

Filed: January 25, 2023

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SONY GROUP CORPORATION (JAPAN), SONY CORPORATION OF  
AMERICA, SONY INTERACTIVE ENTERTAINMENT LLC, SONY  
PICTURES ENTERTAINMENT INC., SONY ELECTRONICS INC., and  
VERANCE CORPORATION,  
Petitioners,

v.

MZ AUDIO SCIENCES, LLC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2022-01544  
Patent 7,289,961

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE  
UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 313 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART .....	2
III.	TECHNOLOGICAL BACKGROUND .....	2
	A. General Principles and Properties of Sound Waves.....	2
	B. The '961 Patent .....	6
	1. First Preferred Embodiment.....	8
	2. Second Preferred Embodiment .....	9
IV.	THE ASSERTED PRIOR ART REFERENCES .....	12
	A. <i>Srinivasan</i> (Ex. 1005).....	12
	B. <i>Cabot</i> (Ex. 1006) .....	15
	C. <i>Kudumakis</i> (Ex. 1007).....	17
	D. <i>Tilki</i> (Ex. 1008).....	19
	E. <i>Hobson</i> (Ex. 1042) .....	20
V.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION .....	22
VI.	STANDARD FOR INSTITUTING IPR .....	23
VII.	<i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW SHOULD NOT BE INSTITUTED .....	24
	A. <i>Cabot</i> Teaches Away From Using Fundamentals and Third Harmonics, Destroying Any Motivation to Combine Required by All Asserted Grounds .....	24
	B. Petitioners Fail to Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood of Prevailing on Ground 1 .....	30
	1. <i>Srinivasan</i> Operates Within a Specific Frequency Range that Is Incompatible with Petitioners' Proposed Modifications .....	30

2.	A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine <i>Srinivasan, Cabot, and Kudumakis</i> .....	34
a)	A POSA Reading <i>Srinivasan</i> Would Not Consider <i>Cabot</i> .....	35
b)	<i>Kudumakis</i> Teaches Away from the Modification Proposed by Petitioners .....	37
c)	Petitioners Fail to Explain How to Combine the Disparate Systems of the Purported <i>Srinivasan/Cabot/Kudumakis</i> Combination .....	38
d)	Dr. Scordilis’ Prior Statements Cast Doubt on His Present Opinions.....	40
C.	Petitioners Fail to Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood of Prevailing on Ground 2 .....	43
1.	A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine <i>Srinivasan, Cabot, Kudumakis, and Hobson</i> .....	43
2.	<i>Hobson</i> is Not Analogous Art.....	43
a)	Legal Standard for Analogous Art .....	44
b)	<i>Hobson</i> Does Not Qualify as Analogous Art Under the “Same Field of Endeavor” Test .....	46
c)	<i>Hobson</i> Does Not Qualify as Analogous Art Under the “Reasonably Pertinent to the Particular Problem with Which the Inventor Is Involved” Test.....	51
D.	Petitioners Fail to Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood of Prevailing on Ground 3 .....	52
1.	A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine <i>Kudumakis, Cabot, and Tilki</i> .....	52
2.	<i>Kudumakis</i> and <i>Cabot</i> Do Not Motivate the Use of Fundamentals and Third Harmonics for Encoding.....	59

3.	A POSA Would Not Have Modified <i>Tilki</i> to Decrease Its Data Rate.....	61
4.	A POSA Would Not Have a Reasonable Expectation of Success in Modifying <i>Tilki</i> to Use Fundamentals and Third Harmonics as Reference and Signal Bins.....	62
E.	The Board Should Deny Grounds 1-2 Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) Because <i>Srinivasan</i> Is Cumulative of Art Before the Examiner.....	63
1.	The Substantially Same Art Previously Was Considered by the Office.....	63
2.	Petitioners Have Failed to Demonstrate that the Office Erred in a Manner Material to the Patentability of the Challenged Claims.....	64
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	66

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Adidas AG, v. Nike, Inc.</i> , IPR2016-00922, Paper 31 (PTAB Feb. 19, 2019).....	32
<i>Advanced Bionics, LLC v. Med-El Elektromedizinische Geräte GMBH</i> , IPR2019-01469, Paper 6 (PTAB Feb. 13, 2020).....	63, 64, 66
<i>Agamatrix, Inc. v. Dexcom, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-01718, Paper 10 (PTAB Mar. 13, 2019) .....	29
<i>Apple Inc. et al. v. Arigna Technology, Ltd.</i> , IPR2022-0139, Paper 9 (PTAB Dec. 2, 2022) .....	40
<i>Arctic Cat Inc. v. Bombardier Rec. Prods. Inc.</i> , 876 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	27
<i>Axalta Coating Systems, LLC v. PPG Industries Ohio, Inc.</i> , IPR2022-00676, Paper 10 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2022).....	28
<i>Darfon Electronics Corp. v. Michael Shipman</i> , IPR2022-01008, Paper 11 (PTAB Dec. 2, 2022) .....	66
<i>Deeper, UAB v. Vexilar, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-01310, Paper 7 (PTAB Jan. 24, 2019).....	24
<i>Duhn Oil Tool, Inc. v. Cooper Cameron Corp.</i> , 474 F. Supp. 2d 1148 (E.D. Cal. 2007).....	64
<i>Env't Designs, Ltd. v. Union Oil Co. of California</i> , 713 F.2d 693 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....	43
<i>Google LLC v. Valtrus Innovations Limited</i> , IPR2022-01197, Paper 9 (PTAB Jan. 3, 2023).....	66
<i>In re Bigio</i> , 381 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	44, 45, 52
<i>In re Clay</i> , 966 F.2d 656 (Fed. Cir. 1992).....	44, 45

# 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.