

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

NETFLIX, INC.

Petitioner,

v.

AFFINITY LABS OF TEXAS, LLC

Patent Owner

Patent No. 9,444,868

Issued: September 13, 2016

Filed: January 23, 2015

Inventors: Russell W. White/Kevin R. Imes

Title: System to Communicate Media

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2017-00122

PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"

Patent Trial and Appeal Board

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Table of Contents

	Page
Table of Contents	ii
Table of Authorities	iii
Exhibit List.....	v
I. Introduction	1
II. The '868 Patent.....	2
III. Overview of the Prior Art.....	6
IV. Legal Standard.....	8
V. Netflix and its expert take inconsistent and speculative positions regarding the meaning and scope of the challenged claims.	8
A. Netflix bears the burden to show obviousness of the challenged claims.	10
B. Netflix cannot establish obviousness where its expert's analysis of the meaning and scope of the challenged claims is based on speculation.	12
1. Netflix's expert testified that several terms of the challenged claims were "confusing" and as such, he would have to "guess" to find their scope and meaning.	12
2. Netflix was required to identify corresponding structure for the terms it alleges are construed under § 112 ¶ 6.	13
VI. Netflix failed to properly analyze the differences between the independent claims and the prior art, instead incorporating significant analysis by reference.....	16
A. Netflix has not met its burden to show all limitations are obvious for Grounds 1 and 2.....	20
VII. Netflix's petition is redundant of the exact same art and argument already before the Examiner.....	23
VIII. Conclusion	27

Table of Authorities

Page(s)

Cases

<i>A.C. Dispensing Equipment Inc. v. Prince Castle LLC</i> , Case IPR2014-00511, slip op. (PTAB Sept. 10, 2014)	22
<i>BlackBerry Corp. v. MobileMedia Ideas, LLC</i> , Case IPR2013-00036, slip op. (PTAB Mar. 7, 2014).....	11
<i>CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Int’l Corp.</i> , 349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	11, 16
<i>Hopkins Mfg’g Corp. v. Cequent Performance Prods., Inc.</i> , Case IPR2015-00616, slip op. (PTAB Aug. 17, 2015)	22
<i>IBM Corp. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC</i> , Case IPR2014-00673, slip op. (PTAB Dec. 23, 2014).....	22
<i>In re Donaldson Co.</i> , 16 F.3d 1189 (Fed. Cir. 1994)	14
<i>In re Donaldson Co.</i> , 16 F.3d at 1193	15
<i>In re NTP, Inc.</i> , 654 F. 3d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	11
<i>KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Micron Tech., Inc. v. Innovative Memory Sys., Inc.</i> , Case IPR2016-00324, slip op. (PTAB June 13, 2016).....	11, 13
<i>Nora Lighting, Inc. v. Juno Mfg., LLC</i> , Case IPR2015-00601, slip op. (PTAB Aug. 12, 2015)	23
<i>Oracle Corp. v. Crossroads Sys., Inc.</i> , Case IPR2014-01177, slip op. (PTAB Jan. 28, 2015).....	22
<i>Prism Pharma Co., Ltd. v. Choongwae Pharma Corp.</i> , Case IPR2014-00315, slip op. (PTAB July 8, 2014).....	24

Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Affinity Labs of Texas, LLC,
Case IPR2014-00408 (PTAB Jan. 31, 2014).....24, 25, 26

Star Sci., Inc. v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.,
655 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2011)11

Williamson v. Citrix Online, LLC,
792 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2015)9, 14

Statutes & Other Authorities

35 U.S.C. § 1031

35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 613, 15

35 U.S.C. § 316(e)8

35 U.S.C. § 325(d)23, 24, 26

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3).....14, 15

37 C.F.R. § 42.1071

37 C.F.R. § 42.108(c).....8

Exhibit List

Exhibit No.	Description
Ex. 2001	Amended Declaration of Nader Mir in Support of Netflix's Opening Claim Construction Brief
Ex. 2002	Netflix's Opening Claim Construction Brief
Ex. 2003	Excerpts of Transcript for <i>Markman</i> Hearing held in <i>Netflix, Inc. v. Affinity Labs of Texas, LLC</i>
Ex. 2004	Excerpts from the Prosecution History of U.S. Patent No. 9,444,868

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.