

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

ROKU, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

UNIVERSAL ELECTRONICS INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2022-01289
Patent No. 9,847,083

**DECLARATION OF DR. MICHAEL S. SCORDILIS IN SUPPORT OF
PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BACKGROUND	2
A.	The ‘083 Patent And The Challenged Claims. <u>My Background, Qualifications, Publications, and Testimony</u>	2 <u>21</u>
B.	The Level Of Ordinary Skill In The Art. <u>Compensation</u>	3 <u>83</u>
II.	Petitioner’s Asserted Prior Art References. <u>SUMMARY OF MY OPINIONS</u>	4 <u>84</u>
1.	U.S. Patent No. 8,995,981 (“Aginsky”)	8
2.	U.S. Patent No. 6,839,670 (“Stammler”)	10
3.	U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2012/0271639 (“Hanson”)	10
4.	U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0103088 (“Dresti”)	11
III.	LEGAL STANDARDS <u>PRINCIPLES</u>	14 <u>14</u>
A.	<u>Legal Standard for Claim Construction</u>	<u>4</u>
B.	<u>Legal Standard for Obviousness</u>	<u>5</u>
IV.	<u>THE BASES FOR MY OPINIONS</u>	<u>7</u>
V.	<u>PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART</u>	<u>8</u>
VI.	<u>THE BOARD’S INSTITUTION DECISION</u>	<u>9</u>
VII.	<u>OVERVIEW OF THE ‘083 PATENT AND RELATED TECHNICAL BACKGROUND</u>	<u>9</u>
VIII.	<u>OVERVIEW OF THE ASSERTED PRIOR ART</u>	<u>16</u>
A.	<u>Aginsky</u>	<u>16</u>
B.	<u>Stammler</u>	<u>18</u>
C.	<u>Hanson</u>	<u>19</u>
D.	<u>Dresti</u>	<u>20</u>
IX.	CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	20 <u>20</u>
A.	The Claimed “protocol and formatting information” Is Separate And Distinct From The Claimed “plurality of individual command function entries” And The Data Contained In The <u>Individual</u> Command Function Entries.	20 <u>20</u>
B.	The Claimed “protocol and formatting information” Must Be Included In <u>Universal Electronics Inc. Exhibit 2001, Page 6 of 77 Roku, Inc. v. Universal Electronics Inc., IPR2022-01289</u>	

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.]

Included In The Claimed “provisioned codeset record” Itself..... ~~17~~25
i

- C. The Claimed “protocol and formatting information” Is “the set of procedures needed to transmit commands from one device to another in a way that the receiving device can make sense of ~~and use the commands.”~~ ~~19~~ and use the commands.” 26

~~¶~~X. PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO ~~SHOW~~MEET ITS BURDEN OF PROVING THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS

OF THE ‘083

PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE ~~AS OBVIOUS UNDER 35~~ 28
~~U.S.C. § 103~~ 21

- A. Ground 1: Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky In Combination With Stammeler Renders Challenged Claims 1-6, 8-10, And 12-18 Obvious. 28

~~21~~

1. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky ~~In Combination With Stammeler~~ Discloses, Teaches, Or Suggests ~~Every Limitation Of Challenged Claims 1 And 12.~~ 21

(a) ~~Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky Discloses, Teaches, Or Suggests~~ “the provisioned codeset record comprising protocol and formatting information.” ~~21~~ 28

(~~ia~~) Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky Discloses, Teaches, Or Suggests “the provisioned codeset record comprising protocol and formatting information” Under Patent Owner’s Construction. ~~21~~ 28

~~(iib)~~ Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky Discloses, Teaches, Or Suggests “the provisioned codeset record

comprising protocol and formatting information” Under
Any Construction..... ~~23~~30

~~(b)~~2. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky In Combination With

Stammler Discloses, Teaches, Or Suggests “wherein each of the
plurality of individual function entries within the codeset
record comprises ... data which comprises a phonetic
representation of a function name corresponding to the
standard function identifier, and a plurality of data each of
which comprises a phonetic representation of a unique one
of a plurality of synonyms of the function name”
 (“Phonetic
Representations Limitation”)..... ~~27~~36

~~(c)~~3. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky In Combination
With

Stammler Discloses, Teaches, Or
Suggests “a speech recognition engine.”..... ~~31~~39

