UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

_____

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

_____

VERANCE CORP.,
Petitioner,

v.
MZ AUDIO SCIENCES, LLC,
Patent Owner.

_____

IPR2022-01544
Patent 7,289,961 B2

_____

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.120

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

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. *Srinivasan* (Ex. 1005) 12

B. *Cabot* (Ex. 1006) 16

C. *Kudumakis* (Ex. 1007) 18

D. *Tilki* (Ex. 1008) 20

E. *Hobson* (Ex. 1042) 21

V. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 23

VI. THE PETITION FAILS TO ESTABLISH THAT ANY OF THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE 23

A. *Cabot* Teaches Away From Using Fundamentals and Third Harmonics, Destroying Any Motivation to Combine Required by All Asserted Grounds 23

1. *Cabot's* Experimental Data Contradicts Petitioner 24

2. Dr. Scordilis' Testimony Undermines the Foundation of the Petition 29

3. Petitioner's Tertiary References Would Dissuade a POSA 33

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

B. Petitioner Fails to Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood of Prevailing on Ground 1 36

1. *Srinivasan* Operates Within a Specific Frequency Range that Is Incompatible with Petitioner's Proposed Modifications 36

2. A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine *Srinivasan*, *Cabot*, and *Kudumakis* 41

a) A POSA Reading *Srinivasan* Would Not Consider *Cabot* 42

b) *Kudumakis* Teaches Away from the Modification Proposed by Petitioner 43

c) Petitioner Fails to Explain How to Combine the Disparate Systems of the Purported *Srinivasan/Cabot/Kudumakis* Combination 45

C. Petitioner Fails to Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood of Prevailing on Ground 2 47

1. A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine *Srinivasan*, *Cabot*, *Kudumakis*, and *Hobson* 47

2. *Hobson* is Not Analogous Art 47

a) Legal Standard for Analogous Art 48

b) *Hobson* Does Not Qualify as Analogous Art Under the "Same Field of Endeavor" Test 50

c) *Hobson* Does Not Qualify as Analogous Art Under the "Reasonably Pertinent to the Particular Problem with Which the Inventor Is Involved" Test 55

D. Petitioner Fails to Demonstrate a Reasonable Likelihood of Prevailing on Ground 3 57

1. A POSA Would Not Have Been Motivated to Combine *Kudumakis*, *Cabot*, and *Tilki* 57

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

2. *Kudumakis* and *Cabot* Do Not Motivate the Use of Fundamentals and Third Harmonics for Encoding.....63

3. A POSA Would Not Have Modified *Tilki* to Decrease Its Data Rate.....65

4. A POSA Would Not Have a Reasonable Expectation of Success in Modifying *Tilki* to Use Fundamentals and Third Harmonics as Reference and Signal Bins.....66

VII. CONCLUSION.....67

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Adidas AG, v, Nike, Inc.,
IPR2016-00922, Paper 31 (PTAB Feb. 19, 2019).....39

Agamatrix, Inc. v. Dexcom, Inc.,
IPR2018-01718, Paper 10 (PTAB Mar. 13, 2019) 29

Apple Inc. et al. v. Arigna Technology, Ltd.,
IPR2022-0139, Paper 9 (PTAB Dec. 2, 20222) 47

Arctic Cat Inc. v. Bombardier Rec. Prods. Inc.,
876 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....28

Axalta Coating Systems, LLC v. PPG Industries Ohio, Inc.,
IPR2022-00676, Paper 10 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2022).....28

In re Bigio,
381 F.3d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 2004)..... 48, 49, 56

In re Clay,
966 F.2d 656 (Fed. Cir. 1992)..... 48, 49

In re Deminski,
796 F.2d 436 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....51

In re Fulton,
391 F.3d 1195 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....28

In re Gurley,
27 F.3d 551 (Fed. Cir. 1994)..... 27, 43

In re Kahn,
441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....43

In re Klein,
647 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2011)..... 48, 50

In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.,
829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....41

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.