

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AMAZON.COM, INC., AMAZON WEB SERVICES, INC.,
AND AMAZON.COM SERVICES LLC.,

Petitioners

v.

WAG ACQUISITION, LLC

Patent Owner

U.S. Pat. No. 9,762,636

Inter Partes Review Case No. IPR2022-01433

PATENT OWNER RESPONSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. INTRODUCTION 1
- II. DESCRIPTION OF THE DISCLOSURE AND CLAIMS 2
- III. LEVEL OF SKILL..... 5
- IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION..... 6
 - A. Construction: Preambles (a) 7
 - B. Construction: Limitation f. “each received request specifying one or more serial identifiers of the requested one or more media data elements.” EX1001-16:48-50..... 9
 - C. Construction: Limitation h. “the data connection between the server system and each requesting user system has a data rate more rapid than the playback rate of the one or more media data elements sent via that connection.” EX1001-16:57-60..... 10
 - D. Construction: Limitation j. “the one or more media data element sent are selected without depending on the server system maintaining a record of the last media data element sent to the requesting user systems.” EX1001-16:64-67. 14
 - E. Construction: Limitation k. “all of the media data elements that are sent by the server system to the one or more user systems are sent in response to the requests.” EX1001-17:1-3. 16
- V. ARGUMENT 18
 - A. Issues in Dispute..... 18
 - B. Response to Ground 1: Asserted obviousness over Carmel in view of Feig and Willebeek 19
 - 1. Overview of Carmel 19
 - a) Background and Disclosure 19
 - b) Opposing reads of Carmel 29
 - c) Conflicting testimony by Petitioner’s expert 29
 - 2. The Petition fails to show that limitation h is rendered obvious by Carmel alone or in view of Feig and Willebeek 36

a) Carmel fails to disclose limitation h (the data connection has a data rate more rapid than the playback rate)37

b) The Petition fails to show either obviousness or a reasonable expectation of success in modifying Carmel to provide a faster data connection41

 (1) Carmel teaches away44

 (2) No reasonable expectation of success47

 (a) No reasonable expectation that the proposed modification is even possible.....47

 (b) Proposed modification compromises reliability49

 (c) Even the faster proposed modification will still experience lag and the modified system will compromise quality50

3. The Petition fails to show that limitation j is disclosed by Carmel alone or in view of Feig (Push vs. Pull)51

 a) Carmel does not disclose limitation j.....51

 b) The Petition fails to provide a sufficient rationale for incorporating the teachings of Feig concerning limitation j into Carmel53

4. The Petition fails to show that limitation k is disclosed by Carmel (Push vs. Pull, again).....55

 a) Carmel does not disclose limitation k.....55

 b) The Petition fails to show that limitation k would have been an obvious modification of Carmel in view of Feig.....58

VI. CONCLUSION.....61

LIST OF PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBITS

Exhibit	Description
2001	<i>WAG Acquisition, LLC v. WebPower, Inc.</i> , 781 F. App'x 1007 (Fed. Cir. 2019)
2002	IETF RFC 1945
2003	CV of Kevin Jeffay, Ph.D.
2004	<i>Longhorn HD LLC v. Netscout Systems, Inc.</i> , Case No. 2:20-CV-00349, Memorandum Opinion (E.D. Tex., March 31, 2022)
2005	<i>3G Licensing, S.A. v. HTC Corp.</i> , Case No. 17-83, Memorandum Order (D. Del. March 30, 2022)
2006	<i>SEVEN Networks, LLC v. Google LLC</i> , Case No. 2:17-cv-442, Pretrial Conference (E.D. Tex., Dec. 12, 2018)
2007	Declaration of W. Leo Hoarty
2008	Declaration of Henry Houh (EX1002 of IPR2022-01228)
2009	Redline comparing declaration of Kevin Jeffay (EX2824) with Declaration of Henry Houh (EX2008)
2010	May 23, 2023, Deposition of Dr. Kevin Jeffay
2011	May 25, 2023, Deposition of Dr. Nathaniel Polish
2012	<i>In re Certain Fitness Devices, Streaming Components Thereof, and System Containing Same</i> , Inv. No. 337-TA-1265, Initial Determination (ITC, Sept. 9, 2022) (CALJ Clark S. Cheney)
2013	<i>In re Certain Fitness Devices, Streaming Components Thereof, and System Containing Same</i> , Inv. No. 337-TA-1265, Evidentiary Hearing – Volume III (ITC, March 14, 2022)

2014	<i>In re Certain Fitness Devices, Streaming Components Thereof, and System Containing Same</i> , Inv. No. 337-TA-1265, Document Filing Report
2015	Redline comparison of claims of '824 and '636 patents
2016	Final Written Decision, <i>WebPower v. WAG Acquisition, LLC</i> , IPR2016-01238, Paper No. 22 (Dec. 26, 2017)
2017	Final Written Decision on Remand, <i>WebPower v. WAG Acquisition, LLC</i> , IPR2016-01238, Paper No. 28 (July 16, 2020)
2018	IETF RFC 2068
2019	Microsoft Computer Dictionary, Fifth ed. (excerpts)
2020	<i>Avi Networks, Inc. v. Citrix Systems, Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00845, Ex. 1007
2021	Deposition of Dr. Henry Houh in IPR2022-01227 and -01228
2636	Declaration of Kevin Jeffay (Ex. 1002 of IPR2022-01433)
2824	Declaration of Kevin Jeffay (Ex. 1002 of IPR2022-01430)

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.