

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

GOOGLE LLC

Petitioner

v.

UNILOC 2017 LLC

Patent Owner

---

IPR2020-00115

PATENT 8,407,609

---

**PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO PETITION**

**PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §42.107(a)**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Exhibit List..... iii

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

II. THE '609 PATENT ..... 1

III. PROSECUTION HISTORY OF THE '609 PATENT ..... 6

IV. RELATED PROCEEDINGS ..... 9

V. GIVEN THE UPCOMING TRIAL IN PARALLEL LITIGATION, AND PARTICULARLY CONSIDERING ANY OF THE OTHER ISSUES RAISED HEREIN, THE BOARD SHOULD EXERCISE DISCRETION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 314(A) AND *NHK SPRING* TO DENY INSTITUTION ..... 10

VI. THE PETITION IMPROPERLY REDUNDANTLY CHALLENGES THE CLAIMS AT ISSUE ..... 13

VII. THE PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO SHOW THAT THE ASSERTED ART IS NOT CUMULATIVE OF THE NUMEROUS REFERENCES RELIED ON BY THE EXAMINER DURING THE EXTENSIVE PROSECUTION . 16

VIII. THE PETITION REDUNDANTLY CHALLENGES AT LEAST CLAIM 1 OF THE '609 PATENT, ALREADY THE SUBJECT OF INTER PARTES REVIEW AND A PRIOR PETITION, AND SHOULD BE DENIED INSTITUTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 314 ..... 20

IX. PETITIONER DOES NOT PROVE A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF UNPATENTABILITY FOR ANY CHALLENGED CLAIM ..... 23

A. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART ..... 24

B. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ..... 25

1. Claim Construction Standard..... 25

C. The Petition fails to establish that Hayward, or Hayward and Middleton, teaches a “first computer system” and causing digital media presentation data “to be streamed from a second computer system distinct from the first computer system directly to the user’s computer independent of the first computer system.” .....25

D. Petitioner has failed to establish that Hayward teaches the Claim 1 recitation “providing an applet to the user’s computer for each digital media presentation to be delivered using the first computer system, wherein the applet is operative by the user’s computer as a timer” (Ground 1) .....28

E. Petitioner has failed to establish that a POSA would have had sufficient reason to modify Hayward using Middleton to provide the Claim 1 recitation “providing an applet to the user’s computer for each digital media presentation to be delivered using the first computer system, wherein the applet is operative by the user’s computer as a timer” (Ground 2) .....32

F. No Prima Facie Obviousness for Dependent Claims 2 and 3 .....34

X. CONCLUSION .....34

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE .....i

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE ..... ii

**EXHIBIT LIST**

<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Description</b>
2001	Claim Construction Memorandum and Order, <i>Uniloc 2017 LLC v. Google LLC</i> , Case 2:18-CV-00502-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex.), Dkt. 149 (Jan. 20, 2020)
2002	Amended Docket Control Order, <i>Uniloc 2017 LLC v. Google LLC</i> , No. 2:18-cv-502-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex.), Dkt. 92 (Oct. 15, 2019)
2003	Google Invalidity Contentions, filed in Dkt. 153-2, <i>Uniloc 2017 LLC v. Google LLC</i> , No. 2:18-cv-502-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex.) (Jan. 22, 2020)

## I. INTRODUCTION

Uniloc 2017 LLC (the “Uniloc” or “Patent Owner”) submits this Preliminary Response to Petition IPR2020-00115 for *Inter Partes* Review (“Pet.” or “Petition”) of United States Patent No. 8,407,609 (“the ’609 patent” or “Ex. 1001”) filed by Google LLC. (“Petitioner”). The instant Petition is procedurally and substantively defective for at least the reasons set forth herein.

## II. THE ’609 PATENT

The ’609 patent is titled “System and method for providing and tracking the provision of audio and visual presentations via a computer network.” The ’609 patent issued March 26, 2013, from U.S. Patent Application No. 12/545,131 filed August 21, 2009, claiming priority to provisional application No. 61/090,672, filed on August 21, 2008.

The inventors of the ’609 patent observed that, because of the virtually unlimited content available via the Internet, it can prove difficult for a user of an Internet enabled computer to identify and locate content of interest. Ex. 1001, 1:50-54. The inventors note that search engines do not always return meaningful results in response to a query, due to the complex nature and nuances of human language, and efforts by document authors or providers to fool or trick the indexer into ranking its documents above those of others. Ex. 1001; 1:55-2:1.

Embodiments of the ’609 Patent address this challenge by aggregating content,

# 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.