(d)4. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky Discloses, Teaches, Or Suggests “a processing device having associated instructions stored on a non-transient readable media which instructions, when executed by the processing device, cause a codeset record to be provisioned to the controlling device” (“Processing Device <u>Limitation</u> ”).	40
Limitation”)	32
2. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That A POSITA Would Have Been Motivated To Combine Aginsky With Stammler To Arrive At The Claimed Invention Of The ‘083 Patent.	33
(a)5. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That A POSITA Would Have Been Motivated To Combine Aginsky With Stammler To Arrive At The <u>Have Been Motivated To Combine Aginsky With Stammler To Arrive At The</u> Phonetic Representations Limitation.	3441
(b)6. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That A POSITA Would Have Been <u>Have Been</u> Motivated To Modify Aginsky To Have A “speech recognition engine.”	3946
37. Petitioner Has Failed to <u>To</u> Show That Aginsky In Combination With Stammler Renders Dependent Challenged Claims 2-6, 8-10, And 13-18 Obvious.	4047
(a) Challenged Claims 6 And 18.	4047
(b) Challenged Claims 8-10.	4148
(c) Challenged Claims 13 And 14.	4551
B. Ground 2: Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky In Combination With Stammler And Dresti Renders Challenged Claims 7, 11, And 19 Obvious.	4652
C. Ground 3: Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky In Combination With Hanson Renders Challenged Claims 1-6, 8-10 <u>8-10</u> , And 12-18 Obvious.	4854
1. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky In Combination With Hanson Discloses, Teaches, Or Suggests Every Limitation Of Challenged Claims 1 And 12.	48

¶¶

~~(a)~~ ~~Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky Discloses, Teaches, Or~~
Teaches, Or Suggests “the provisioned codeset record
comprising protocol and formatting information.”.....~~48~~54

~~(b)~~2. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky In
Combination With Hanson Discloses, Teaches, Or
Suggests The Phonetic Representations Limitation.....~~49~~55

iii

~~(e)~~3. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky In Combination With Hanson, Discloses, Teaches, Or Suggests “a speech recognition engine.”~~51~~57

~~(d)~~4. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky In Combination With Hanson Discloses, Teaches, Or Suggests The Processing Device Limitation.~~52~~58

~~2~~5. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That A POSITA Would Have Been Motivated To Combine Aginsky With Hanson To Arrive At The Claimed Invention Of The ‘083 Patent.~~52~~

~~(a)~~ Petitioner Has Failed To Show That A POSITA Would Have Been Motivated To Combine Aginsky With Hanson To Arrive At The Phonetic Representations ~~Limitation~~.~~53~~
Limitation58

~~(b)~~6. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That A POSITA Would Have Been Motivated To Modify Aginsky To Have A “speech recognition engine.”~~56~~59

~~3~~7. Petitioner Has Failed to Show That Aginsky In Combination With Hanson Renders Dependent Challenged Claims 2-6, 8-10, And ~~13-13-18~~13-18 Obvious.~~56~~59

D. Ground 4: Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky In Combination With Hanson And Dresti Renders Challenged Claims 7, 11, And 19 Obvious.~~57~~60

VI <u>XI.</u>	CONCLUSION	57 <u>CONCLUSIONS</u>	<u>60</u>
--------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------

iii

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit No.	Description
2001	Declaration of Dr. Michael S. Scordilis in Support of Patent Owner's Response
2002	Transcript of the June 7, 2023 Deposition of Bruce McNair
2003	U.S. Patent No. 9,716,853 to Arling et al.
2004	Excerpts from Deller, John et al., "Discrete Time Processing of Speech Signals," Macmillan Publishing Company, 1993
2005	Peacocke, Richard D. et al., "An Introduction to Speech and Speaker Recognition," IEEE Computer, Volume 23, Issue 8, August 1990
2006	Mariani, J., "Recent Advances in Speech Processing," IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing, 1989
2007	Martin, E. A. et al., "Dynamic Adaptation of Hidden Markov Models for Robust Isolated Word Speech Recognition," IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing, 1988
2008	Bahl, L. R. et al., "Some Experiments with Large Vocabulary Isolated Word Sentence Recognition," IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing,

I, Dr. Michael S. Scordilis, declare as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

~~Petitioner Roku, Inc. (“Petitioner”) has petitioned for *Inter Partes* Review of Claims 1-19 (“Challenged Claims”) of U.S. Pat. No. 9,847,083 (“the ‘083 patent”), which is owned by Patent Owner Universal Electronics Inc. (“Patent Owner”). The Board should confirm the patentability of the Challenged Claims because Petitioner has failed to meet its burden of proving that the Challenged Claims are invalid as obvious.~~

~~First, Petitioner has failed to show that its asserted obviousness combinations disclose, teach, or suggest every limitation of the Challenged Claims.~~

~~Second, Petitioner has failed to identify sufficient reasons why one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the asserted prior art references to arrive at the claimed invention. Petitioner’s “reasons” for combining the asserted references lack a rational underpinning, are conclusory and unsupported, and exhibit classic hindsight bias that the Federal Circuit has cautioned against. In some instances, Petitioner has failed to identify any reason whatsoever why a POSITA would have been motivated to combine or modify the asserted prior art.~~

~~Accordingly, Patent Owner respectfully requests that the Board confirm the patentability of the Challenged Claims.~~

1. My name is Dr. Michael S. Scordilis. I have been retained by counsel for Patent Owner Universal Electronics Inc. (“Patent Owner” or “UEI”) to provide my independent analysis regarding the validity of claims 1-19 (“Challenged Claims”) of U.S. Patent No. 9,847,083 (“the ‘083 patent”).

