

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

TOUCHSTREAM TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2022-00795
U.S. Patent No. 8,356,251

**PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R § 42.120**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|------|--|----|
| I. | The '251 Patent..... | 4 |
| A. | Claims | 4 |
| B. | Specification | 6 |
| C. | Prosecution History | 11 |
| II. | Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art | 12 |
| III. | Claim Construction..... | 13 |
| A. | “Media Player” | 13 |
| B. | “Programming Code” | 16 |
| IV. | Petitioner’s Grounds and Cited References..... | 20 |
| A. | Muthukumarasamy | 20 |
| 1. | Muthukumarasamy’s presentation and selection of content | 22 |
| 2. | Muthukumarasamy describes two distinct processes that may be initiated by the IED | 24 |
| B. | Hayward..... | 28 |
| V. | Legal Standards | 29 |
| VI. | The Challenged Claims Would Not Have Been Obvious over Muthukumarasamy Alone (Ground I) or in View of Hayward (Ground II) | 30 |
| A. | Muthukumarasamy Describes Two Distinct Processes, Neither Disclosing the Claimed Method, and Petitioner Fails to Show Any Obvious Modification Satisfying the Claims | 31 |
| 1. | Petitioner Relies on Muthukumarasamy’s Descriptions of Two Separate Processes | 32 |
| 2. | Neither the RCIBS Process nor the zHub/zNode Process Discloses All the Limitations of the Challenged Independent Claims | 37 |
| B. | Muthukumarasamy Does Not Disclose or Suggest Converting the Universal Playback Control Command Includes Selecting from among a Plurality of Specific Commands That Correspond to a Respective Media Player | 54 |
| C. | Petitioner Fails to Prove That an Ordinary Artisan Would Have Considered the zHub and zNode Part of a <i>Server System</i> with Muthukumarasamy’s Server | 55 |

| | |
|---|----|
| D. Claims 2, 5, 6–8, 9 Would Not Have Been Obvious..... | 58 |
| VII. Conclusion | 58 |

PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBIT LIST

| Exhibit No. | Description |
|--------------------|---|
| 2001 | <i>Touchstream Technologies, Inc. v. Google LLC</i> , Case No. 6:21-cv-00569-ADA (E.D. Tex.) - Docket |
| 2002 | DocketNavigator Time to Milestones – Waco Division, from September 18, 2018 to present |
| 2003 | Email from Google's Counsel, dated July 7, 2022 |
| 2004 | Declaration of Jordan T. Bergsten |
| 2005 | Touchstream's Preliminary Infringement Contentions, dated August 27, 2021 |
| 2006 | Google's Preliminary Invalidity Contentions, dated October 22, 2021 |
| 2007 | Google's Supplemental Preliminary Invalidity Contentions, dated January 3, 2022 |
| 2008 | Touchstream's Amended Preliminary Disclosure of Asserted Claims, Infringement Contentions, and Priority Dates, dated November 8, 2021 |
| 2009 | Google's Final Invalidity Contentions, dated April 14, 2022 |
| 2010 | Google's Notice of Subpoenas to Boxee, dated April 14, 2022 |
| 2011 | Google's Notice of Subpoenas to Lynx Tech, dated April 14, 2022 |
| 2012 | Google's Notice of Subpoenas to Peel Tech, dated April 14, 2022 |
| 2013 | Google's Notice of Subpoenas to Samsung, dated April 14, 2022 |
| 2014 | Touchstream's First Set of Requests for Production, dated April 15, 2022 |
| 2015 | Touchstream's First Set of Interrogatories, dated April 19, 2022 |
| 2016 | Touchstream's Second Set of Interrogatories, dated April 25, 2022 |
| 2017 | Google's First Set of Requests for Production to Touchstream, dated April 25, 2022 |
| 2018 | Google's First Set of Interrogatories to Touchstream, dated April 25, 2022 |

| | |
|------|---|
| 2019 | Exhibit J to Google's Final Invalidity Contentions, dated April 14, 2022 |
| 2020 | Order Granting Joint Motion to Amend Scheduling Order (Dkt. 81), <i>Touchstream Technologies, Inc. v. Google LLC</i> , Case No. 6:21-cv-00569-ADA (E.D. Tex.) |
| 2021 | Transcript of the Deposition of Benjamin B. Bederson, Ph.D. on December 21, 2022 |
| 2022 | Declaration of Kevin C. Almeroth, Ph.D. |
| 2023 | Curriculum Vitae of Kevin C. Almeroth, Ph.D. |

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.