

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Charter Communications, Inc.

Petitioner

v.

Sprint Communications Company

Patent Owner

Case Nos. IPR2019-01135, IPR2019-01137, IPR2019-01139
Patent No. 6,757,907

PETITIONER'S NOTICE
(As Authorized by the Board via Email Dated July 29, 2019)

Patent Owner Sprint Communications Company (“Sprint”) has taken numerous inconsistent positions with respect to the scope of the ’7907 patent claims in both the pending district court litigation as well as prior litigation involving the patent. As detailed below, these inconsistent positions have forced Petitioner Charter Communications, Inc. (“Petitioner”) to file three separate petitions covering the various possible permutations of Sprint’s arguments. For example, when Sprint asserted the ’7907 patent against Comcast Cable Communications, LLC in *Comcast Cable Commc’ns, LLC v. Sprint Commc’ns Co., LP*, Case No. 2:12-cv-859-JD (E.D. Pa.), it took the position that the claims do not require using a set-top box to remotely control the claimed video-on-demand system. The *Comcast* court rejected Sprint’s proposed construction and instead held that the ’7907 patent disclaimed the use of a set-top box for remote control. Based on its adopted construction, the *Comcast* court granted summary judgment of non-infringement of the ’7907 patent, because the accused Comcast product required a set-top box for remote control of the video-on-demand system. Despite this judgment, in its pending district court litigation against Petitioner, Sprint accuses Petitioner’s products of infringing the ’7907 patent even though those products also use a set-top box for remote control of the video-on-demand system. It is unclear to what extent Sprint contends the set-top boxes in Petitioner’s accused products are relevant to the accused functionality and whether it contends, despite the prior *Comcast* court’s constructions, that the set-top boxes in

Petitioner's accused products perform the accused remote control. Accordingly, based on Sprint's inconsistent positions, Petitioner was forced to file three separate petitions based on the different disclosures of "video-on-demand systems" in the prior art references.

Ordering of Petitions. Although Petitioner's petitions are all meritorious, non-cumulative, and justified in light of the numerous positions Sprint has taken and may take, Petitioner requests that the Board consider them in the following order:

Rank	Petition	Primary References
A	IPR2019-01135 (Pet. 1 of 3)	<i>Sampsell</i>
B	IPR2019-01139 (Pet. 3 of 3)	<i>Humpleman</i>
C	IPR2019-01137 (Pet. 2 of 3)	<i>Ellis</i>

The following are exemplary material differences between the petitions:

(1) ***Sprint's inconsistent litigation positions:*** In the pending district court litigation, Sprint fails to provide specific and consistent positions on the scope of the claims. As noted above, Sprint previously asserted the '7907 patent against Comcast Cable Communications, LLC in Case No. 2:12-cv-859-JD (E.D. Pa.). In construing the terms "a video-on-demand system" (claim 1) and "operating a video-on-demand system" (claims 21 and 41), the *Comcast* court held that the '7907 patent disclaims the use of a set-top box for remote control because the patent disparages the prior art's reliance on set-top boxes and does not include a set-top box in any of its embodiments. (Petition Ex. 1010 at 28-32.) Based on these claim constructions, the *Comcast* court granted summary judgment of non-infringement. *Comcast Cable*

Commc 'ns, LLC v. Sprint Commc 'ns Co., LP, 203 F. Supp. 3d 499, 553 (E.D. Pa. 2016). Nonetheless, Sprint now asserts that Petitioner's products that use a set-top box for remote control—like the *Comcast* product—infringe the '7907 patent. Therefore, Petitioner was forced to file different petitions to address Sprint's disparate reading of “a video-on-demand system” as used in the claims based on prior art references that: (1) include a docking station for remote control of the video-on-demand system (*Sampsell*); (2) do not include any set-top box or docking station (*Humpleman*); and (3) disclose a set-top box in some embodiments but do not use it for remote control of the video-on-demand system (*Ellis*).

(2) ***Different video-on-demand system disclosures:*** Given Sprint's vague and inconsistent infringement allegations in the litigations, Petitioner relies on separate and distinct primary references that each disclose a different video-on-demand system—one in each petition. IPR2019-1135 relies on primary reference *Sampsell*. *Sampsell* discloses an image display system that is capable of displaying user selected video images on two displays—the first display device can be a screen or display and the second display can be a video remote-control that is integrated with a computer monitor, such as a WEB-TV device. (*Sampsell*, Abstract, 13:12-16.) While *Sampsell* does not use a set-top box for remote control, it does disclose a docking station for the video remote-control to “hold the remote control” and to passively “send[] and receiv[e] RF signals.” (*Sampsell*, 11:45-12:12.)

IPR2019-1139 relies on primary reference *Humpleman*. *Humpleman* discloses a system that generates a program guide to watch video content over a network that bridges various electronic devices, such as a digital video device, a digital TV, and a PC. (*Humpleman*, Abstract, 1:16-18, 4:20-24, 5:39-67, Figs. 6-8, 10-11.) *Humpleman* does not disclose the use of a set-top box, as neither the term “set-top box” nor any analogous term appears in *Humpleman*.

IPR2019-1137 relies on primary reference *Ellis*. *Ellis* discloses a video-on-demand system that allows a user to remotely control the system using a remote program access device so that the user can remotely play a stored program or a currently broadcasted program on the remote program access device or on television equipment. (*Ellis*, 2:23-28, 2:47-60, 5:9-12, Fig. 2d.) While *Ellis* discloses using a set-top box for control in some embodiments, it explicitly discloses that these embodiments are “alternative” embodiments and explicitly teaches not using the set-top box for control in the other embodiments. (*Ellis*, 7:53-65, 8:10-20, 9:4-6.)

While *Sampsell*, *Humpleman*, and *Ellis* each invalidate the claims under the *Comcast* court’s construction, it is unclear which construction Sprint will rely on in the district court litigation and PTAB proceedings against Petitioner. Therefore, Petitioner was required to file three petitions based on different primary prior art references to cover the various constructions Sprint may rely on in these proceedings.

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.