

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

AMAZON.COM, INC., AMAZON DIGITAL SERVICES, INC., AMAZON  
FULFILLMENT SERVICES, INC., HULU, LLC, and NETFLIX, INC.,  
Petitioners,

v.

UNILOC LUXEMBOURG, S.A.,  
Patent Owner.

---

CASE: IPR2017-00948

Patent No. 8,566,960

---

Before DAVID C. MCKONE, BARBARA A. PARVIS, and MICHELLE N.  
WORMMEESTER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

**PETITIONERS' REPLY**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. PATENT OWNER MISCHARACTERIZES THE INVENTION BASED UPON ALLEGED LIMITATIONS NOT PRESENT IN THE CLAIMS OR DISCLOSED IN THE PATENT .....	1
II. THE BOARD PROPERLY CONSTRUED THE CLAIM LIMITATIONS.....	3
A. The Board Properly Concluded That “Setting” The Allowed Copy Count Does Not Require “Adjusting” The Allowed Copy Count .....	3
B. The Board Properly Construed The “Verify” Limitation .....	8
III. THE LIMITATIONS CHALLENGED BY PATENT OWNER ARE DISCLOSED IN THE PRIOR ART .....	13
A. DeMello Discloses The “Verify” Limitation As Properly Construed By The Board.....	13
B. DeMello Discloses Setting the Allowed Copy Count In Response To The Device Identity Not Being On Record .....	16
C. Patent Owner Fails To Identify Any Error In The Board’s Determination That DeMello Anticipates Claims 7, 12, and 16 .....	19
D. Petitioners Proved That Claims 6, 11, And 15 Are Obvious Based Upon DeMello And The Knowledge Of A POSITA .....	20
IV. INTER PARTES REVIEW PROCEEDINGS ARE CONSTITUTIONAL.....	23
V. CONCLUSION.....	23
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH LIMITATION ON WORD COUNT (37 C.F.R. § 42.24) .....	25
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE .....	26

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES	PAGE
<i>Arendi S.A.R.L. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 832 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2016) .....	22
<i>In re Sang-Su Lee</i> , 277 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2002) .....	22
<i>In re Smith Int'l, Inc.</i> , 871 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2017) .....	12
<i>Johnson Health Tech. Co. Ltd. v. Icon Health &amp; Fitness, Inc.</i> , IPR2014-00184, Paper 12 (PTAB June 10, 2014) .....	22
<i>MCM Portfolio LLC v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , 812 F.3d 1284 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	23
<i>Rhine v. Casio, Inc.</i> , 183 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....	5
<b>STATUTES</b>	
35 U.S.C. § 311(b) .....	22

Petitioners respectfully reply to Patent Owner's Response (Paper No. 15), which fails to overcome Petitioners' showing and the Board's correct assessment that claims 1-25 of U.S. Patent No. 8,566,960 are invalid and should be cancelled.

5 **I. PATENT OWNER MISCHARACTERIZES THE INVENTION  
BASED UPON ALLEGED LIMITATIONS NOT PRESENT IN THE  
CLAIMS OR DISCLOSED IN THE PATENT.**

To support its argument that "setting" in the claims of the '960 Patent means "adjusting," Patent Owner repeatedly mischaracterizes the patent and invention. Specifically, Patent Owner argues that the '960 Patent is directed to a system for  
10 "temporarily" increasing a limit on the number of devices allowed to access a digital product and then returning the device limit to a previous setting. (*See, e.g.*, Response at 4 ("Under certain conditions, a temporary 'grace period' may be applied, during which a reasonable number of additional copy count(s) may also be allowed to run.")) The '960 Patent, however, never discloses or claims returning the de-  
15 vice limit (i.e., the "allowed copy count") to a previous setting. Indeed, the patent never discloses how such a system could be implemented, and the limitations of the claims prohibit such a system.

To allow users to access a digital product from newly acquired devices, the patent discloses a system where the number of allowed devices is set to a first limit,  
20 and then that limit can be increased over time. (*See, e.g.*, '960 Patent at 4:13-17 ("In accordance with one or more aspects of the embodiments described herein,

there is provided a system for adjustable digital licensing over time allows a software user to increase the number of devices they can use with a particular software license over the period of ownership of that license.”.) For example, the patent discloses setting the allowable device limit to five devices for the first five days after the initial authorization, then increasing the limit to seven devices for the next 5 25 days, and then increasing the limit to 11 devices thereafter. (*Id.* at 4:27-34.)

The patent never discloses increasing the allowed device limit to a higher number of devices and then decreasing the limit back to a previous setting. Not surprisingly, Patent Owner has not identified any such disclosure in the specification or claims. 10

Not only is there no disclosure of decreasing the device limit back down to a previous setting, the claims preclude reducing the number of authorized devices to a lower number. Each of the independent claims of the '960 Patent recite that the system checks if the device identity is on record, and if it is on record, allowing the 15 digital product to be used on the device. ('960 Patent at 12:5-7 (“in response to the device identity already being on a record, allow the digital product to be used on the given device”); *id.* at 13:42-44 (same); *id.* at 14:32-34 (same).) Thus, even if the allowed copy count were decreased back down to a previous, lower setting, all of the previously authorized devices would continue to be allowed access to the

# 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.