

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK
OFFICE

Before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board

Sony Network Entertainment International LLC, Petitioner,

v.

William Grecia, Patent Owner.

U.S. Patent No. 8,533,860

Filing Date: January 11, 2013

Issue Date: September 10, 2013

Title: Personalized Digital Media Access System—PDMAS Part II

Preliminary Response by Patent Owner William Grecia

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Background	2
<i>Overview of the '860 Patent</i>	2
Written Description	2
Exemplary Claim from the '860 Patent	8
<i>The Examiner's Reasons for Allowance of the '860 Patent Claims</i>	10
Baiya	11
Wimmer	13
Argument	14
I. Sony is unlikely to prevail with DeMello or Pestoni as anticipatory references because neither reference establishes a connection with a verified web service as claimed in the '860 patent.	14
A. DeMello does not anticipate the '860 patent because DeMello requests and receives the identification reference from the same module or apparatus that received and authenticated the verification token.	15
B. Pestoni does not anticipate the '860 patent because Pestoni fails to disclose establishing a connection with a verified web service and requesting an identification reference from the communications console.	20
II. Sony is unlikely to prevail on the asserted obviousness grounds because none of the proffered combinations cure the failure of the prior art to establish a connection with a verified web service as claimed in the '860 invention.	21
Conclusion	22

Exhibit List

Exhibit No.	Description
2001	2013-05-31 Notice of Allowance and Fees Due (PTOL-85)
2002	U.S. Pub. No. 2011/0288946 to Baiya <i>et al.</i>
2003	U.S. 7,526,650 to Wimmer

Introduction

U.S. Patent 8,533,860 (the “‘860 patent”) claims methods, systems, and apparatuses for facilitating access rights to digital content among a plurality of data processing devices. In stating the reasons for allowance of claims 1 through 30 of the ‘860 patent, the Examiner recognized that although the prior art included methods for facilitating access rights between a plurality of devices, no reference included the steps of “establishing a connection with . . . a verified web service” and “requesting at least one identification reference from the at least one communications console” via the connection with the verified web service. (Ex. 2001.)

The Board should decline to institute *inter partes* review of the ‘860 patent. Petitioner Sony Network Entertainment International LLC (“Sony”) cannot show a reasonable likelihood of prevailing on any of the grounds raised in the petition because each of the four references Sony cites (DeMello, Pestoni, Wiser, and Cooper) fails to teach the ‘860 patent limitations that the USPTO has already determined to be novel and nonobvious. Specifically, DeMello, Pestoni, Wiser, and Cooper are cumulative to the two prior art references the Examiner believed to be

closest to the invention claimed in the '860 patent (Baiya and Wimmer). None of the cited art teaches, discloses, or in any way renders obvious the claimed process of establishing a connection with a verified web service and requesting an identification reference from a device through that connection.

In short, the United States Patent and Trademark Office already reviewed the questions raised in the Sony's Petition. Therefore, no basis exists to institute proceedings under 35 U.S.C. § 314.

Background

Overview of the '860 Patent

Written Description

The '860 patent claims methods, systems, and apparatuses that “work as a front-end to encrypted files as an authorization agent for decrypted access.” ('860 patent, 5:37-39.)¹ Thus, the invention claimed in the '860 patent is akin to a gatekeeper who authorizes access to the encrypted digital content behind him.

Fig. 1, for example, shows a system containing six modules that lay at the front-end of the encrypted content:

¹ The '860 patent has been filed as Exhibit 1001 with the Petition.

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.