

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

EBAY, INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

LEXOS MEDIA IP, LLC,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2023-00337

U.S. Patent No. 6,118,449

PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW

OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,118,449

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b).....	1
A.	Real Parties-in-Interest	1
B.	Related Matters.....	2
C.	Counsel and Service Information	7
III.	PAYMENT OF FEES	8
IV.	GROUND FOR STANDING	8
V.	PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED	8
A.	Challenged Claim	8
B.	Statutory Grounds of Challenge	8
VI.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL.....	10
VII.	OVERVIEW OF THE '449 PATENT	10
A.	Priority Date of the '449 Patent.....	10
B.	State of the Art Before the Application for the '449 Patent.....	11
1.	Cursors in Graphical User Interfaces	11
2.	Client/Server Systems	12
C.	Summary of the '449 Patent	13
VIII.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	14
A.	Claim Term Construed in <i>APMEX</i> : “said specific image including content corresponding to at least a portion of said information to be displayed on said display of said user’s terminal”	16
B.	Subsequent Claim Constructions.....	17
IX.	DETAILED EXPLANATION OF GROUNDS	19
A.	Overview of Prior Art References	19
1.	Malamud (EX1004).....	19
2.	Nakagawa (EX1005).....	22
3.	Nielsen (EX1006).....	23
B.	Motivation to Combine References.....	25
1.	Legal Standard.....	25

2.	Motivation to Download Malamud’s Application Program from a Server, and the Obviousness of Doing So	26
3.	Motivation to Combine the Teachings of Malamud and Nakagawa, and the Obviousness of that Combination	28
4.	Motivation to Combine the Teachings of Nielsen and Malamud, and the Obviousness of that Combination	29
C.	Ground 1: The Challenged Claims Are Rendered Obvious by Malamud 31	
1.	Claim 1	31
2.	Claim 27	37
3.	Claim 53	38
D.	Ground 2: The Challenged Claims Are Rendered Obvious by Malamud and Nakagawa.....	46
1.	Claim 1	46
2.	Claim 27	50
3.	Claim 53	50
E.	Ground 3: The Challenged Claims Are Rendered Obvious by Nielsen and Malamud.....	53
1.	Claim 1	53
2.	Claim 27	59
3.	Claim 38	60
4.	Claim 53	60
X.	DISCRETIONARY DENIAL IS NOT APPROPRIATE	66
A.	The Board Should Not Deny Institution Under <i>Fintiv</i>	66
B.	The Board Should Not Deny Institution Under 35 U.S.C. § 325(d).....	68
C.	The Board Should Not Deny Institution Under <i>General Plastic</i>	69
XI.	CONCLUSION	69
	LISTING OF CHALLENGED CLAIMS OF THE ’449 PATENT	70
	CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT UNDER 37 CFR § 42.24(d).....	75
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	76

LIST OF EXHIBITS¹

Exhibit	Title
EX1001	U.S. Patent No. 5,995,102 entitled <i>Server System and Method for Modifying a Cursor Image</i> to James Samuel Rosen et al. (“the ’102 Patent”).
EX1002	U.S. Patent No. 6,118,449 entitled <i>Server System and Method for Modifying a Cursor Image</i> to James Samuel Rosen et al. (“the ’449 Patent”).
EX1003	Declaration of Dr. Craig Rosenberg.
EX1004	U.S. Patent No. 6,437,800 to Mark A. Malamud (“Malamud”).
EX1005	U.S. Patent No. 5,835,911 to Toru Nakagawa, et al. (“Nakagawa”).
EX1006	U.S. Patent No. 5,937,417 to Jakob Nielsen (“Nielsen”).
EX1007	<i>Lexos Media IP, LLC v. APMEX, Inc.</i> , No. 2:16-cv-00747-JRG-RSP (“ <i>APMEX</i> ”), Early Claim Construction Opinion and Order, Dkt. 86 (E.D. Tex., Mar. 16, 2017).
EX1008	<i>Lexos Media IP, LLC v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , No. 2:22-cv-00169-JRG, Parties’ Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement, Dkt. 89 (E.D. Tex., May 16, 2023) (including the exhibits attached thereto).
EX1009	U.S. Patent No. 5,754,176 to Chris Crawford (“Crawford”).
EX1010	File History of the ’102 Patent.
EX1011	File History of the ’449 Patent.
EX1012	Curriculum Vitae of Dr. Craig Rosenberg.
EX1013	Appendices to the Declaration of Dr. Craig Rosenberg.
EX1014	<i>Lexos Media IP, LLC v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , No. 2:22-cv-00169-JRG, Claim Construction Memorandum Opinion and Order, Dkt. 130 (E.D. Tex. Sep. 5, 2023)
EX1015	<i>Lexos Media IP, LLC v. Nike, Inc.</i> , No. 2:22-cv-00311-JRG, Claim Construction Order, Dkt. 187 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 2, 2023)

¹ Given the near complete overlap of the documents relied upon in this IPR Petition and those relied upon in the IPR Petition on the related ’449 Patent, Petitioner has included in this list and in both Petitions all documents relied upon in the two IPR Petitions so that the Board need only refer to one set of Exhibits.

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review
U.S. Patent No. 6,118,449

Exhibit	Title
EX1016	<i>Lexos Media IP, LLC v. Overstock.Com, Inc.</i> , No. 2:22-cv-2324-JAR-ADM, Memorandum and Order, Dkt. 99 (D. Kan. Dec. 4, 2023)
EX1017	<i>Lexos Media IP, LLC v. eBay, Inc.</i> , 6:22-cv-00648, Parties' Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement (Dkt. 76) (W.D. Tex. Oct. 17, 2023) (including the exhibits attached thereto)
EX1018	Lex Machina Stay Statistics on N.D. Cal.

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.