

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

HYUNDAI MOTOR AMERICA,
Petitioner

v.

STRATOSAUDIO INC.,
Patent Owner.

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,166,081**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8.....	2
III. FEE AUTHORIZATION	4
IV. GROUNDS FOR STANDING.....	4
V. PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED	4
VI. THE CHALLENGED PATENT	5
VII. PATENT PROSECUTION HISTORY	8
VIII. LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	9
IX. PRIORITY DATE	10
X. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	10
XI. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLIED PRIOR ART REFERENCES	11
A. Noreen (Ex-1005).....	11
B. Crosby (Ex-1006).....	13
C. Ellis-2002 (Ex-1007).....	15
D. Ellis-2005 (Ex-1008).....	16
XII. THE BOARD SHOULD NOT EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION UNDER § 325(D) TO DENY HEARING THESE INVALIDITY ISSUES FOR THE FIRST TIME IN THIS PETITION	18
XIII. DETAILED EXPLANATION OF THE UNPATENTABILITY GROUNDS	22
A. Grounds 1 and 2: Claims 9, 15, and 23 are rendered obvious by Noreen (Ex-1005) (Ground 1) or Noreen in view of Crosby (Ex-1006) (Ground 2).....	23
1. A POSITA would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Noreen and Crosby, and would have had a reasonable expectation of success in doing so.....	23

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
2. Independent Claim 9	23
3. Dependent Claims 15 and 23	32
B. Ground 3: Claims 10 and 11 are rendered obvious by Noreen (Ex-1005) in view of Crosby (Ex-1006) and Ellis-2002 (Ex-1007).....	35
1. A POSITA would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Noreen, Crosby, and Ellis-2002, and would have had a reasonable expectation of success in doing so.....	35
2. Dependent Claims 10-11.....	36
C. Grounds 4 and 5: Claims 9-11, 15, and 23 are rendered obvious by Ellis-2005 (Ex-1008) alone (Ground 4) or Ellis-2005 in view of Crosby (Ex-1006) (Ground 5).....	40
1. A POSITA would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Ellis-2005 and Crosby, and would have had a reasonable expectation of success in doing so.....	40
2. Independent Claim 9	40
3. Dependent Claims 10-11, 15, and 23.....	52
XIV. THE BOARD SHOULD NOT USE ITS DISCRETION TO DENY INSTITUTION UNDER <i>GENERAL PLASTIC</i>	57
XV. THE BOARD SHOULD NOT USE ITS DISCRETION TO DENY INSTITUTION UNDER <i>FINTIV</i>	60
A. Whether the court granted a stay or evidence exists that one may be granted if a proceeding is instituted.....	60
B. Proximity of the court’s trial date to the Board’s projected statutory deadline for a final written decision.....	61
C. Investment in the parallel proceeding by the court and the parties	62
D. Overlap between issues raised in the petition and in the parallel proceeding	64
E. Whether the petitioner and the defendant in the parallel proceeding are the same party.....	65

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
F. Other circumstances that impact the Board’s exercise of discretion, including the merits	65
XVI. CONCLUSION.....	66

LIST OF EXHIBITS¹

Ex-1001	U.S. Patent No. 8,166,081 B2, issued Apr. 24, 2012 (“’081 Patent”)
Ex-1002	Declaration of Dr. Kevin Almeroth
Ex-1003	Curriculum Vitae of Dr. Kevin Almeroth
Ex-1004	Prosecution History of U.S. Patent No. 8,166,081
Ex-1005	U.S. Patent No. 5,303,393 A, issued Apr. 12, 1994 (“Noreen”)
Ex-1006	U.S. Patent No. 6,628,928 B1, issued Sept. 30, 2003 (“Crosby”)
Ex-1007	WO Publication No. 2002/067447 A2, published Aug 29, 2002 (“Ellis-2002”)
Ex-1008	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0227611 A1, published Oct. 13, 2005 (“Ellis-2005”)
Ex-1009	Email from Albright Clerk, dated May 4, 2021
Ex-1010	[INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]
Ex-1011	[INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]
Ex-1012	[INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]
Ex-1013	[INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]
Ex-1014	[INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]
Ex-1015	[INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]
Ex-1016	[INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]
Ex-1017	[INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]
Ex-1018	[INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

¹ Four-digit pin citations that begin with 0 are to the page stamps added by Hyundai in the bottom right corner of the exhibits. All other pin citations are to original page, column, paragraph, and/or line numbers.

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.