A. **My Background, Qualifications, Publications, and Testimony**

2. My background, qualifications, and educational and employment history are

set forth in my curriculum vitae, which is attached hereto as **Exhibit 1**.

3. I have over 40 years of experience in the areas of acoustics, electronics, and signal processing. I started building electronic radio circuits in 1977. That hands-on activity continued during my undergraduate studies at the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology, where I built voice scrambling radio transmitters, as well as several other circuits, and during my summer work experience where I programmed and built control circuits for farming applications. My practical experience continued during my work as Technical Officer at LM Ericsson where I evaluated, repaired, and modified telephone exchange electronic systems for voice communications.

4. I have over 30 years of academic experience. First at the University of Melbourne (1990-1995) where, as tenured lecturer, I developed and taught

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.]

several courses in digital signal processing and digital speech processing, and supervised several masters theses and doctoral dissertations in the areas of communications and audio and speech processing. I have had visiting scientist positions at Bell Communication Research (Bellcore) (1994) working on speech analysis and synthesis, at Sun Microsystems (1994) working on microphone arrays for speech recognition, and at the University of Patras, Greece (1995-96) working on acoustics and audio processing research. My academic career continued at the University of Miami (1997-2021) where, as associate professor, I developed and taught several undergraduate and graduate courses in electrical circuits, electronics, linear systems, digital signal processing, electrical and computer design, digital speech and audio processing, and engineering acoustics. I also supervised many senior projects, masters theses, and doctoral dissertations in the areas of signals and systems, electronics, communications, acoustics, digital signal processing, audio and speech signal processing.

5. I am also the author of numerous academic research publications that focus on various aspects of electronic devices, machine learning, speech identification, speech recognition, affective speech processing, speech enhancement, audio watermarking, acoustic filtering for echo cancellation, and numerous other audio-related scientific studies. In addition, I am the named inventor on at least one United States patent focused on audio watermarking.

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.]

~~IPR2022-01289~~

~~Patent Owner's Response~~

Universal Electronics Inc. Exhibit 2001, Page 7 of 77
Roku, Inc. v. Universal Electronics Inc., IPR2022-01289

6. I have experience with several aspects of the technology related to voice-controlled universal remotes. That experience includes research and development of speech detection in automatic speech recognition systems and spoken keyword spotting in real-world acoustic noise conditions. My research experience includes noise suppression, loudness estimation and acoustic analysis of speech and audio signals, and speech recognition adaptation to varying acoustic environmental conditions. My consulting experience includes work on speech recognition, voice-activated smart devices, voice detection, and noise suppression.

7. Numerous projects I have worked on have included speech-based devices and services, which are integral parts in voice-controlled universal remotes. One project I completed while working on a Sabbatical leave at Sun Microsystems Laboratories involved the design and implementation of a microphone array for improving speech quality in noisy home environments that utilize remote voice detection. In another project for Visa, I developed and applied signal enhancement methods for the purpose of estimating and suppressing environmental noise and improving speech signal quality when, during a transaction, users entered credit card credentials using voice.

B. Compensation

8. My compensation in this case is \$390 per hour without regard to the outcome of this proceeding.

9. I am not, and never have been, an employee of UEI. I am not receiving compensation for this declaration beyond my normal hourly fees based on my time actually spent analyzing and documenting my opinions herein on the ‘083 patent. My compensation is not related to the outcome of this proceeding, and I will not receive any additional compensation based on the outcome of any IPR or other proceeding involving the ‘083 patent.

II. SUMMARY OF MY OPINIONS

10. In summary, it is my opinion that each of the Challenged Claims of the ‘083 patent is valid and patentable. Petitioner and its expert, Mr. McNair, have failed to show that the Challenged Claims of the ‘083 patent are rendered obvious by the prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

III. LEGAL PRINCIPLES

11. I will not offer opinions of the law, as I am not an attorney. However, patent counsel has informed me of several patent law principles, upon which I have relied to arrive at my conclusions.

A. Legal Standard for Claim Construction

12. It is my understanding that the purpose of the claim construction process is to determine the meaning of the terms in the Challenged Claims of the ‘083 patent to a person of ordinary skill in the art (“POSITA”) as of the time that the claimed invention was filed. I also understand that the words of the claims, the

specification, and the prosecution history are to be primarily considered in order to construe the claims. These three sources are commonly referred to as “intrinsic evidence,” while everything else is referred to as “extrinsic evidence.”

