

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

HYUNDAI MOTOR AMERICA,
Petitioner

v.

STRATOSAUDIO, INC.,
Patent Owner

IPR2021-01303
U.S. Patent No. 8,688,028

PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

II.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BACKGROUND OF STRATOSAUDIO, INC.	6
III.	THE '028 PATENT	7
	A. Specification	7
	B. Claim 11	16
	C. Claim 16	18
IV.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART	19
V.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	19
	A. “broadcast segment”	20
	B. “media content”	22
	C. Additional terms identified by the Board.....	22
	1. “receiving a broadcast stream comprising the at least one broadcast segment and associated media content”	23
	2. “associating/associated”	24
	3. “corollary”	25
VI.	THE CITED PRIOR ART	25
	A. Curtin (EX1010).....	25
	B. Crosby (EX1006)	29
	C. Alwadish (EX1011).....	31
	D. Koerber (EX1012).....	35

VII. CLAIMS 11 AND 13-20 ARE NOT RENDERED OBVIOUS BY CURTIN ALONE (GROUND 1).....36

A. Curtin alone does not render Claim 11 obvious.....36

1. Element 11[pre]: A method for correlating media content identifying data with at least one broadcast segment received by a communication device.....36

2. Element 11[a]: receiving a broadcast stream comprising the at least one broadcast segment and associated media content.....41

3. Element 11[e]: providing for presentation of at least a portion of the data elements stored in the electronic memory of the communication device, whereby the providing provides selective outputting, using an interface, of at least one of the following: the media content identifying data, the media content, the corollary broadcast segment, a temporal position of the corollary broadcast segment of the broadcast stream.....42

B. Curtin alone does not render Claims 13-20 obvious.....47

C. Curtin alone does not render Claim 16 obvious.....47

VIII. CLAIMS 11 AND 13-20 ARE NOT RENDERED OBVIOUS BY CURTIN IN VIEW OF CROSBY (GROUND 2).....48

A. A POSITA would not have been motivated to combine the teachings of Curtin and Crosby, and would not have had a reasonable expectation of success in doing so48

B. A POSITA would not have been motivated to consider Petitioner’s proposed combination of the teachings of Curtin and Crosby, and would not have had a reasonable expectation of success in doing so.51

C. Curtin in view of Crosby does not render Claim 11 obvious54

D. Curtin in view of Crosby does not render Claims 13-20 obvious.....57

IX.	CLAIMS 11, 14, 15 AND 18 ARE NOT RENDERED OBVIOUS BY ALWADISH ALONE (GROUND 3)	58
A.	Alwadish alone does not render Claim 11 obvious.....	58
1.	Element 11[pre]: A method for correlating media content identifying data with at least one broadcast segment received by a communication device, the system comprising.....	58
2.	Element 11[d]: storing in an electronic memory of the communication device, at a minimum, media content identifying data elements into identifying data aggregates, each identifying data aggregate associated with at least one of the plurality of media content and the at least one broadcast segment, wherein the at least one broadcast segment is corollary to the at least one of the plurality of media content	60
3.	Alwadish alone does not render Claims 14, 15 and 18 obvious	62
X.	CLAIMS 12 AND 16 ARE NOT RENDERED OBVIOUS BY ALWADISH ALONE (GROUND 4).....	62
A.	Alwadish alone does not render Claim 12 obvious.....	62
B.	Alwadish alone does not render Claim 16 obvious.....	63
XI.	CLAIMS 12 AND 16 ARE NOT RENDERED OBVIOUS BY ALWADISH IN VIEW OF KOERBER (GROUND 5).....	65
A.	Alwadish in view of Koerber does not render Claim 12 obvious.....	65
B.	Alwadish in view of Koerber does not render Claims 16 obvious	67
XII.	SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS SUPPORT PATENTABILITY	67
XIII.	CONCLUSION.....	68

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

CASES

<i>Boehringer Ingelheim Vetmedica, Inc. v. Schering-Plough Corp.</i> , 320 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	36
<i>In re Wertheim</i> , 541 F.2d 257 (CCPA 1976)	36
<i>KSR Intern. Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007)	48
<i>Plantronics, Inc. v. Aliph, Inc.</i> , 724 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	48

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.