

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SONY CORPORATION  
Petitioner

v.

ARRIS ENTERPRISES LLC  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2017-01695  
Patent 7,107,532

---

**PATENT OWNER'S PRELIMINARY RESPONSE  
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.107**

*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**

I. Introduction.....1

II. Overview of the '532 patent. ....2

    A. The '532 patent provided an innovative graphical user interface for improved navigation of selectable options.....2

    B. The claimed techniques of the '532 patent were praised by the industry. ....5

III. Claim Construction.....6

    A. “visual card” .....6

IV. Ground 1: The Board should deny institution of Ground 1 because Sony did not establish a reasonable likelihood that claims 1-7, 9-11, 16-20, 24, 26-32, 34-36, 41-45, 52, and 53 are anticipated by Törnqvist. ....7

    A. Overview of Törnqvist. ....7

    B. Sony did not establish a reasonable likelihood that Törnqvist anticipates independent claims 1, 26, and 52. ....10

        1. Sony fails to establish that Törnqvist discloses a “spatially-fixed focus area,” as recited in claims 1, 26, and 52.....10

        2. Sony fails to establish that Törnqvist discloses a “scroll[ing] only visual cards from a first sequence of visual cards ... through a spatially-fixed focus area,” as recited in independent claims 1, 26, and 52.....12

    C. Sony fails to establish that Törnqvist discloses “wherein the scrolling of visual cards is in response to a single user action,” as recited in claims 9 and 34.....13

V. Ground 2: The Board should deny institution of Ground 2 because Sony did not establish a reasonable likelihood that claims 3, 4, 25, 28, 29, and 49 are rendered obvious by the combination of Törnqvist and Kazamaki. ....15

    A. Overview of Kazamaki.....16

    B. Sony did not provide a sufficient motivation to combine Törnqvist and Kazamaki. ....17

C.	Sony fails to establish that the combination of Törnqvist and Kazamaki teaches “pausing the scrolling of the first sequence of visual cards in response to a user command,” as recited in claim 3.....	20
VI.	Ground 3: The Board should deny institution of Ground 3 because Sony did not establish a reasonable likelihood that claims 8, 12-15, 23, 33, 37-40, 48, 50, and 51 are rendered obvious by the combination of Törnqvist and LaJoie. ....	21
A.	Sony fails to establish that Törnqvist discloses “a spatially-fixed focus area,” as recited in independent claim 50. ....	22
B.	Sony fails to establish that Törnqvist discloses “in response to a user horizontally scrolling a particular visual card of the first sequence of visual cards corresponding to a television application into the focus area, enabling vertically scrolling of a second sequence of visual cards through the focus area,” as recited in independent claim 50.....	23
VII.	Ground 4: The Board should deny institution of Ground 4 because Sony did not establish a reasonable likelihood that claims 19 and 44 are rendered obvious by the combination of Törnqvist and Bergsten.....	25
VIII.	Ground 5: The Board should deny institution of Ground 5 because Sony did not establish a reasonable likelihood that claims 20-22 and 45-47 are rendered obvious by the combination of Törnqvist and Sciammarella. ....	25
IX.	The Petitions filed against the ’532 patent improperly include redundant grounds. ....	26
A.	The Petitions include vertically redundant grounds.....	29
B.	The Petitions include horizontally redundant grounds. ....	33
C.	Sony’s alternative grounds run contrary to the laws and regulations governing post-grant review.....	36
X.	Conclusion. ....	38

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Cases:**

*Alarm.com Inc. v. Vivint, Inc.*,  
IPR2015-01965, Paper 12 (PTAB Mar. 30, 2016) .....29

*Apple Inc. v. Parthenon Unified Memory Architecture LLC*,  
IPR2016-00924, Paper 10 (PTAB Aug. 23, 2016) .....28

*Berk-Tek LLC v. Belden Tech’s, Inc.*,  
IPR2013-00057, Paper 21 (PTAB May 14, 2013) .....27

*Conopco, Inc. v. Procter & Gamble Co.*,  
Case IPR2013- 00505, Paper 9 (PTAB Feb. 12, 2014)..... 27-28

*Free-Flow Packaging International, Inc. v. Automated Packaging Systems, Inc.*,  
IPR2016-004465, Paper 8 (PTAB, July 22, 2016) ..... 10-11, 21

*Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.*,  
815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....26, 27

*Heart Failure Technologies, LLC v. CardioKinetix, Inc.*,  
IPR2013-00183, Paper 12 (PTAB, July 31, 2013) .....17

*Illumina, Inc. v. The Trustees of Columbia Univ.*,  
IPR2012-00006, Paper No. 43 (PTAB May 10, 2013).....27

*In re Kahn*,  
441 F.3d 977 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....17

*In re Nuvasive, Inc.*,  
842 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....20

*In re Paulsen*,  
30 F.3d 1475 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....6

*In re Ratti*,  
270 F.2d 810 (CCPA 1959) .....19

*KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*,  
550 U.S. 398 (2007) .....17

*LG Electronics, Inc. v. ATI Technologies ULC*,  
IPR2015-00330, Paper 17 (PTAB Sept. 2, 2015).....27

*Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Progressive Cas. Ins. Co.*,  
CBM2012-00003, Paper 7 (PTAB Oct. 25, 2012) .....26

*Oracle Corp. v. Clouding IP, LLC*,  
IPR2013-00088, Paper 13 (PTAB June 13, 2013) .....27

*Scentair Tech’s., Inc. v. Politec, Inc.*,  
IPR2013-00179, Paper 18 (PTAB Aug. 23, 2013).....27

*Ultratec v. Sorenson Commc’ns*,  
IPR2013-00288, Paper 23 (PTAB Jan. 10, 2014) .....28

*Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*,  
814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987).....7

*Wowza Media Sys., LLC v. Adobe Sys., Inc.*,  
IPR2013-00054, Paper 16 (PTAB, July 13, 2013) .....10, 21

**Statutes:**

35 U.S.C. § 325(d) .....26  
35 U.S.C. § 326(b) .....36

**Regulations:**

37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b) .....36  
37 C.F.R. § 42.20(c).....27  
37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4).....13, 21  
37 C.F.R. § 42.108(a).....26

# 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.