

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ROKU, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

UNIVERSAL ELECTRONICS INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2020-01012
U.S. Patent 7,589,642

PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page(s)
LIST OF EXHIBITS	VII
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. <i>Windy City</i> Abrogated <i>Proppant Express</i> and the Board has no Discretion to Allow Same Party Joinder	4
B. The Board Should Deny Institution Under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a) in View of the Upcoming ITC Trial	5
C. The Board Should Deny Institution Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) Because of Petitioner’s Multiple Petitions	8
1. Petitioner previously filed a petition on several claims of the ’642 Patent	9
2. Petitioner has known of the prior art asserted in its follow-on petition since February 2019	9
3. Petitioner had received the institution decision on its previous Petition before filing the follow-on Petition	10
4. The long delay between Petitioner’s notice of the references in the follow-on Petition and filing the follow- on Petition weighs against institution	11
5. Petition has no adequate explanation for the delay in filing its follow-on Petition	11
6. The finite resources of the Board are not well spent on this follow-on Petition	14
7. Instituting trial on the follow-on Petition will disrupt the schedule	14
II. PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO SHOW THAT THERE IS A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT THE CHALLENGED	

CLAIMS OF THE ‘642 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE AS OBVIOUS.....	16
A. Technology Background	17
B. U.S. Patent No. 7,589,642.....	18
C. Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art	20
D. Claim Construction.....	20
1. “Key Code”	21
2. “Keystroke Indicator Signal”	21
3. “Key Code Signal”	23
4. “Key Code Generator Device”.....	24
5. “Means for receiving a key code”.....	26
E. Ground 1: Mishra in Combination with Dubil Does Not Render the Challenged Claims Obvious.....	28
1. Petitioner has not shown that Mishra or Dubil discloses, teaches or suggests Element 1.2: “generating a key code within a key code generator device using the keystroke indicator signal”	29
a. Mishra does not disclose <i>using</i> a keystroke indicator signal to <i>generate</i> a key code	29
b. Each of Mishra and Dubil does not disclose a “key code generator device”	31
2. Petitioner has not shown that Mishra or Dubil discloses, teaches, or suggests Element 1.3: “modulating said key code onto a carrier signal, thereby generating a key code signal”	31
a. Each of Mishra and Dubil does not disclose “modulating said key code onto a carrier signal”	31
b. Each of Mishra and Dubil does not disclose a “key code signal” separate from a “keystroke indicator signal”	34
c. Each of Mishra and Dubil does not disclose “generating a key code signal”	35
3. Petitioner has not shown that Mishra or Dubil discloses, teaches, or suggests Element 1.4: “transmitting said key code signal from said key code generator device to said remote control device”	35

a.	Each of Mishra and Dubil does not disclose a “key code signal”	35
b.	Each of Mishra and Dubil does not disclose a “key code generator device”	36
4.	Petitioner has failed to establish motivation to combine Mishra and Dubil	36
5.	A POSITA would not have combined Mishra and Dubil.....	40
F.	Ground 2: Rye in Combination with Dubil Does Not Render the Challenged Claims Obvious.....	42
1.	Petitioner has not shown that Rye or Dubil discloses, teaches, or suggests Element 2.2: “generating a key code within a key code generator device using the keystroke inductor signal”	43
a.	Each of Rye and Dubil does not disclose a “key code generator device”	43
2.	Petitioner has not shown that Rye or Dubil discloses, teaches, or suggests Element 2.3: “modulating said key code onto a carrier signal, thereby generating a key code signal”	45
a.	Each of Rye and Dubil does not disclose “modulating said key code onto a carrier signal”	45
3.	Petitioner has not shown that Rye or Dubil discloses, teaches, or suggests Element 2.4: “transmitting said key code signal from said key code generator device to an electronic consumer device”	45
a.	Each of Rye and Dubil does not disclose a “key code signal”	45
b.	Each of Rye and Dubil does not disclose a “key code generator device”	46
4.	Petitioner has failed to establish motivation to combine Rye and Dubil	46
5.	A POSITA would not have combined Rye and Dubil.....	50
III.	THIS PROCEEDING SHOULD BE DISMISSED AS UNCONSTITUTIONAL.....	52
IV.	CONCLUSION.....	53
	CERTIFICATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.24.....	54
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	55

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
FEDERAL CASES	
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 694 F.3d 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	39, 40, 49, 50
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 15 (P.T.A.B. May 13, 2020)	5, 6, 7
<i>Arris Group v. Cirrex Systems LLC</i> , IPR2015-00530, Paper No. 12 (P.T.A.B. July 27, 2015)	12
<i>Arthrex, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.</i> , No. 2018-2140, 2019 U.S. App. LEXIS 32613 (Fed. Cir. Oct. 31, 2019)	52
<i>Belden Inc. v. Berk-Tek LLC</i> , 805 F.3d 1064 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	39, 49
<i>Duncan Parking Techs., Inc. v. IPS Group Inc.</i> , IPR2016-01145, Paper No. 9 (Nov. 21, 2016)	11
<i>E-One, Inc. v. Oshkosh Corp.</i> , No. IPR2019-00161, Paper 16 (P.T.A.B. May 15, 2019)	5
<i>Facebook, Inc. v. Windy City Innovations, LLC</i> , 953 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	3, 4
<i>General Plastic Industrial Co., Ltd. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , Case IPR2016-01357, slip op. (P.T.A.B. Sept. 6, 2017)	8, 9, 16
<i>Infinera Corp. v. Core Optical Technologies LLC</i> , IPR2018-01259, Paper 9	23, 25
<i>Intel Corporation v. VLSI Technology LLC</i> , IPR2020-00112, Paper 15 (P.T.A.B. May 19, 2020)	5
<i>KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	39, 49

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.