13. It is my understanding that in an *Inter Partes* Review the words of a claim are generally given their ordinary and customary meaning to a POSITA as of the time that the patent application containing the claimed invention was filed.

14. It is my further understanding that the same words and phrases within a claim or claims are presumed to have the same meaning. It is also my understanding that different words and phrases within a claim or claims are presumed to have different meanings. Similarly, all words in a claim have meaning, and a word or phrase in a claim should not be interpreted so as to render other words or phrases in the claim superfluous.

15. It is also my understanding that a POSITA is deemed to read the claim term not only in the context of the particular claim in which the disputed term appears, but in the context of the entire patent, including the specification and the prosecution history.

B. Legal Standard for Obviousness

16. I understand that a patent claim may be unpatentable if the invention recited in the claim would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. In considering whether the Challenged Claims of

the '083 patent are obvious, I have been asked to consider (a) the level of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention, (b) the scope and content of the prior art, and (c) any differences between the prior art and the Challenged Claims of the '083 patent. I further understand that the patent owner may show "secondary factors" related to non-obviousness, including commercial success, long-felt but unresolved need, failure of others, copying, praise by others, and unexpected results.

17. I understand that a patent claim composed of several elements is not necessarily proved obvious merely by demonstrating that each of its elements was independently known in the prior art. I also understand that obviousness should not be analyzed using the benefit of hindsight. Instead, it must be analyzed from the standpoint of what was known and understood by a POSITA at the time of the claimed invention. I further understand that a party seeking to invalidate a patent claim as obvious must demonstrate that a skilled artisan would have had reason to combine the teachings of the prior art references to achieve the claimed invention, and that the skilled artisan would have had a reasonable expectation of success in doing so. I also understand that the party must persuasively explain how the references would be combined to arrive at the claimed invention. I understand that a proposed modification or combination is inappropriate for an obviousness inquiry when the modification or combination would change a prior art reference's

⁶
basic principle of operation or would render the prior art reference inoperable for its intended purpose.

18. I understand that a reference qualifies as prior art for an obviousness determination only when it is analogous to the claimed invention. I understand that prior art is analogous if it is from the same field of endeavor or if it is reasonably pertinent to the particular problem the inventor is trying to solve.

IV. THE BASES FOR MY OPINIONS

19. I have reviewed the '083 patent, including the Challenged Claims and the prosecution history of the '083 patent. (EX1001 and EX1002).

20. I have also reviewed the Petition for *Inter Partes* Review filed by Petitioner Roku, Inc. ("Petitioner" or "Roku"), the attached Declaration of Bruce McNair (EX1003), the transcript of the deposition of Mr. McNair (EX2002), as well as the Exhibits attached to Roku's Petition.

21. I have also reviewed the Board's Institution Decision.

22. In forming my opinions, I have considered the materials listed above and any other documents cited in this declaration. I have also relied on my own education, knowledge, and experience in the relevant art.

23. I have also considered the understanding of a POSITA around the time of the invention of the Challenged Claims.

V. PERSON OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART

24. I am informed that prior art and any opinions related to the prior art are to be analyzed from the perspective of a POSITA who would be involved in the same field as the '083 patent at the time of the invention of the Challenged Claims (*i.e.*, November 17, 2011).

25. All of the opinions that I express in this declaration have been made from the standpoint of a POSITA at the time of the invention of the Challenged Claims of the '083 patent.

26. I understand that Petitioner has proposed that a POSITA would have had a bachelor's degree in computer science, in electrical engineering, or a related field, and approximately three years of experience or equivalent study in voice-controlled devices in universal remote controlled systems. I further understand that Petitioner has proposed that additional graduate education could substitute for professional experience, or significant experience in the field could substitute for formal education.

27. For the purposes of this declaration only, I have adopted Petitioner's proposed definition of a POSITA.

28. I met Petitioner's proposed definition of a POSITA as of the time of the invention of the Challenged Claims of the '083 patent.

~~H. BACKGROUND~~

VI. THE BOARD'S INSTITUTION DECISION

~~A29. The '083 Patent And The~~ I understand that the Board instituted review of the Challenged Claims.

of the '083 patent on four grounds: (1) alleged obviousness of claims 1-6, 8-10, and 12-18 over Aginsky in view of Stammli; (2) alleged obviousness of claims 7, 11, and 19 over Aginsky in view of Stammli and Dresti; (3) alleged obviousness of claims 1-6, 8-10, and 12-18 over Aginsky in view of Hanson; and (4) alleged obviousness of claims 7, 11, and 19 over Aginsky in view of Hanson and Dresti.

