

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ROKU, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

UNIVERSAL ELECTRONICS INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2019-01612
U.S. Patent 7,589,642

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page(s)
LIST OF EXHIBITS	VI
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	1
A. Technology Background	1
B. U.S. Patent No. 7,589,642	3
C. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art	4
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	5
A. “Key Code”	7
B. “Keystroke Indicator Signal”	8
C. “Key Code Signal”	8
D. “Key Code Generator Device”	8
IV. THE BOARD SHOULD NOT INSTITUTE <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW	9
A. Ground 1: Mishra in Combination with Dubil Does Not Render the Challenged Claims Obvious	10
1. Petitioner has not shown that Mishra or Dubil discloses Element 1.2: “generating a key code within a key code generator device using the keystroke indicator signal”	11
a. Mishra does not disclose <i>using</i> a keystroke indicator signal to <i>generate</i> a key code	11
b. Each of Mishra and Dubil does not disclose a “key code generator device”	13
2. Petitioner has not shown that Mishra or Dubil discloses Element 1.3: “modulating said key code onto a carrier signal, thereby generating a key code signal”	13
a. Each of Mishra and Dubil does not disclose “modulating said key code onto a carrier signal”	13

b.	Each of Mishra and Dubil does not disclose a “key code signal” separate from a “keystroke indicator signal”	16
c.	Each of Mishra and Dubil does not disclose “generating a key code signal”	17
3.	Petitioner has not shown that Mishra or Dubil discloses Element 1.4: “transmitting said key code signal from said key code generator device to said remote control device”	17
a.	Each of Mishra and Dubil does not disclose a “key code signal”	17
b.	Each of Mishra and Dubil does not disclose a “key code generator device”	18
4.	Petitioner has failed to establish motivation to combine Mishra and Dubil	18
5.	A POSITA would not have combined Mishra and Dubil.....	22
B.	Ground 2: Rye in Combination with Dubil Does Not Render the Challenged Claims Obvious.....	24
1.	Petitioner has not shown that Rye or Dubil discloses Element 2.2: “generating a key code within a key code generator device using the keystroke indicator signal”	25
a.	Each of Rye and Dubil does not disclose a “key code generator device”	25
2.	Petitioner has not shown that Rye or Dubil discloses Element 2.3: “modulating said key code onto a carrier signal, thereby generating a key code signal”	27
a.	Each of Rye and Dubil does not disclose “modulating said key code onto a carrier signal”	27
3.	Petitioner has not shown that Rye or Dubil discloses Element 2.4: “transmitting said key code signal from said key code generator device to an electronic consumer device”	27
a.	Each of Rye and Dubil does not disclose a “key code signal”	27
b.	Each of Rye and Dubil does not disclose a “key code generator device”	28
4.	Petitioner has failed to establish motivation to combine Rye and Dubil	28
5.	A POSITA would not have combined Rye and Dubil.....	32

C.	Ground 3: Caris in Combination with Skerlos Does Not Render the Challenged Claims Obvious.....	35
1.	Petitioner has not shown that Caris or Skerlos discloses Element 1.2: “generating a key code within a key code generator device using the keystroke indicator signal” Element 2.2: “generating a key code within a key code generator device using the keystroke indicator signal”	35
a.	Each of Caris and Skerlos does not disclose generating a “key code generator device”	36
2.	Petitioner has not shown that Caris or Skerlos discloses Element 1.3: “modulating said key code onto a carrier signal, thereby generating a key code signal” Element 2.3: “modulating said key code onto a carrier signal, thereby generating a key code signal”	37
a.	Each of Caris and Skerlos does not disclose “said key code” for modulating onto a carrier signal	37
b.	Each of Caris and Skerlos does not disclose “generating a key code signal”	37
3.	Petitioner has not shown that Caris or Skerlos discloses Element 1.4: “transmitting said key code signal from said key code generator device to said remote control device” Element 2.4: “transmitting said key code signal from said key code generator device to an electronic consumer device”	37
a.	Each of Caris and Skerlos does not disclose a “key code signal”	38
b.	Each of Caris and Skerlos does not disclose a “key code generator device”	38
4.	Petitioner has failed to establish motivation to combine Caris and Skerlos	39
5.	A POSITA would not have combined Caris and Skerlos.....	42
V.	CONCLUSION.....	44
	CERTIFICATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.24.....	45
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	46

...

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
FEDERAL CASES	
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	28, 29, 39, 49
<i>Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , No. 2018-2140, 2019 U.S. App. LEXIS 32613 (Fed. Cir. Oct. 31, 2019)	51
<i>Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC</i> , 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	28, 38, 49
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	28, 39, 49
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Enfish, LLC</i> , 662 Fed. Appx 981 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	27, 37, 38, 48
<i>Personal Web Techs. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	28, 38, 49
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005)	12
<i>Sanofi-Aventis Deutschland GMBH v. Mylan Pharms. Inc.</i> , No. 2019-1368, 2019 U.S. App. LEXIS 34328 (Fed. Cir. Nov. 19, 2019)	51
<i>Securus Technologies, Inc. v. Global Tel*Link Corp.</i> , 701 Fed. Appx. 971 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	27, 38, 48
<i>SpaceCo Business Solutions, Inc. v. Moscovitch</i> , IPR2015-00127, Paper 16 (P.T.A.B. May 14, 2015)	25, 27, 35, 37, 46, 48
FEDERAL STATUTES	
35 U.S.C. § 112(6)	13, 16

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.