

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

**AMAZON.COM, INC.,  
AMAZON.COM SERVICES LLC, and  
AMAZON WEB SERVICES, INC.,**  
Petitioners,

v.

**AUDIO POD IP, LLC,**  
Patent Owner.

---

Case No. IPR2025-01041  
U.S. Patent No. 10,735,488

---

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF  
U.S. PATENT NO. 10,735,488**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION -----	1
II.	BACKGROUND AND STATE OF THE ART -----	1
	A. Selecting Servers Based on Performance Statistics Was Known -----	1
	B. Storing Media Content in Segments Was Known -----	2
III.	THE '488 PATENT -----	3
	A. Overview -----	3
	B. Claims -----	4
	C. Prosecution -----	5
	D. Priority -----	5
IV.	LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART -----	5
V.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION -----	6
VI.	STATEMENT OF PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED -----	6
	A. Grounds -----	6
	B. Status of References as Prior Art -----	7
VII.	GROUND 1A: CLAIMS 1-3, 5-12, AND 14-18 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF YOUNG -----	7
	A. Claim 1 -----	9
	1. Preamble -----	9
	2. Element 1[a]: Downloading a List of Content Servers -----	10
	3. Element 1[b]: Tracking Service Level Statistics -----	11
	4. Element 1[c]: Selecting a First Content Server -----	13

5.	Element 1[d]: Downloading a First Segment -----	14
6.	Element 1[e]: Selecting a Second Server-----	16
7.	Element 1[f]: Downloading a Second Segment -----	18
8.	Element 1[g][i]: Digital Media Stream Including First and Second Segments-----	20
9.	Element 1[g][ii]: First Library Server-----	20
10.	Element 1[g][iii]: Second Library Server -----	21
B.	Claim 2 -----	21
C.	Claim 3 -----	22
D.	Claim 5 -----	22
E.	Claim 6 -----	23
1.	Element 6[a]: Rendering Segments -----	23
2.	Element 6[b]: No Interruption in Rendering -----	24
F.	Claim 7 -----	25
G.	Claim 8 -----	25
H.	Claim 9 -----	26
I.	Claim 10-----	26
J.	Claims 11-12 and 14-18-----	28
VIII.	GROUND 1B: CLAIMS 1-3, 5-12, AND 14-18 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF YOUNG AND YOSHIMURA -----	28
A.	Claim 1 -----	29
1.	Elements 1[d], 1[f], and 1[g][i] -----	29
2.	Element 1[e]-----	31

B.	Claim 6 -----	32
1.	Element 6[a]: Rendering Segments -----	32
2.	Element 6[b]: No Interruption in Rendering -----	33
C.	Claim 10-----	33
D.	Claim 15-----	34
IX.	GROUND 1C: CLAIMS 2, 4, 11, AND 13 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF YOUNG, FREEDMAN, AND OPTIONALLY YOSHIMURA-----	34
A.	Claims 2 and 11 -----	34
B.	Claims 4 and 13 -----	37
X.	GROUND 2A: CLAIMS 1, 4-10, AND 13-18 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF LEIGHTON-----	38
A.	Claim 1 -----	38
1.	Preamble-----	38
2.	Element 1[a]: Downloading a List of Content Servers -----	39
3.	Element 1[b]: Tracking Service Level Statistics -----	40
4.	Element 1[c]: Selecting a First Content Server -----	41
5.	Element 1[d]: Downloading a First Segment -----	42
6.	Element 1[e]: Selecting a Second Server-----	43
7.	Element 1[f]: Downloading a Second Segment -----	45
8.	Element 1[g][i]: Digital Media Stream Including First and Second Segments-----	45
9.	Element 1[g][ii]: First Library Server-----	46
10.	Element 1[g][iii]: Second Library Server -----	46

B.	Claim 4 -----	47
C.	Claim 5 -----	47
D.	Claim 6 -----	48
1.	Element 6[a]: Rendering Segments -----	48
2.	Element 6[b]: No Interruption in Rendering -----	49
E.	Claim 7 -----	50
F.	Claim 8 -----	50
G.	Claim 9 -----	51
H.	Claim 10-----	51
I.	Claims 13-18-----	52
XI.	GROUND 2B: CLAIMS 1, 4-10, AND 13-18 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF LEIGHTON AND SEED -----	52
A.	Claim 1 – Elements 1[d], 1[f], and 1[g][i] -----	52
B.	Claim 6 -----	55
C.	Claim 10-----	56
D.	Claim 15-----	56
XII.	GROUND 2C: CLAIMS 2-4 AND 11-13 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF LEIGHTON, FREEDMAN, AND OPTIONALLY SEED -----	56
A.	Claims 2 and 11 -----	57
B.	Claims 3 and 12 -----	59
C.	Claim 4 and 13-----	59
XIII.	SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS OF NONOBVIOUSNESS -----	59
XIV.	CONCLUSION -----	60



# 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.