VII. OVERVIEW OF THE '083 PATENT AND RELATED TECHNICAL BACKGROUND

30. The '083 patent, entitled "System and Method for Voice Actuated Configuration of a Controlling Device," was issued on December 19, 2017 from U.S. Patent Application No. 13/298,629 (filed November 17, 2011). (EX1001 at [21], [22], [45], [54].)

31. The '083 patent and the Challenged Claims generally relate "to remote control systems and, more particularly, to a system and method for setting up and configuring a controlling device such as a universal remote control to command functions of one or more types of remotely controllable appliances of one or more manufacturers." (*Id.* at 1:7-12.) According to the '083 patent, "it has been seen that the process of setting up and configuring a controlling device such as a universal remote control [is] demanding, exacting, and generally frustrating for many users." (*Id.* at 2:14-17.) "For example, user manuals or other documents

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.]

~~IPR2022-01289~~

~~Patent Owner's Response~~

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.]

containing setup codes and entry instructions may be lost or misplaced, or may be superseded as brand and/or model names evolve or controllable functions are added; a personal computer and/or Internet access may not be readily available at the location of the appliances to be controlled; etc.” (*Id.* at 2:17-23.)—~~Thus,~~
~~the ‘083 patent recognized the need~~

32. To achieve a “~~for~~a simplified and more user friendly system and method for conveniently setting up and configuring a controlling device.” (~~*Id.*~~*id.* at 2:23-25.)

, the

~~The~~ ‘083 patent created “a controlling device ... provisioned with means to receive voice input from a user, e.g., a microphone, such that when placed in a setup mode the controlling device may solicit spoken appliance descriptive information, for example brand and model number, to be processed by a speech recognition system in order to identify the appliance to be controlled and the command data to which it is responsive.” (*Id.* at 2:34-41.) This “speech recognition capability may be extended to allow a user to further refine the controlling device configuration, for example by assigning extended functionality to certain keys, verbally accessing infrequently used functions, defining activities, etc.” (*Id.* at 2:47-51.)

33. The ‘083 patent also created ~~an~~ a more robust appliance command code database for use in conjunction with the controlling device, wherein the command code database “may comprise a series of brand records 702 each of which points to a group of model records 704 specific to that brand, each model record in turn pointing to a codeset record 706 containing ... [data] applicable to that specific

brand and model of appliance.” (*Id.* at 9:55-62.) “[E]ach code set record 706 may comprise ... a block of protocol and formatting information 752 which may describe the physical protocol requirements for transmitting the command data elements which comprise this codeset...” (*Id.* at 10:47-51.) “Following block 752 may be a series of individual command function entries 754.” (*Id.* at 10:54-55.) “Each entry may comprise a standard function ID 756, ... a function name 758 ... together with its

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.]

phonetic representation 760; and command data 762.” (*Id.* at 10:56-65.) “In some embodiments, multiple instances of function name 758 and associated phonetic representation 760 may be present to cater for synonyms and/or regional differences.” (*Id.* at 11:1-3.)

34. An example codeset record 706 of the '083 patent is shown below:

(Modified)




Figure 7b

(*Id.* at FIG. 7b.)

35. According to the '083 patent, “the information contained in the identified codeset record may be transferred to the controlling device being configured.” (*Id.* at 11:5-7.) “Furthermore, in order to identify user-requested ~~extended command~~”

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.]

extended command functions, the phonetic representations 758 corresponding to

the command function entries of the codeset number corresponding to the currently
~~configured appliance~~

~~may be searched by the speech recognition means ... and the matching command~~

configured appliance may be searched by the speech recognition means ... and the

matching command data returned to the requesting controlling device.” (*Id.* at

11:13-20.)

36. Independent Challenged Claims 1 and 12 of the '083 patent are

reproduced below:

1. A method for configuring a controlling device to command functional operations of a target appliance, the method comprising:

causing a codeset record to be provisioned to the controlling device for use in commanding functional operations of the target appliance, the provisioned codeset record comprising protocol and formatting information and a plurality of individual command function entries wherein each of the plurality of individual function entries within the codeset record comprises command data, a standard function identifier, data which comprises a phonetic representation of a function name corresponding the standard function identifier, and a plurality of data each of which comprises a phonetic representation of a unique one of a plurality of synonyms of the function name;

causing less than all of the individual command function entries from within the provisioned codeset record to each be matched to one or more of a plurality of user input elements of the controlling device whereupon a subsequent activation of a one of the plurality of user input elements will cause the controlling device to transmit a command communication by using the protocol and formatting information and the command data of a one or more of the plurality of individual command function entries from within the provisioned codeset record that

was mapped to the one of the plurality of user input element activated; and

causing the controlling device to transmit a command communication by using the protocol and formatting information and the command data of a one of the one or more of the plurality of individual command function entries from within the provisioned codeset record having

a phonetic representation of the function name or a synonym of the function name which corresponds to voice data provided to a speech recognition engine.

