

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

ROKU, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

UNIVERSAL ELECTRONICS INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2019-01615  
U.S. Patent 9,716,853

---

**PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page(s)
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	i
LIST OF EXHIBITS.....	v
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. BACKGROUND.....	1
A. Technology Background.....	1
B. U.S. Patent No. 9,716,853 .....	2
C. Prosecution History.....	5
D. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art (POSITA) .....	6
E. Petitioner’s References .....	8
1. U.S Patent Application Publication No. 2012/0249890 to Chardon (“Chardon”) .....	8
2. High-Definition Multimedia Interface Specification Version 1.3a (“HDMI v. 1.3a”).....	9
3. U.S Patent Application Publication No. 2009/0254500 to Stecyk (“Stecyk”) .....	10
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	11
A. “for use in controlling each of at least a first functional operation and a second functional operation of the intended target appliance” (claim 1).....	12
IV. THE BOARD SHOULD NOT INSTITUTE <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW..	13
A. Chardon Does Not Qualify as Prior Art Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a).....	14
B. The Board Should Deny Institution Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) .....	15
1. Factors (a)-(d) weigh in favor of denial of institution.....	17

2. Factor (e) whether Petitioner has pointed out sufficiently how the Examiner erred in its evaluation of the asserted prior art. ....	18
3. Factor (f) the extent to which additional evidence and facts presented in the Petition warrant reconsideration of prior art or arguments.....	18
C. The Board Should Deny Institution because Petitioner Has Failed to Establish a Reasonable Likelihood that Any Challenged Claim Is Unpatentable .....	19
1. Chardon in view of HDMI v. 1.3a and Stecyk Does Not Render Obvious Claim 1 (Ground #1).....	19
(i) There is no motivation to combine Chardon and HDMI v. 1.3a.....	20
(ii) There is no motivation to combine Chardon and Stecyk.....	25
(iii) There is no motivation to combine HDMI v. 1.3a and Stecyk.....	31
2. Chardon in view of HDMI v. 1.3a and Stecyk Does Not Render Obvious Claim 3 (Ground #1).....	33
3. Chardon in view of HDMI v. 1.3a and Stecyk Does Not Render Obvious Claim 5 (Ground #1).....	33
4. Chardon in view of HDMI v. 1.3a and Stecyk Does Not Render Obvious Claim 7 (Ground #1).....	34
V. CONCLUSION .....	34

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Adidas AG v. Nike, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00921, 2019 WL 764060 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 19, 2019).....	passim
<i>Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith &amp; Nephew, Inc.</i> , No. 2018-2140, 2019 U.S. App. LEXIS 32613 (Fed. Cir. Oct. 31, 2019) .....	34
<i>Becton, Dickinson &amp; Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG</i> , IPR2017-01586, Paper 8 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 15, 2017).....	16
<i>Haag-Streit AG v. Eidolon Optical, LLC</i> , IPR2018-01309 .....	14
<i>Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge, Ltd.</i> , 821 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	24, 31
<i>Johns Manville Corp.</i> , IPR2018-00827 .....	21, 23, 26, 27
<i>Merck Animal Health v. Boehringer Ingelheim Vetmedica, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-01789 .....	13
<i>NEC Corp. et al. v. Neptune Subsea IP Ltd.</i> , IPR2018-01158 .....	20
<i>PersonalWeb Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 848 F.3d 987 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	28
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	11
<i>Sanofi-Aventis Deutschland GMBH v. Mylan Pharms. Inc.</i> , No. 2019-1368, 2019 U.S. App. LEXIS 34328 (Fed. Cir. Nov. 19, 2019) .....	34
<i>SAS Inst., Inc. v. Iancu</i> , 138 S. Ct. 1348 (2018).....	24, 31
<i>Unified Patents Inc. v. Berman</i> , IPR2016-01571 .....	15, 18
<i>VIZIO, Inc. v. Nichia Corp.</i> , IPR2017-01608 .....	32

**STATUTES**

35 U.S.C. § 102(a) .....14, 15  
35 U.S.C. § 325(d) ..... passim

**OTHER AUTHORITIES**

37 C.F.R. 42.65(a).....27  
37 C.F.R. §§ 42.8 and 42.6(e).....2  
37 C.F.R. § 42.24 .....1  
37 C.F.R. § 42.24(a)(i).....1  
37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b) .....11  
37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c).....1, 14, 19, 34  
M.P.E.P. § 602 .....17

# 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.