

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ROKU, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

UNIVERSAL ELECTRONICS INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2020-00951
U.S. Patent 9,911,325

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	THE BOARD SHOULD NOT INSTITUTE <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW	1
A.	Joinder Should Be Denied, Making Petitioner’s Challenge Untimely under 35 U.S.C. § 315(b).....	2
1.	Same Party Joinder is Not Allowed by 35 U.S.C. § 315(c)	2
2.	Even if Same Party Joinder is Allowed, Joinder Should Not be Permitted in this Case	4
(a)	Petitioner has been on Notice of the Challenged Claims Since September 2018	5
(b)	Denying Joinder Causes no Undue Prejudice to Petitioner.....	6
(c)	Allowing Joinder Causes Significant Undue Prejudice to Patent Owner	7
(d)	Other Factors Support Denying Joinder	9
B.	The Board Should Deny Institution Under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a) in View of the Upcoming ITC Trial	10
C.	The Board Should Deny Institution Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) Because of Petitioner’s Multiple Petitions	14
II.	PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO SHOW THAT THERE IS A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OF THE ‘325 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE AS OBVIOUS.....	17
A.	Technology Background	17
B.	U.S. Patent No. 9,911,325	18
C.	Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art	20

D.	Claim Construction.....	21
1.	“Key Code”	21
2.	“Keystroke Indicator”	22
3.	“Key Code Signal”	23
4.	“generate a key code using a keystroke indicator”	25
E.	Ground 1: Rye in Combination with Skerlos Does Not Render the Challenged Claims Obvious	26
1.	Petitioner has failed to establish motivation to combine Rye and Skerlos.....	26
2.	Neither Rye nor Skerlos, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests Element [1.3]: “a processing device coupled to the receiver and the transmitter; and”	30
3.	Petitioner has not shown that Rye or Skerlos discloses, teaches, or suggests Element [1.4]: “a memory storing instructions executable by the processing device, the instructions causing the processing device to”	30
4.	Petitioner has not shown that Rye or Skerlos discloses, teaches, or suggests Element [1.4.2]: “format the key code for transmission to the second device”	31
5.	Petitioner has not shown that Rye or Skerlos discloses, teaches, or suggests Element [1.4.3]: “transmit the formatted key code to the second device in a key code signal via use of the transmitter”	33
6.	Petitioner has not shown that Rye or Skerlos discloses, teaches, or suggests Element [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”	34
F.	Ground A: Rye in Combination with Skerlos and Woolgar Does Not Render the Challenged Claims Obvious.....	35
1.	Petitioner has failed to establish a motivation to combine Rye, Skerlos, and Woolgar	35
2.	Petitioner has not shown that Rye, Skerlos, or Woolgar discloses, teaches, or suggests Element [9.4.4]: “transmit the formatted key code to the second device in a keycode signal via use of the second transmitter and a second communication protocol when it is determined that the second device is not responsive to the key code signal transmitted via use of the first transmitter and the first communication protocol”	38
G.	Ground B: Rye in Combination with Skerlos and Gutman Does Not Render Claim 6 Obvious.....	42
1.	Petitioner has failed to establish a motivation to combine Rye, Skerlos, and Gutman.....	42
H.	Ground C: Rye in Combination with Skerlos, Woolgar, and Gutman Does Not Render Claim 14 Obvious.....	44
I.	Ground 2.A: Caris in Combination with Dubil Does Not Render the Challenged Claims Obvious	45
1.	Petitioner has failed to establish a motivation to combine Caris and Dubil	45
2.	Neither Caris nor Dubil discloses, teaches, or suggests Element [1.3]: “a processing device coupled to the receiver and the transmitter; and”	49
3.	Neither Caris nor Dubil discloses, teaches, or suggests Element [1.4]: “a memory storing	

instructions executable by the processing device, the instructions causing the processing device to”	50
4. Petitioner has not shown that Caris or Dubil discloses, teaches, or suggests Element [1.4.2]: “format the key code for transmission to the second device”	51
5. Petitioner has not shown that Caris or Dubil discloses, teaches, or suggests Element [1.4.3]: “transmit the formatted key code to the second device in a key code signal via use of the transmitter”	54
6. Neither Caris nor Dubil discloses, teaches, or suggests Element [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”	54
J. Ground D: Caris in Combination with Dubil and Woolgar Does Not Render the Challenged Claims Obvious.....	55
III. THIS PROCEEDING SHOULD BE DISMISSED AS UNCONSTITUTIONAL.....	58
IV. CONCLUSION.....	59

TABLE OF ATHORITIES

	Page(s)
FEDERAL CASES	
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc 'ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	24, 25, 33

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.