UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

———————————————————

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

———————————————————

NETFLIX, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

AFFINITY LABS OF TEXAS, LLC,
Patent Owner.

———————————————————

Case IPR2017-00122
Patent 9,444,868 B2

———————————————————

PETITIONER'S UPDATED MANDATORY NOTICES
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.8

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.8, Petitioner Netflix, Inc. ("Petitioner") hereby submits the following Updated Mandatory Notices information to update the Petitioner's counsel of record.

I. MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R § 42.8(A)(1)

A. Real Party-In-Interest Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)

The real party in interest is Netflix, Inc.

B. Related Matters Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2)

The '868 patent is the subject of a patent infringement lawsuit brought by Affinity in the Western District of Texas, Case No. 1:15-cv-00849. U.S. Patent No. 9,094,802 ("'802 patent") is also the subject of the same suit. Netflix has petitioned for IPR of the '802 patent in IPR2016-01701.

Other sibling patents to the '868 patent have been the subject of adverse decisions in District Courts and at the Board. These sibling patents are all continuations of the same parent '812 application, share the same specification, and have substantively similar claims. In two District Court cases, recently affirmed by the Federal Circuit (with cert petitions having been denied),[1] Judges Manske and Smith found every claim of two of these sibling patents, U.S. Patent Nos. 7,970,379 and 8,688,085, to be ineligible for patenting under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and, in doing so, found the claims

---

[1] *Affinity Labs of Texas, LLC v. Amazon.com Inc.*, 838 F.3d 1266, 1270 (Fed. Cir. 2016), cert. denied, 137 S. Ct. 1596, 197 L. Ed. 2d 708 (2017);
Affinity Labs of Texas, LLC v. DIRECTV, LLC, 838 F.3d 1253, 1258 (Fed. Cir. 2016), cert. denied, No. 16-1046, 2017 WL 844021 (U.S. Apr. 17, 2017).

provided no inventive concept. Ex. 1009, p. 6; Ex. 1010, pp. 14, 19. As stated by Judge Smith, "[t]he '085 patent solves no problems, includes no implementation software, designs no system." Ex. 1009, p. 6. The claims of the '085 patent are substantively similar to those of the '868 patent, allegedly including the "bitrate-switching" feature. In fact, invalidated claim 16 of the '085 patent is similar to the independent claims of the '868 patent. Compare Ex. 1001, 18:56-19:24, 19:48-20:10, 19:49-21:6 with Ex. 1008 ('085 patent), 20:6-20:24, 20:30-36.

Three other siblings to the '868 patent have had claims rendered unpatentable by the Board. First, in IPR2014-00209 and -00212, the Board held claims 16, 19 and 20 of U.S. Patent No. 7,953,390 unpatentable. This decision too was recently affirmed by the Federal Circuit. Ex. 1013. Second, in IPR2014-01181, -01182 and -01184, the Board held claims 1-3 and 5-14 of U.S. Patent No. 8,532,641 unpatentable in light various combinations of art. Third—and most relevant here—in the '407 IPR, the Board held claims 1, 2, 5-8, and 10 of the '007 patent unpatentable in light of Treyz and Fuller. The claims of the '007 patent are strikingly similar to Challenged Claims, which add more words but not substance. See Ex. 1007, ¶¶79-81.

Affinity cannot escape these prior invalidity rulings on similar claims by simply rearranging claim limitations. Given the extensive overlap in claim language between the unpatentable claims of the '007 patent and the claims of the

'868 patent at issue here, to promote judicial economy and to the extent feasible, Netflix respectfully requests that this proceeding be assigned to the same panel that presided over IPR2014-00209, -00212, and IPR2014-00407, -00408 (Judges Turner, Pettigrew, and Tornquist).

C. Lead and Back-Up Counsel and Service Information Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3) and (4)

Hector Ribera (Reg. No. 54,397) Marton Ribera Schumann & Chang LLP 548 Market St. Suite 36117 San Francisco, CA 94104 Email: hector@martonribera.com Tel: (415) 360-2512	David D. Schumann (Reg. No. 53,569) Marton Ribera Schumann & Chang LLP 548 Market St. Suite 36117 San Francisco, CA 94104 Email: david@martonribera.com Tel: (415) 360-2513
Andrew Holmes (Reg. No. 64,718) Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP 50 California Street 22nd Floor San Francisco, CA 94111 Email: drewholmes@quinnemanuel.com Tel: (415) 875-6322	John McCauley (Reg. No. 63,161) Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP 50 California Street 22nd Floor San Francisco, CA 94111 Email: johnmccauley@quinnemanuel.com Tel: (415) 875-6434

Petitioner designates Mr. Andrew Holmes as Lead Counsel. Petitioner consents to electronic service by delivering the documents to the email addresses of primary and backup counsel.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 18, 2017

By: */Hector Ribera/*

Hector Ribera (Reg. No. 54,397)
Marton Ribera Schumann & Chang LLP
548 Market St. Suite 36117

San Francisco, CA 94104
Email: hector@martonribera.com
Tel: (415) 360-2513

Attorney for Petitioner

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.