

Exhibit B to Parties' Joint Claim Construction Chart – Roku's Proposed Constructions and Supporting Evidence

United States Patent Nos.

7,589,642, 8,004,389, and 9,911,325

Patent Terms		Roku's Construction	Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evidence
1.	"key code signal"	A signal, for controlling a specific type, brand, and model of consumer electronic device, and which contains a modulated key code. Excludes signals containing key codes to be stored on the remote control for later use in generating IR signals.	'642 Patent at Title, Abstract, Figs. 1-2, 4-6, 1:23-25, 1:34-38, 2:2-15, 2:45-61, 4:35-5:5, 5:37-49, 6:27-33, 6:43-58, 6:63-65, 7:21-26, 7:1-9, 8:1-6; 9:58-59. <sup>1</sup>  Prosecution of U.S. Patent Appl. No. 10/737,029: July 28, 2006 Response to Office Action at 16-18, December 19, 2006 Response to Office Action at 19-21, March 24, 2007 Appeal Brief at 2-3, 21-23; June 11, 2007 Amended Appeal Brief at 2-3, 22-24; January 2, 2008 Reply Brief at 5-6, 13.  Expert declaration of Stu Lipoff. Mr. Lipoff will opine as to correctness of Roku's proposed construction of "key code signal", how one of ordinary skill in the art would interpret the related disclosures of the specifications and file history, what ordinary meaning(s) (if any) "key code signal" has in the field, the background of the technology, the level of ordinary skill in the art, the state of art at the time of the invention, and rebuttal opinions in response to UEI's construction and supporting evidence for

<sup>1</sup> Citations to the specification of one of the asserted patents should be understood as also citing to the corresponding portions of each other asserted patent in the same family. Citations to the figures of a patent should be understood as citing to the corresponding portions of the written description and vice-versa.

Exhibit B to Parties' Joint Claim Construction Chart – Roku's Proposed Constructions and Supporting Evidence

			“key code signal” and rebuttal to any opinions or declarations offered by any witness on behalf of Plaintiff.
2.	“key code generator device”	<p>This is a means-plus-function term subject to 35 U.S.C. § 112(6).</p> <p>The function is generate a key code.</p> <p>The structure is indefinite due to lack of sufficient corresponding structure.</p>	<p>‘642 Patent at Abstract, Figs. 1-2, 2:2-6, 3:9-12, 3:27-35, 6:14-30.</p> <p>Prosecution of U.S. Patent Appl. No. 10/737,029: July 28, 2006 Response to Office Action at 16-18, December 19, 2006 Response to Office Action at 19-21, March 24, 2007 Appeal Brief at 2-3, 21-23; June 11, 2007 Amended Appeal Brief at 2-3, 22-24; January 2, 2008 Reply Brief at 5-6, 13.</p> <p>Expert declaration of Stu Lipoff. Mr. Lipoff will opine as to correctness of Roku’s proposed construction of “key code generator device”, how one of ordinary skill in the art would interpret the related disclosures of the specifications and file history, what ordinary meaning(s) (if any) “key code generator device” has in the field, to what extent “key code generator device” or alleged corresponding disclosures in the specification are structural, to what extent disclosures of the specification correspond to the recited function, the background of the technology, the level of ordinary skill in the art, the state of art at the time of the invention, and rebuttal opinions in response to UEI’s construction and supporting evidence for “key code generator device”</p>

Exhibit B to Parties' Joint Claim Construction Chart – Roku's Proposed Constructions and Supporting Evidence

