

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ROKU, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

UNIVERSAL ELECTRONICS INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2019-01614
U.S. Patent 9,911,325

PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page(s)
LIST OF EXHIBITS.....	VII
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. BACKGROUND.....	3
A. Technology Background.....	3
B. U.S. Patent No. 9,911,325 (“the ’325 Patent”).....	4
C. Prosecution History.....	5
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”.....	12
C. “key code signal”.....	13
D. “generate a key code using the keystroke indicator signal”.....	14
IV. THE CITED GROUNDS DO NOT RENDER ANY CLAIMS UNPATENTABLE.....	15
A. Ground 1: Rye in View of Skerlos Does Not Render Obvious Claims 1-3, 5, or 7.....	15
1. Overview of Rye.....	16
2. Overview of Skerlos.....	17
3. A POSITA Would Not Have Combined Rye and Skerlos.....	17
4. Rye in view of Skerlos does not render obvious Claim 1.....	22
a. Neither Rye nor Skerlos, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests [1.3]: “a processing device coupled to the receiver and the transmitter; and”.....	22

b.	Neither Rye nor Skerlos, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests [1.4]: “a memory storing instructions executable by the processing device, the instructions causing the processing device to”	22
c.	Neither Rye nor Skerlos, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests [1.4.1]: “generate a key code using a keystroke indicator received from a third device in communication with first device via use of the receiver, the keystroke indicator having data that indicates an input element of the third device that has been activated”	24
d.	Neither Rye nor Skerlos, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests [1.4.2]: “format the key code for transmission to the second device”	28
e.	Neither Rye nor Skerlos, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests [1.4.3]: “transmit the formatted key code to the second device in a key code signal via the use of a transmitter”	31
f.	Neither Rye nor Skerlos, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests [1.4.4]: “wherein the generated key code comprises a one of a plurality of key code data stored in a codeset, wherein the one of the plurality of key code data is selected from the codeset as a function of the keystroke indicator received from the third device, wherein each of the plurality of key code data stored in the codeset comprises a series of digital ones and/or digital zeros, and”	31
g.	Neither Rye nor Skerlos, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests [1.4.5]: “wherein the codeset further comprises time information that describes how a digital one and/or a digital zero within the selected one of the plurality of key code data is to be represented in the key code signal to be transmitted to the second device”	32
5.	Rye in view of Skerlos does not render obvious Claim 2: “The first device as recited in claim 1, wherein the receiver comprises an RF receiver”	34
6.	Rye in view of Skerlos does not render obvious Claim 3: “The first device as recited in claim 1, wherein the transmitter comprises an IR transmitter”	35
7.	Rye in view of Skerlos does not render obvious Claim 5: “The first device as recited in claim 1, wherein the formatted key code is transmitted from the first device to the second device via a wireless connection between the	

first device and the second device”	35
8. Rye in view of Skerlos does not render obvious Claim 7: “The first device as recited in claim 1, wherein the generated key code controls at least one of a power on, power off, volume up, and volume down functional operation of the second device”	36
B. Ground 2: Caris in View of Dubil Does Not Render Obvious Claims 1-5	36
1. Overview of Caris	36
2. Overview of Dubil	37
3. A POSITA Would Not Have Combined Caris and Dubil	39
4. Caris in view of Dubil does not render obvious Claim 1	42
a. Neither Caris nor Dubil, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests [1.3]: “a processing device coupled to the receiver and the transmitter; and”	42
b. Neither Caris nor Dubil, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests [1.4]: “a memory storing instructions executable by the processing device, the instructions causing the processing device to”	43
c. Neither Caris nor Dubil, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests [1.4.1]: “generate a key code using the keystroke indicator received from a third device in communication with first device via use of the receiver, the keystroke indicator having data that indicates an input element of the third device that has been activated”	44
d. Neither Caris nor Dubil, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests [1.4.2]: “format the key code for transmission to the second device”	47
e. Neither Caris nor Dubil, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests [1.4.3]: “transmit the formatted key code to the second device in a key code signal via the use of a transmitter”	50
f. Neither Caris nor Dubil, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests [1.4.4]: “wherein the generated key code comprises a one of a plurality of key code data stored in a codeset, wherein the one of the plurality of key code data is selected from the codeset as a function of the keystroke indicator received from the third device,	

	wherein each of the plurality of key code data stored in the codeset comprises a series of digital ones and/or digital zeros, and”	51
g.	Neither Caris nor Dubil, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests [1.4.5]: “wherein the codeset further comprises time information that describes how a digital one and/or a digital zero within the selected one of the plurality of key code data is to be represented in the key code signal to be transmitted to the second device”	53
5.	Caris in view of Dubil does not render obvious Claim 2: “The first device as recited in claim 1, wherein the receiver comprises an RF receiver”	54
6.	Caris in view of Dubil does not render obvious Claim 3: “The first device as recited in claim 1, wherein the transmitter comprises an IR transmitter”	55
7.	Caris in view of Dubil does not render obvious Claim 4: “The first device as recited in claim 1, wherein the formatted key code is transmitted from the first device to the second device via a wired connection between the first device and the second device”	55
8.	Caris in view of Dubil does not render obvious Claim 5: “The first device as recited in claim 1, wherein the formatted key code is transmitted from the first device to the second device via a wireless connection between the first device and the second device”	55
V.	CONCLUSION.....	56
	CERTIFICATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.24.....	57
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	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.