(*Id.* at claim 1.)

12. A system for configuring a controlling device to command functional operations of a target appliance, the system comprising:

a processing device having associated instructions stored on a non-transient readable media which instructions, when executed by the processing device, cause a codeset record to be provisioned to the controlling device for use in commanding functional operations of the target appliance wherein the provisioned codeset record comprises protocol and formatting information and a plurality of individual command function entries wherein each of the plurality of individual function entries within the codeset record comprises command data, a standard function identifier, data which comprises a phonetic representation of a function name corresponding to the standard function identifier, and a plurality of data each of which comprises a phonetic representation of a unique one of a plurality of synonyms of the function name; cause less than all of the individual command codes from within the provisioned codeset record to each be mapped to one or more of a plurality of user input elements of the controlling device wherein a subsequent activation of a one of the plurality of user input elements will cause the controlling device to transmit a command communication by using the protocol and formatting information and the

command data of a corresponding one or more of the plurality of individual command function entries from with the provisioned codeset record that was mapped to the one of the plurality of user input elements activated, and cause the controlling device to transmit a command communication by using the protocol and formatting information and the command data of a one of the one or more of the plurality of

individual command function entries from within the provisioned codeset record having a phonetic representation of the function name or a synonym of the function name which corresponds to voice data provided to a speech recognition engine.

(*Id.* at claim 12.)

~~As shown above,~~ 37. Challenged Claims 1 and 12 of the '083 patent recite a controlling

~~controlling~~ device with a codeset record comprising: (i) protocol and information; (ii) formatting

information; and (ii) a plurality of command function entries. ~~(*Id.* at claims 1, 12.) Each~~

38. Each of the command function entries comprises, *inter alia*, (i) a phonetic representation of a function name; and (ii) phonetic representations of a

~~a function name and phonetic representations of a~~ plurality of synonyms of the function name. (*Id.* at claims 1, 12.) When a speech

~~function name. (*Id.*) When a speech~~ recognition engine recognizes a function name (or a synonym of a function name)

in user-provided voice data, the data in the command function entry having the phonetic representation of the recognized function name (or a synonym of the function name) is used to cause the controlling device to transmit a command communication to a target appliance. (*Id.*)

39. Challenged Claims 1 and 12 of the '083 patent expressly require that ~~the~~ the claimed phonetic representations of the function name and the synonyms of the function name be stored in a very precise location within the controlling device. ~~(*Id.*)~~ (*Id.*) The phonetic representations of the function name and the synonyms of the

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.]

function name must be stored in:

15

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.]
Universal Electronics Inc. Exhibit 2001, Page 20 of 77
Roku, Inc. v. Universal Electronics Inc., IP R2022-01289

~~Not only must the phonetic representations be stored in a specific codeset record~~

- a specific codeset record (i.e., the codeset record provided to the controlling device for use in commanding functional operations of the target appliance and comprising protocol and formatting information and a plurality of command function entries), ~~but they must also be;~~ and

~~stored in~~ • a specific location within the specific codeset record (i.e., in each of the command function entries within the provided codeset record). (Id.)

VIII. OVERVIEW OF THE ASSERTED PRIOR ART

~~B40. The Level Of Ordinary Skill In The Art.~~ I understand that Petitioner has asserted the following prior art

references. These references are discussed in detail below:

<u>Exhibit Number</u>	<u>Prior Art</u>
<u>1004</u>	<u>U.S. Patent No. 8,995,981 (“Aginsky”)</u>
<u>1005</u>	<u>U.S. Patent No. 6,839,670 (“Stammler”)</u>
<u>1006</u>	<u>U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2012/0271639 (“Hanson”)</u>
<u>1007</u>	<u>U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0103088 (“Dresti”)</u>

~~For the purposes of this proceeding only, Patent Owner adopts Petitioner’s~~

~~proposed level of ordinary skill in the art. (Petition at 19.)~~

~~CA. Petitioner’s Asserted Prior Art References.~~ Aginsky

~~141. U.S. Patent No. 8,995,981 (“I have reviewed Aginsky”).~~ Aginsky is generally directed to “systems

~~Aginsky is generally directed to “systems~~ and methods in which a controllable device transfers to [a] remote device, such as

~~device transfers to [a] remote device, such as~~ to a remote control application (‘app’) located on a smartphone, a data structure

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.]