			and rebuttal to any opinions or declarations offered by any witness on behalf of Plaintiff.
3.	“means for receiving a key code from said RF receiver and for sending said key code to said IR transmitter such that said key code is modulated onto an IR carrier signal”	<p>This is a means-plus-function term subject to 35 U.S.C. § 112(6).</p> <p>The function is receiving a key code from said RF receiver and sending said key code to said IR transmitter such that said key code is modulated onto an IR carrier signal.</p> <p>The structure is indefinite due to lack of sufficient corresponding structure.</p>	<p>Specification lacks corresponding algorithm. See '642 Patent at 3:66-4:3.</p> <p>Expert declaration of Stu Lipoff. Mr. Lipoff will opine as to correctness of Roku's proposed construction of “means for receiving . . .”, how one of ordinary skill in the art would interpret the related disclosures of the specifications and file history, what ordinary meaning(s) (if any) “means for receiving . . .” has in the field, to what extent “means for receiving . . .” or alleged corresponding disclosures in the specification are structural, to what extent disclosures of the specification correspond to the recited function, the background of the technology, the level of ordinary skill in the art, the state of art at the time of the invention, and rebuttal opinions in response to UEI's construction and supporting evidence for “means for receiving . . .” and rebuttal to any opinions or declarations offered by any witness on behalf of Plaintiff.</p>
4.	“autoscan functionality”	Functionality for testing keycodes to determine the right keycode or codeset to control a particular device.	<p>'642 Patent at 2:22-36, 7:4-8:18</p> <p>Expert declaration of Stu Lipoff. Mr. Lipoff will opine as to correctness of Roku's proposed construction of “autoscan functionality”, how one of ordinary skill in</p>

Exhibit B to Parties' Joint Claim Construction Chart – Roku's Proposed Constructions and Supporting Evidence

			the art would interpret the related disclosures of the specifications and file history, what ordinary meaning(s) (if any) “autoscan functionality” has in the field, the background of the technology, the level of ordinary skill in the art, the state of art at the time of the invention, and rebuttal opinions in response to UEI’s construction and supporting evidence for “autoscan functionality” and rebuttal to any opinions or declarations offered by any witness on behalf of Plaintiff
5.	“format ... for transmission” / “formatted”	Modulate / modulated	<p>‘642 Patent at Abstract, Figs. 2-6, 1:34-38; 1:59-2:21; 5:53-63; 6:24-42.</p> <p>Expert declaration of Stu Lipoff. Mr. Lipoff will opine as to correctness of Roku’s proposed construction of “format ... for transmission” / “formatted”, how one of ordinary skill in the art would interpret the related disclosures of the specifications and file history, what ordinary meaning(s) (if any) “format ... for transmission” / “formatted” have in the field, the background of the technology, the level of ordinary skill in the art, the state of art at the time of the invention, and rebuttal opinions in response to UEI’s construction and supporting evidence for “format ... for transmission” / “formatted” and rebuttal to any opinions or declarations offered by any witness on behalf of Plaintiff.</p>

Exhibit B to Parties' Joint Claim Construction Chart – Roku's Proposed Constructions and Supporting Evidence

United States Patent No. 9,716,853

	Patent Terms	Roku's Construction	Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evidence
1.	<p>“by using an identity associated with the intended target appliance to 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 at least a first functional operation and a second functional operation of the intended target appliance”</p>	<p>Create a listing by using an identity associated with the intended target appliance. The listing must contain at least two different communication methods, each of which can control and is associated with the same two or more functional operations of the same, single target appliance.</p> <p>Does not include selecting a communication protocol and thereafter using the selected communication protocol for any and all commands sent to the target appliance.</p>	<p>‘853 Patent, cl. 1, Figs. 7, 9, 10, 8:49-11:9, 11:40-12:43, 14:6-24.</p> <p>13/657,176 File History, May 14, 2015 Response at 6</p> <p>13/933877 File History, April 28, 2015 Response at 6; 14/948,927 File History January 31, 2017 Response at 3</p> <p>Expert declaration of Stu Lipoff. Mr. Lipoff will opine as to correctness of Roku's proposed construction of “by using ...”, how one of ordinary skill in the art would interpret the related disclosures of the specifications and file history, what ordinary meaning(s) (if any) “by using ...” has in the field, the background of the technology, the level of ordinary skill in the art, the state of art at the time of the invention, and rebuttal opinions in response to UEI's construction and supporting evidence for “by using ...” and rebuttal to any opinions or declarations offered by any witness on behalf of Plaintiff</p>
2.	<p>“universal control engine”</p>	<p>Indefinite</p>	<p>‘853 Patent at 2:4-55</p> <p>Expert declaration of Stu Lipoff. Mr. Lipoff will opine as to correctness of Roku's proposed construction of “universal control</p>

# 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.