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

PATENT OWNER'S SUR-REPLY TO PETITIONER'S REPLY



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	RODUCTION	
ARG	GUMENT	1
A.	Chardon Alone Does Not Render The Challenged Claims Obvious.	.1
	1. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Chardon Discloses, Teaches, Or Suggests "causing the universal control engine to respond to a detected presence of an intended target appliance within a logical topography of controllable appliances which includes the universal control engine by creat[ing] a listing" ("Response Limitation")	1
	2. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Chardon Discloses, Teaches, Or Suggests "using an identity associated with the intended target appliance to create a listing" ("Identity Limitation").	6
	3. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Chardon Discloses, Teaches, Or Suggests "creat[ing] a listing comprised of at least a first communication method and a second communication method different than the first communication method" ("Communication Methods Limitation")	9
	4. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Chardon Discloses, Teaches, Or Suggests "[create a listing comprised of at least a first communication method and a second communication method different than the first communication method] for use in controlling each of at least a first functional operation and a second functional operation of the intended target appliance" ("Functional Operations Limitation").	15
B.	Chardon In Combination With HDMI 1.3a And/Or Stecyk Does Not Render The Challenged Claims Obvious1	17
	1. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Chardon In Combination With HDMI 1.3a And/Or Stecyk Discloses, Teaches, Or Suggests Each And Every Limitation Of The Challenged Claims.	17



		2.	Petitioner Has Failed To Establish A Motivation To Combine Chardon With Stecyk	18
		3.	Petitioner Has Failed To Establish A Motivation To Combine Chardon With HDMI 1.3a	19
	C.		Board Should Strike And Exclude Petitioner's New Reply ments.	19
Ш	CON	_		22



TABLE OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit No.	Description
2001	Declaration of Dr. Don Turnbull ("1/17/20 Turnbull
	Declaration")
2002	Declaration of Dr. Don Turnbull in Support of Patent Owner's
	Response ("7/13/20 Turnbull Declaration")
2003	Transcript of the June 24, 2020 Deposition of Dr. Samuel H.
	Russ ("Russ Deposition Transcript")
2004	8/5/19 Markman Hearing Transcript from Universal
	Electronics, Inc. v. Roku, Inc., Case No. 18-cv-1580 (C.D. Cal.)
	("Markman Transcript")
2005	Roku's Opening Claim Construction Brief in Universal
	Electronics, Inc. v. Roku, Inc., Case No. 18-cv-1580 (C.D. Cal.)
	("Petitioner's CC Brief")
2006	Roku's Response to Plaintiff's Opening Claim Construction
	Brief in Universal Electronics, Inc. v. Roku, Inc., Case No. 18-
	cv-1580 (C.D. Cal.) ("Petitioner's Reply CC Brief")
2100	Curriculum Vitae of Dr. Don Turnbull



I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner spends most of its Reply rewriting the claim language and unconvincingly arguing that it did not take certain positions in its Petition. Like the Petition and its supporting expert declaration, Petitioner's Reply *confirms* that the asserted prior art (either alone or in combination) fails to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every limitation of the Challenged Claims of the '853 patent.

Petitioner fails to dispute the points raised in Patent Owner's Response, and instead raises brand new, conclusory, and legally irrelevant arguments that noticeably ignore or change the plain and unambiguous language of the Challenged Claims and are unsupported by the testimony of a person of skill in the art.

In the end, Petitioner cannot salvage its meritless obviousness positions.

Accordingly, Patent Owner requests that the Board confirm the patentability of the Challenged Claims of the '853 patent.

II. ARGUMENT

- A. Chardon Alone Does Not Render The Challenged Claims Obvious.
 - 1. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Chardon Discloses, Teaches, Or Suggests "causing the universal control engine to respond to a detected presence of an intended target appliance within a logical topography of controllable appliances which includes the universal control engine by ... creat[ing] a listing" ("Response Limitation").

Petitioner has failed to show that Chardon discloses, teaches, or suggests the Response Limitation because Petitioner's Reply again confirms that the alleged



DOCKET

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.

