gaming Inc. v. International Game Tech.</i> , 184 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	7
Other Authorities	
32 C.F.R. § 42.107(a).....	4
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3).....	6
CBM2017-00008, Paper No. 7	3
Oxford English Dictionary.....	13

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.