IPR2022-01289

Patent Owner's Response

identifying various functions that can be controlled by [the] remote device,
together with the identity of the signal type that will achieve the desired

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.]

operation.” (EX1004 at Abstract.) “The remote device, upon accepting input directly from the remote device, can then allow the remote device user to select how controls of the various functions are to be configured and presented to, or otherwise selectively arranged for a user on a user interface of the remote device.” (*Id.*)

42. Aginsky discloses that a data structure may identify information such as exemplary functions (*e.g.*, on-off, menu, volume, channel, and input) and exemplary command signals (*e.g.*, XY1, XY2, XX1, ZZZ, and XY3). (*Id.* at 8:~~21-28~~2128.) The command signals “denote the type of signal as well as the code or code sequence of the signal.” (*Id.* at 9:9-10.) The command signals cause a function to be carried out when transmitted from the remote device 107-1 to a controllable device 101-1. (*Id.* at 8:28-30.) The data structure may also identify “the appearance, arrangement, and/or assignment of function controls (*e.g.*, left, center, right, button, up, down, button, arrow, one-click, two-click, key word) for a specific function of a controllable device, and an associated status (*e.g.*, on or off).” (*Id.* at 9:24-28.) Aginsky discloses that the memory 109-1 of the remote device 107-1 stores multiple data structures. (*See, e.g., id.* at 2:44-46 (“Small data files also enable the remote device to store many different data structures”); *see also id.* at 7:58-64.)

43. Aginsky generally discloses that the remote device 107-1 is capable of voice control. (*Id.* at 6:1-6, 8:8-12, 9:61-65.)~~However,~~

44. Aginsky does not disclose, teach, or suggest that its data structures include any information relating to voice control technology or how any ~~such of~~ its data structures ~~are~~would be constructed to include information relating to voice control technology. (*See generally id.* at 7:58-10:2;~~EX2001, ¶ 44.~~)

B. Stammler

~~2. U.S. Patent No. 6,839,670 (“Stammler”)~~

45. I have reviewed Stammler. Stammler is generally directed to “a process for automatic control of one or several devices by speech commands or by speech dialog in real-time operation.” (EX1005 at 1:12-14.) Stammler’s system “permits a speech command input or speech dialog control that is for the most part adapted to the natural way of speaking, and that an extensive vocabulary of admissible commands is made available to the speaker for this.” (*Id.* at 2:61-65.) “The extensive vocabulary is used to increase the user friendliness by using synonymous words or different variations in the pronunciation.” (*Id.* at 6:8-10.)

~~3. U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2012/0271639 (“Hanson”)~~

46. Stammler “generally recognizes even non-admissible words, names, sounds or word rearrangements in the speech commands entered by the speaker as such and extracts from these entered speech commands admissible speech commands, which the speaker actually intended.” (*Id.* at 3:1-6.) The provided speech dialog system includes two types of speech recognizers. The first type is a speaker-independent recognizer with fixed-vocabulary. (*Id.* at 5:8-10.) The second type is a speaker-dependent recognizer with a freely-definable vocabulary. (*Id.* at 5:8-12.)

C. Hanson

Universal Electronics Inc. Exhibit 2001, Page 27 of 77
Roku, Inc. v. Universal Electronics Inc., IPR2022-01289

47. I have reviewed Hanson. Hanson is generally directed to “a solution for permitting automated speech command discovery via manual event to function mapping.” (EX1006 at [0008].) “In the solution, a manual event (e.g., manually performed operation) within a computing system can be mapped to a function within a speech interface.” (*Id.*) “The mapping can trigger speech command discovery via one or more customizable rulesets” such as “using a grammar tree, utterance length, text strings, and the like.” (*Id.*) The mapping can support synonyms and/or alternative commands for a function. (*Id.* at [0037].) In one example of Hanson’s method, “when a user opens a car window via toggling an electronic power window switch, a speech interface

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.]

can audibly present an appropriate voice activated command to the user.” (*Id.* at [0018].) In another example, “when a driver adjusts the air conditioning temperature manually, a speech interface of the automobile can announce ‘You could have said increase temperature one degree to adjust the air conditioning.’” (*Id.* at [0008].)

~~4. U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0103088 (“Dresti”)~~

D. Dresti

48. I have reviewed Dresti. Dresti “relates generally to hand-held

~~Dresti “relates generally to hand-held~~ electronic devices and, more particularly, relates to a user interface for an universal

remote control application resident on the hand-held electronic device.” (EX1007 at [0002].) The user interface “functions to display[] operational mode information to a user.” (*Id.* at Abstract.) “The graphical user interface may be used, for example, to setup the remote control application to control appliances for one or more users in one or more rooms, to perform activities, and to access favorites.” (*Id.*)

(*Id.*)

IIIX. LEGAL STANDARDS CLAIM CONSTRUCTION

~~In an *Inter Partes* Review, the Petitioner bears the burden of persuasion to prove unpatentability by a preponderance of the evidence. See *Dynamic Drinkware, LLC v. Natl. Graphics, Inc.*, 800 F.3d 1375, 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2015). The Board “will not consider arguments and information that are not presented and developed in the Petition...” See *DIRECTV, LLC v. Qurio Holdings, Inc.*, Case IPR2015-02007, Paper No. 6 at 14 (PTAB April 4, 2016). “[T]he Board is not bound by any findings made in its Institution Decision.” *In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd.*, 829 F.3d 1364, 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2016). “The Board is free to change its view of the merits after further development of the record.” *Id.*~~

