

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 RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page(s)
LIST OF EXHIBITS.....	VIII
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	3
A. Technology Background	3
B. U.S. Patent No. 7,589,642 (“the ’642 Patent”)	3
C. Prosecution History	6
D. Denial of IPR2014-01082	9
E. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art (“POSITA”).....	10
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	11
A. “key code”	11
B. “keystroke indicator signal”	11
C. “key code signal”.....	12
D. “key code generator device”	13
E. “generating a key code within a key code generator device using the keystroke indicator signal”	15
IV. THE CITED GROUNDS DO NOT RENDER ANY CLAIMS UNPATENTABLE.....	16
A. Ground 1: Mishra in View of Dubil Does Not Render Obvious Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, or 9	16
1. Overview of Mishra	16
2. Overview of Dubil	17
3. A POSITA Would Not Have Combined Mishra and Dubil.....	18
4. Mishra in view of Dubil does not render obvious Claim 1	22

a.	Mishra and Dubil do not disclose “receiving a keystroke indicator signal from a remote control device, wherein the keystroke indicator signal indicates a key on said remote control device that a user has selected”	22
b.	Mishra and Dubil do not disclose “generating a key code within a key code generator device using the keystroke indicator signal”	24
c.	Mishra and Dubil do not disclose “modulating said key code onto a carrier signal, thereby generating a key code signal”	25
d.	Mishra and Dubil do not disclose “transmitting said key code signal from said key code generator device to said remote control device”	27
5.	Mishra in view of Dubil does not render obvious Claim 3: “The method of claim 1, wherein said key code consists of a binary number”	28
6.	Mishra in view of Dubil does not render obvious Claim 4: “The method of claim 1, wherein said key code comprises a binary number and timing information, and wherein said timing information defines how said binary number is modulated in (c) onto said carrier signal”	28
7.	Mishra in view of Dubil does not render obvious Claim 6	29
a.	Mishra and Dubil do not disclose “The method of claim 1, wherein said carrier frequency is in a radio frequency band, wherein said key code signal is received by said remote control device, and wherein said method further comprises:”	29
b.	Mishra and Dubil do not disclose “modulating said key code onto a second carrier signal, thereby generating a second key code signal, said modulating being performed on said remote control device wherein said second carrier signal is in an infrared frequency band”	30
c.	Mishra and Dubil do not disclose “transmitting said second key code signal from said remote control device to an electronic consumer device”	31
8.	Mishra in view of Dubil does not render obvious claim 8: “The method of claim 1, wherein said key code generated in (b) is part of a codeset, and wherein said remote control device does not store said codeset”	31
9.	Mishra in view of Dubil does not render obvious claim 9: “The method of claim 8, wherein said codeset comprises	

	timing information and a plurality of key codes, and wherein said timing information describes a digital one and a digital zero”	32
B.	Ground 2: Rye in View of Dubil Does Not Render Obvious Claims 2 or 22-25	34
1.	Overview of Rye	34
2.	A POSITA Would Not Have Combined Rye and Dubil	35
3.	Rye in view of Dubil does not render obvious Claim 2	38
a.	Rye and Dubil do not disclose “receiving a keystroke indicator signal from a remote control device, wherein the keystroke indicator signal indicates a key on said remote control device that user has selected”	38
b.	Rye and Dubil do not disclose “generating a key code within a key code generator device using the keystroke indicator signal”	39
c.	Rye and Dubil do not disclose “modulating said key code onto a carrier signal, thereby generating a key code signal”	40
d.	Rye and Dubil do not disclose “transmitting said key code signal from said key code generator device to an electronic consumer device”	43
4.	Rye in view of Dubil does not render obvious Claim 22: “The method of claim 2, wherein said key code consists of a binary number”	43
5.	Rye in view of Dubil does not render obvious Claim 23: “The method of claim 2, wherein said key code comprises a binary number and timing information, and wherein said timing information defines how said binary number is modulated in (c) onto said carrier signal”	44
6.	Rye in view of Dubil does not render obvious Claim 24: “The method of claim 2, wherein said key code generated in (b) is part of a codeset, and wherein said remote control device does not store said codeset”	44
7.	Rye in view of Dubil does not render obvious Claim 25: “The method of claim 24, wherein said codeset comprises timing information and a plurality of key codes, and wherein said timing information describes a digital one and a digital zero”	45
C.	Ground 3: Caris in View of Skerlos Does Not Render Obvious Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, and 22-25	46

1.	Overview of Caris	46
2.	Overview of Skerlos	47
3.	A POSITA Would Not Have Combined Caris and Skerlos.....	47
4.	Caris in View of Skerlos Does Not Render Obvious Claim 1	50
	a. Caris and Skerlos do not disclose “generating a key code within a key code generator device using the keystroke indicator signal”	50
	b. Caris and Skerlos do not disclose “modulating said key code onto a carrier signal, thereby generating a key code signal”	51
	c. Caris and Skerlos do not disclose “transmitting said key code signal from said key code generator device to said remote control device”	53
5.	Caris in view of Skerlos does not render obvious Claim 3	53
6.	Caris in view of Skerlos does not render obvious Claim 4	53
7.	Caris in view of Skerlos does not render obvious Claim 6	54
	a. Caris and Skerlos do not disclose “The method of claim 1, wherein said carrier frequency is in a radio frequency band, wherein said key code signal is received by said remote control device, and wherein said method further comprises:”	54
	b. Caris and Skerlos do not disclose “modulating said key code onto a second carrier signal, thereby generating a second key code signal, said modulating being performed on said remote control device wherein said second carrier signal is in an infrared frequency band”	55
	c. Caris and Skerlos do not disclose “transmitting said second key code signal from said remote control device to an electronic consumer device”	56
8.	Caris in view of Skerlos does not render obvious claim 8	56
9.	Caris in view of Skerlos does not render obvious claim 9	57
10.	Caris in view of Skerlos does not render obvious Claim 2	58
	a. Caris and Skerlos do not disclose “generating a key code within a key code generator device using the keystroke inductor signal”	58

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.