

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ROKU, INC.
Petitioner

v.

MEDIA CHAIN, LLC,
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2022-00394
U.S. Patent No. 10,885,154

**DECLARATION OF JOHN TINSMAN IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR
INTER PARTES REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 10,885,154**

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 and Watermarking.....	24
	1. Digital Fingerprints	24
	2. Digital Watermarks.....	29
	C. Targeted Marketing Based on User Demographics and Preferences.	30
	1. Targeted Marketing Over the Internet.....	30
	2. Targeted Marketing Based on Users' Negative Preferences ...	34
VI.	OVERVIEW OF THE '154 PATENT	36
	A. Summary of the Disclosure	36
	1. Licensing and Distributing Digital Media Content.....	38
	2. Targeted Marketing.....	42
	B. Summary of the Claims	43
	1. Overview of the '154 Patent Claims	43
	2. The '154 Patent Claims Relative to Other Claims in the Family.....	47
	C. Summary of the Prosecution History	49

VII. OVERVIEW OF THE PRIOR ART.....	50
A. Brandstetter	50
B. Peled.....	57
C. Levy	65
D. Pou.....	71
E. Rassool.....	76
VIII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	77
IX. GROUND 1: CLAIMS 1-2 AND 4-18 OF THE '154 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 OVER BRANDSTETTER IN VIEW OF LEVY.....	77
A. Overview of the Combination of Brandstetter and Levy.....	78
1. A POSA would have been motivated to combine Brandstetter and Levy.....	78
2. A POSA would have known how to combine Brandstetter and Levy and would have had a reasonable expectation of success.....	85
B. Independent Claim 1	87
1. [1P]: “A multimedia hardware device comprising:”	87
2. [1A]: “a processor; and:”	88
3. [1B]: “a memory coupled with the processor, the memory including instructions that, when executed by the processor cause the processor to:”	89
4. [1C]: “generate a first request from a user to evaluate streaming a first media content item to the device;”.....	89
5. [1D]: “identify the first media content item by determining a first media fingerprint that identifies a first unique characteristic inherently present in the first media content item captured during the recorded creation of the first media content item, and excluding information introduced to the first media content item extraneous to the recorded creation;”.....	91
6. [1E]: “extract first user data specific to the user when the user accepts to stream the first media content item;”.....	98

Declaration of John Tinsman
U.S. Pat. No. 10,885,154

7.	[1F]: “generate a second request from the user to evaluate streaming a second media content item to the device;”	103
8.	[1G]: “identify the second media content item by determining a second media fingerprint that identifies a second unique characteristic inherently present in the second media content item captured during the recorded creation of the second media content item, and excluding information introduced to the second media content item extraneous to the recorded creation;”	104
9.	[1H]: “extract second user data specific to the user when the user declines to stream the second media content item;”	105
10.	[1I]: “aggregate the extracted first user data into a first statistics record and the extracted second user data into a second statistics record, wherein the first statistics record summarizes the first user data and the second statistics record summarizes the second user data; and”	108
11.	[1J]: “transmit to a database the first and second statistics record with the identities of the first and second media content items determined by the first and second media fingerprints so that the summarized first and second user data is accessible to a third party online retailer for”	111
12.	[1K]: “retrieving the first and second statistics record with the identities of the first and second media content items determined by the first and second media fingerprints,”	116
13.	[1L]: “analyzing the retrieved first and second statistics record to determine a target demographic of the first and second media content items based on a demographic corresponding to the first and second user data, and”	118
14.	[1M]: “providing the third party online retail[er] the target demographic to market the media content item to a plurality of other users corresponding to the target demographic of the media content item.”	125
C.	Claim 2	129
D.	Claim 4	130
E.	Claim 5	131
F.	Claim 6	133

Declaration of John Tinsman
U.S. Pat. No. 10,885,154

G.	Claim 7	134
H.	Claim 8	135
I.	Claim 9	136
J.	Claim 10.....	141
K.	Claim 11.....	143
L.	Claim 12.....	146
M.	Claim 13.....	148
N.	Claim 14.....	154
O.	Claim 15.....	159
P.	Claim 16.....	161
Q.	Claim 17.....	163
R.	Claim 18.....	166
X.	GROUND 2: CLAIM 3 OF THE '154 PATENT IS UNPATENTABLE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 OVER BRANDSTETTER IN VIEW OF LEVY AND RASSOOL.	168
XI.	GROUND 3: CLAIMS 1-2, 4-7, AND 9-18 OF THE '154 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 OVER PELED IN VIEW OF POU.....	172
A.	Overview of the Combination of Peled and Pou.....	172
1.	A POSA would have been motivated to combine Peled and Pou.....	173
2.	A POSA would have known how to combine Peled and Pou and would have had a reasonable expectation of success.	179
B.	Independent Claim 1	181
1.	[1P]: “A multimedia hardware device comprising:”	181
2.	[1A]: “a processor; and:”	184
3.	[1B]: “a memory coupled with the processor, the memory including instructions that, when executed by the processor cause the processor to:”	184
4.	[1C]: “generate a first request from a user to evaluate streaming a first media content item to the device;”	185

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.