

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

ROKU, INC.,  
Petitioner

v.

MEDIA CHAIN, LLC,  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2022-00391  
U.S. Patent 10,489,560

---

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW  
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 10,489,560**

***Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"***  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	IDENTIFICATION OF UNPATENTABILITY GROUNDS.....	2
III.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....	2
IV.	OVERVIEW OF THE '560 PATENT .....	3
	A. Summary of Disclosure.....	3
	1. Licensing and Distributing Digital Media Content.....	3
	2. Targeted Marketing.....	7
	B. Prosecution History and Alleged Novelty .....	8
	C. The '560 Patent Claims.....	9
	D. Other Challenged Patents.....	10
V.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	10
VI.	GROUND 1: CLAIMS 1-14 AND 16-19 OF THE '560 PATENT ARE OBVIOUS OVER PELED-POU.....	12
	A. Overview of Peled .....	12
	B. Overview of Pou.....	13
	C. A POSA Would Have Combined Peled and Pou.....	16
	1. A POSA would have been motivated to improve Peled's distribution of content by including Pou's licensing management framework.....	16
	2. A POSA would have known how to combine Peled and Pou and would have had a reasonable expectation of success.....	18
	D. Peled-Pou Discloses Claim 1. ....	19
	1. [1P].....	19
	2. [1A] "receiving a request from a user to stream the media content item." .....	21
	3. [1B] "evaluating the request to stream to determine whether the user has acquired a license ...and offering the license ... when the user does not have the license to stream the media content item." .....	22

*Petition for Inter Partes Review of  
U.S. Patent No. 10,489,560*

4.	[1C] “extracting user data that is specific to the user” when the user streams and declines to stream the media content item, “wherein the user data includes demographic data” that enables a third party online retailer to gauge a demographic that streamed the media content item and a demographic that declined to stream that “enables the third party online retailer to target marketing of different media content items” based on a user’s “trend of interest.” .....	26
	(a) [1C.1] “extracting user data”.....	26
	(b) [1C.2] “user data includes demographic data” enabling a third party online retailer to gauge a demographic .....	27
	(c) [1C.3] user data includes a “history of media content items” that the user has streamed to allow for targeted marketing.....	30
	(d) [1C.4] marketing media content items based on a determined trend of interest for the user.....	30
5.	[1D] “aggregating the user data into a statistics record.”.....	31
6.	[1E] “storing” the statistics record in a license database “so that the user data is accessible to the third party online retailer.” ....	32
7.	[1F] “analyzing a plurality of statistics records... to provide the third party online retailer with the aggregated user data.” .....	33
E.	Claim 6. ....	34
F.	Claim 11. ....	38
G.	Claim 16. ....	39
H.	Claims 2 and 12 (receiving a license to [reproduce/stream] the media content from a licensing system when the request is granted, and “preventing streaming... when the request is declined”). .....	42
I.	Claims 3 and 13 (“plurality of [reproduction/streaming] parameters”). .....	43
J.	Claims 4, 9, 14, and 18 (storing in the license database the user data so that it is “accessible to a third party online media retailer”). .....	43
K.	Claims 5 and 19 (“geographic location”). .....	44
L.	Claim 7 and 17 (generating and storing a “license record in a registered user database”)......	45

M.	Claim 8 (“fingerprint”).	45
N.	Claim 10 (user data includes “additional media content items” previously accessed).	46
VII.	GROUND 2: CLAIM 15 IS OBVIOUS OVER PELED, POU, AND BRANDSTETTER.	46
VIII.	GROUND 3: CLAIMS 1-19 ARE OBVIOUS OVER BRANDSTETTER-LEVY.	47
A.	Overview of Brandstetter	47
B.	Overview of Levy	50
C.	A POSA Would Have Combined Brandstetter and Levy.	53
1.	A POSA would have been motivated to improve Brandstetter’s content licensing platform with Levy’s content identification and fingerprinting framework.	53
2.	A POSA would have known how to combine Brandstetter and Levy and would have had a reasonable expectation of success.	56
D.	Brandstetter-Levy Discloses Claim 1.	57
1.	[1P].	57
2.	[1A] “receiving a request from a user to stream the media content item.”	59
3.	[1B] “evaluating the request to stream to determine whether the user has acquired a license ...and offering the license ... when the user does not have the license to stream the media content item.”	60
4.	[1C] “extracting user data that is specific to the user” when the user streams and declines to stream the media content item, “wherein the user data includes demographic data” that enables a third party online retailer to gauge a demographic that streamed the media content item and a demographic that declined to stream that “enables the third party online retailer to target marketing of different media content items” based on a user’s “trend of interest.”	64
(a)	[1C.1] “extracting user data”	64
(b)	[1C.2] “user data includes demographic data” enabling a third party online retailer to gauge a demographic	65

*Petition for Inter Partes Review of  
U.S. Patent No. 10,489,560*

(c)	[1C.3] user data includes a “history of media content items” that the user has streamed to allow for targeted marketing.....	67
(d)	[1C.4] marketing media content items based on a determined trend of interest for the user.....	69
5.	[1D] “aggregating the user data into a statistics record.”.....	70
6.	[1E] “storing” the statistics record in a license database “so that the user data is accessible to the third party online retailer.” ....	70
7.	[1F] “analyzing a plurality of statistics records... to provide the third party online retailer with the aggregated user data.” .....	72
E.	Claim 6. ....	74
F.	Claim 11. ....	79
G.	Claim 16. ....	80
H.	Claims 2 and 12 (receiving a license to [reproduce/stream] the media content from a licensing system when the request is granted, and “prevent[ing] streaming... when the request is declined”). ....	83
I.	Claims 3 and 13 (“plurality of [reproduction/streaming] parameters”). .....	84
J.	Claims 4, 9, 14, and 18 (storing in a license database the user data ... that is accessible to the third party). ....	85
K.	Claims 5 and 19 (“geographic location”). ....	86
L.	Claims 7 and 17 (generating and storing a “license record in a registered user database”). ....	87
M.	Claim 8 (“fingerprint”). ....	89
N.	Claims 10 and 15 (user data includes “additional media content items” previously accessed and “a quantity of times that the user has previously accessed the media content item”). ....	89
IX.	PETITIONER IS UNAWARE OF ANY SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS. ....	90
X.	THE BOARD SHOULD NOT EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION TO DENY THIS PETITION BASED ON EITHER 35 U.S.C. § 314(A) OR § 325(D). ....	90
A.	The Board Should Not Use its Discretion to Deny the Petition Under § 314(a). ....	90

# 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.