

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ROKU, INC.
Petitioner

v.

MEDIA CHAIN, LLC,
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2022-00392
U.S. Patent No. 10,515,191

**DECLARATION OF JOHN TINSMAN IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR
INTER PARTES REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 10,515,191**

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.	QUALIFICATIONS	2
III.	MATERIALS CONSIDERED.....	9
IV.	RELEVANT LEGAL STANDARDS	14
	A. Obviousness.....	14
	B. Level of Skill in the Art	16
	C. Motivation to Combine and Hindsight Bias	17
	D. Claim Construction	18
V.	TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND.....	19
	A. Licensing and Distribution of Digital Media.....	19
	1. E-Commerce and the Digital Revolution	19
	2. The Rise of Digital Rights Management Technology.....	20
	3. Cloud-Based Streaming and Licensing Models.....	23
	B. Digital Fingerprinting	24
	C. Targeted Marketing Based on User Demographics and Preferences.....	28
	1. Targeted Marketing Over the Internet	28
	2. Targeted Marketing Based on Users' Negative Preferences	32
VI.	OVERVIEW OF THE '191 PATENT	34
	A. Summary of the Disclosure	34
	1. Licensing and Distributing Digital Media Content	36
	2. Targeted Marketing.....	39
	B. Summary of the Claims	40
	1. Overview of the '191 Patent Claims	40
	2. The '191 Patent Claims Relative to Other Claims in the Family.....	44
	C. Summary of the Prosecution History.....	46
VII.	OVERVIEW OF THE PRIOR ART	47
	A. Peled.....	47

Declaration of John Tinsman
U.S. Pat. No. 10,515,191

B.	Brandstetter.....	55
C.	Pou	62
D.	Levy.....	66
E.	Vijay.....	73
VIII.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	76
IX.	GROUND 1: CLAIMS 1-4, 6-10, 12-16, 19-21, AND 23 OF THE '191 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 OVER PELED IN VIEW OF POU.....	76
A.	Overview of the Combination of Peled and Pou.....	77
1.	A POSA would have been motivated to combine Peled and Pou.....	77
2.	A POSA would have known how to combine Peled and Pou and would have had a reasonable expectation of success.	81
B.	Independent Claim 1	83
1.	[1P] “A computer implemented method for determining a target demographic for media marketing, comprising:”	83
2.	[1A] “receiving a first request from first user and a second request from a second user to reproduce the media content item;”	89
3.	[1B] “evaluating each of the first and second request to determine whether each of the first and second users has previously acquired a license to reproduce the media content item and offering the license to reproduce the media content item to each user when the each user does not have the license to reproduce the media content item;”	90
4.	[1C] “after the evaluation of the first request, extracting first user data specific to first user when the first user accepts the offer and acquires the license;”	95
5.	[1D] “after the evaluation of the second request, extracting second user data specific to the second user when the second user declines the offer to acquire the license;”	97
6.	[1E] “aggregating the extracted first and second user data into a statistics record,”	99

Declaration of John Tinsman
U.S. Pat. No. 10,515,191

7.	[1F] “wherein the statistics record summarizes the first user data and second user data;”	101
8.	[1G] “storing in a license database the statistics record so that the summarized first and second user data is accessible to a third party;”	102
9.	[1H] “analyzing by the third party, the statistics record, to determine the target demographic based on a first demographic corresponding to the first user data and a second demographic corresponding to the second user data;”	106
10.	[1I] “and marketing, by the third party, the media content item to a plurality of other users corresponding to the determined target demographic.”	109
C.	Independent Claim 7	110
D.	Independent Claim 13	123
E.	Independent Claim 19	128
F.	Claims 2 and 14	136
G.	Claims 3 and 15	140
H.	Claims 4, 10, 16, and 21.....	143
I.	Claims 6 and 23	148
J.	Claims 8 and 20	150
K.	Claim 9	153
L.	Claim 12	154
X.	GROUND 2: CLAIMS 5, 11, 17, AND 22 OF THE ’191 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 OVER PELED IN VIEW OF POU AND VIJAY	155
XI.	GROUND 3: CLAIM 18 OF THE ’191 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 OVER PELED IN VIEW OF POU AND BRANDSTETTER	161
XII.	GROUND 4: CLAIMS 1-4, 6-10, 12-16, 18-21, AND 23 OF THE ’191 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 OVER BRANDSTETTER IN VIEW OF LEVY	163
A.	Overview of the Combination of Brandstetter and Levy	164

Declaration of John Tinsman
U.S. Pat. No. 10,515,191

1.	A POSA would have been motivated to combine Brandstetter and Levy.	164
2.	A POSA would have known how to combine Brandstetter and Levy and would have had a reasonable expectation of success.	172
B.	Independent Claim 1	174
1.	[1P] “A computer implemented method for determining a target demographic for media marketing, comprising:”	174
2.	[1A] “receiving a first request from first user and a second request from a second user to reproduce the media content item;”	181
3.	[1B] “evaluating each of the first and second request to determine whether each of the first and second users has previously acquired a license to reproduce the media content item and offering the license to reproduce the media content item to each user when the each user does not have the license to reproduce the media content item;”	183
4.	[1C] “after the evaluation of the first request, extracting first user data specific to first user when the first user accepts the offer and acquires the license;”	194
5.	[1D] “after the evaluation of the second request, extracting second user data specific to the second user when the second user declines the offer to acquire the license;”	196
6.	[1E] “aggregating the extracted first and second user data into a statistics record,”	198
7.	[1F] “wherein the statistics record summarizes the first user data and second user data;”	200
8.	[1G] “storing in a license database the statistics record so that the summarized first and second user data is accessible to a third party;”	201
9.	[1H] “analyzing by the third party, the statistics record, to determine the target demographic based on a first demographic corresponding to the first user data and a second demographic corresponding to the second user data;”	206

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.