

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

COMCAST CABLE COMMUNICATIONS, LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

TOUCHSTREAM TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Patent No. 11,048,751
Filing Date: August 25, 2017
Issue Date: June 29, 2021
Title: PLAY CONTROL OF CONTENT ON A DISPLAY DEVICE

Inter Partes Review No.: IPR2024-00323

DECLARATION OF DAVID B. LETT

**IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.100 *et seq.***

Declaration in Support of Petition 1 of 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS	1
3. MATERIALS CONSIDERED	7
4. UNDERSTANDING OF APPLICABLE LEGAL STANDARDS	11
5. THE RELEVANT ART AND LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE RELEVANT ART	15
6. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	16
7. OVERVIEW OF THE '751 PATENT	21
7.1. PROSECUTION HISTORY	23
8. OVERVIEW OF THE PRIOR ART	27
8.1. STREAMING FORMATS AND VOD	27
8.2. MEDIA PLAYERS	28
8.3. APPLICATIONS ON TVS AND STBS	30
8.4. DEVICE CASTING	31
8.5. REMOTE VIEWING	32
8.6. FILE EXTENSIONS AND MIME TYPES	33
8.7. APPLICATION PROGRAMMING INTERFACES (APIS)	35
8.8. LOOK-UP TABLES (LUTS)	37
8.9. U.S. PAT. NO. 8,660,545 – REDFORD (EX. 1005)	37
8.10. U.S. PUB. NO. 2008/0235588 – GONZE (EX. 1006)	52
8.11. U.S. PUB. NO. 2006/0107299 - BARTFELD (EX. 1018)	56
9. IDENTIFICATION OF HOW CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE	60
10. SUMMARY OF OPINIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE '751 PATENT	60
11. REDFORD-BARTFELD AND REDFORD-GONZE-BARTFELD RENDER CLAIMS 1-20 OBVIOUS	61
11.1. INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1	61

- 11.2. DEPENDENT CLAIM 2: “THE NON-TRANSITORY COMPUTER STORAGE MEDIUM OF CLAIM 1, WHEREIN EACH COMMAND OF THE AT LEAST ONE COMMAND IN THE SECOND FORMAT IS A UNIVERSAL COMMAND.”.....112
- 11.3. DEPENDENT CLAIM 3: “THE NON-TRANSITORY COMPUTER STORAGE MEDIUM OF CLAIM 2, WHEREIN THE FIRST FORMAT IS DIFFERENT THAN THE SECOND FORMAT.”112
- 11.4. DEPENDENT CLAIM 4: “THE NON-TRANSITORY COMPUTER STORAGE MEDIUM OF CLAIM 1, WHEREIN THE SECOND MESSAGE IS SENT FROM THE ASSOCIATED SECOND COMPUTING DEVICE TO THE REMOTE SERVER DEVICE.”116
- 11.5. DEPENDENT CLAIM 5: “THE NON-TRANSITORY COMPUTER STORAGE MEDIUM OF CLAIM 1, WHEREIN THE REMOTE SERVER DEVICE IS CONFIGURED TO CONVERT THE AT LEAST ONE COMMAND IN THE SECOND FORMAT INTO THE AT LEAST ONE COMMAND IN THE FIRST FORMAT BASED AT LEAST IN PART ON THE SECOND MESSAGE INCLUDING THEREIN A REFERENCE TO THE FIRST PIECE OF CONTENT.”.....117
- 11.6. DEPENDENT CLAIM 6: “THE NON-TRANSITORY COMPUTER STORAGE MEDIUM OF CLAIM 1, WHEREIN THE REMOTE SERVER DEVICE IS CONFIGURED TO CONVERT THE AT LEAST ONE COMMAND IN THE SECOND FORMAT INTO THE AT LEAST ONE COMMAND IN THE FIRST FORMAT BASED AT LEAST IN PART ON A REFERENCE TO THE FIRST MEDIA PLAYER APPLICATION HAVING BEEN INCLUDED IN THE SECOND MESSAGE.”119
- 11.7. DEPENDENT CLAIM 7: “THE NON-TRANSITORY COMPUTER STORAGE MEDIUM OF CLAIM 1, WHEREIN THE FIRST MEDIA PLAYER APPLICATION IS SELECTED BASED AT LEAST IN PART ON THE RECEIVED FIRST MESSAGE INCLUDING THEREIN A

