

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
Patent 9,716,853 B2

Before PATRICK M. BOUCHER, MINN CHUNG, and
SHARON FENICK, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

FENICK, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ERRATA

The panel modifies our Order issued on March 24, 2020 (Paper 7) as follows:

On page 2 of the Order, the sentence “In its Preliminary Response, Patent Owner argues that the Board should apply its discretion under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) to deny institution of the requested proceeding because the Examiner considered three of Petitioner’s primary references during prosecution of the ’853 patent” is changed to “In its Preliminary Response,

IPR2019-01615
Patent 9,716,853 B2

Patent Owner argues that the Board should apply its discretion under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) to deny institution of the requested proceeding because one of the pieces of prior art relied on in the Petition was submitted in an IDS and initialed by the Examiner during prosecution of the '853 patent.”

IPR2019-01615
Patent 9,716,853 B2

PETITIONER:

Jon Wright
Lestin Kenton
Daniel Block
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC
Jwright-ptab@sternekessler.com
Lkenton-ptab@sternekessler.com
Dblock-ptab@sternekessler.com

PATENT OWNER:

Benjamin S. Pleune
Ryan W. Koppelman
Thomas W. Davison
James H. Abe
Caleb J. Bean
Derek S. Neilson
Nicholas T. Tsui
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
ben.pleune@alston.com
ryan.koppelman@alston.com
tom.davison@alston.com
james.abe@alston.com
caleb.bean@alston.com
derek.neilson@alston.com
nick.tsui@alston.com