	REFERENCE TO THE FIRST MEDIA PLAYER APPLICATION.”	129
11.8.	DEPENDENT CLAIM 8: “THE NON-TRANSITORY COMPUTER STORAGE MEDIUM OF CLAIM 1, WHEREIN CONTROLLING HOW THE SELECTED FIRST MEDIA PLAYER APPLICATION PLAYS THE REFERENCED FIRST PIECE OF CONTENT INCLUDES AN EXECUTION OF THE FIRST COMMAND.”	131
11.9.	DEPENDENT CLAIM 9: “THE NON-TRANSITORY COMPUTER STORAGE MEDIUM OF CLAIM 1, THE OPERATIONS FURTHER COMPRISING: RETRIEVING THE FIRST MEDIA PLAYER APPLICATION FROM A REMOTE CONTENT PROVIDER BASED ON A DETERMINATION THAT THE FIRST MEDIA PLAYER APPLICATION IS NOT ALREADY SELECTED.”	131
11.10.	DEPENDENT CLAIM 10: “THE NON-TRANSITORY COMPUTER STORAGE MEDIUM OF CLAIM 9, WHEREIN THE REMOTE CONTENT PROVIDER IS ASSOCIATED WITH THE REFERENCED FIRST PIECE OF CONTENT.”	132
11.11.	DEPENDENT CLAIM 11:.....	133
11.12.	INDEPENDENT CLAIM 12.....	136
11.13.	DEPENDENT CLAIM 13: “THE COMPUTER-IMPLEMENTED METHOD OF CLAIM 12, WHEREIN THE FIRST MEDIA PLAYER APPLICATION IS SELECTED BASED FURTHER IN PART ON THE RECEIVED FIRST MESSAGE INCLUDING THEREIN A REFERENCE TO THE FIRST MEDIA PLAYER APPLICATION.”	185
11.14.	DEPENDENT CLAIM 14: “THE COMPUTER-IMPLEMENTED METHOD OF CLAIM 12, THE OPERATIONS FURTHER COMPRISING: SELECTING THE FIRST MEDIA PLAYER APPLICATION BASED ON A DETERMINATION THAT A SECOND MEDIA PLAYER APPLICATION IS CURRENTLY SELECTED.”	187
11.15.	DEPENDENT CLAIM 15: “THE COMPUTER-IMPLEMENTED METHOD OF CLAIM 12, FURTHER COMPRISING: RETRIEVING, BY THE CONTENT	

	PRESENTATION DEVICE, THE SELECTED FIRST MEDIA PLAYER APPLICATION FROM A REMOTE CONTENT PROVIDER BASED ON THE FIRST FORMAT OF THE FIRST MESSAGE.”	189
11.16.	DEPENDENT CLAIM 16: “THE COMPUTER-IMPLEMENTED METHOD OF CLAIM 12, WHEREIN THE REMOTE SERVER DEVICE IS CONFIGURED TO CONVERT THE AT LEAST ONE COMMAND IN THE SECOND FORMAT INTO THE AT LEAST ONE COMMAND IN THE FIRST FORMAT BASED AT LEAST IN PART ON A REFERENCE TO THE FIRST MEDIA PLAYER APPLICATION HAVING BEEN INCLUDED IN THE SECOND MESSAGE, AND WHEREIN THE FIRST MEDIA PLAYER APPLICATION IS SELECTED BASED FURTHER ON THE AT LEAST ONE COMMAND IN THE FIRST FORMAT HAVING BEEN CONVERTED FROM THE SECOND FORMAT.”	190
11.17.	INDEPENDENT CLAIM 17.....	199
11.18.	DEPENDENT CLAIM 18: “THE CONTENT PRESENTATION DEVICE OF CLAIM 17, WHEREIN THE FIRST MEDIA PLAYER APPLICATION IS CONFIGURED TO RECOGNIZE EACH COMMAND OF THE AT LEAST ONE COMMAND IN THE FIRST FORMAT.”	250
11.19.	DEPENDENT CLAIM 19: “THE CONTENT PRESENTATION DEVICE OF CLAIM 17, WHEREIN THE SECOND MESSAGE IS SENT FROM THE ASSOCIATED SECOND COMPUTING DEVICE TO THE REMOTE SERVER DEVICE.”.....	253
11.20.	DEPENDENT CLAIM 20: “THE CONTENT PRESENTATION DEVICE OF CLAIM 18, WHEREIN THE FIRST MEDIA PLAYER APPLICATION IS SELECTED BASED FURTHER ON THE RECEIVED FIRST MESSAGE INCLUDING THEREIN A REFERENCE TO THE FIRST MEDIA PLAYER APPLICATION.”.....	254
12.	CONCLUSION.....	256
	CLAIM LISTING APPENDIX.....	257

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.