~~To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Petitioner must show “how the prior art references, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest the claimed invention.” See *In re Bell*, 991 F.2d 781, 783 (Fed. Cir. 1993); see also *Metalcraft of Mayville, Inc. v. The Toro Co.*, 848 F.3d 1358, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2017) (petitioner must persuasively explain how the references would be combined to arrive at the claimed invention). The Petitioner must also demonstrate “that a skilled artisan would have had reason to combine the teachings of the prior art references to achieve the claimed invention, and that the skilled artisan would have had a reasonable expectation of success from doing so.” *In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Pat. Litig.*, 676 F.3d 1063, 1068–69 (Fed. Cir. 2012); see also *Orexo AB v. Actavis Elizabeth LLC*, 903 F.3d 1265, 1271 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (holding that a finding of obviousness requires a showing “that a person of ordinary skill would have selected and combined and modified the subject matter of the references in the manner of the claimed invention, with a reasonable expectation of success.”).~~

~~IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION~~

A. The Claimed “protocol and formatting information” Is Separate

And Distinct From The Claimed “plurality of individual command function entries” And The Data Contained In The Individual Command Function Entries.

~~Based on the plain language of the Challenged Claims, as well as the specification and prosecution history of the ‘083 patent, the Board should construe~~
Universal Electronics Inc. Exhibit 2001, Page 27 of 77
Roku, Inc. v. Universal Electronics Inc., IPR2022-01289

49. Challenged Claims 1 and 12 recite: “the provisioned codeset record comprising protocol and formatting information and a plurality of individual command function entries...” and “the provisioned codeset record comprises protocol and formatting information and a plurality of individual command function entries,” respectively.

~~the Challenged Claims to clarify that the~~50. The claimed “protocol and formatting information” is separate and distinct from the claimed “plurality of individual command function entries” and the data contained in the command function entries.~~(EX2001, ¶ 50.)~~ in view of the plain language

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.]

of the Challenged Claims, as well as the specification and prosecution history of the ‘083 patent.

~~First, the~~ 51. I have reviewed the Challenged Claims of the ‘083 patent. The plain

language of the Challenged Claims ~~confirms~~supports that the claimed “protocol and formatting information” is separate and distinct from the claimed “plurality of individual command function entries” and the data contained in the command function entries. ~~(EX2001, ¶ 51~~

~~52.)~~ Challenged Claims 1 and 12 of the ‘083 patent recite: ~~“the provisioned~~ a codeset record “comprising protocol and formatting information and a plurality of individual command function entries.” ~~and “the provisioned codeset record comprises protocol and formatting information and a plurality of individual command function entries,” respectively.~~ (EX1001 at claims 1 and 12.) ~~Crucially, the~~ The claimed “protocol and formatting information” and the claimed “plurality of individual command function entries” are recited as separate and distinct elements of the claimed “codeset record.” (~~Id.; EX2001, ¶ 52.)~~ ~~Petitioner’s expert, Mr. McNair, confirmed during his deposition that the claimed “protocol and formatting information” and the claimed “plurality of individual command function entries” are separate and distinct. (EX2002 at 15:1-8, 15:17-20.)~~

Universal Electronics Inc. Exhibit 2001, Page 27 of 77
Roku, Inc. v. Universal Electronics Inc., IPR2022-01289

~~IPR2022-01289~~

~~Patent Owner's Response~~

~~Moreover,~~ 53. Challenged Claims 1 and 12 ~~further~~ specify that each of the
claimed

“plurality of individual command function entries” comprises data such as

“command data” and “a standard function identifier.” (~~EX1001 at claims 1 and 12.)~~ ~~Notably, however, the~~ Id.) The Challenged Claims do not recite that the claimed “protocol and formatting information” is part of the claimed “plurality of individual command function entries.” (~~Id.;~~ ~~EX2001, ¶ 53.~~)

~~Additionally,~~ 54. Challenged Claims 1 and 12 recite that the controlling device transmits a command communication using the claimed “protocol and formatting information,” as well as “command data” from one or more of the “plurality of individual command function entries.” (EX1001 at claims 1 and 12.) ~~According to the Challenged Claims, the~~ The same “protocol and formatting information” is used to transmit a subsequent command communication to a target appliance regardless of which individual command function entries and their corresponding command data are used therewith. (~~Id.;~~ ~~EX2001, ¶ 54.~~) That the same “protocol and formatting information” is used to transmit a command communication regardless of which individual command function entries and their associated command data are used ~~further confirms~~ also supports that the “protocol and formatting information” is separate and distinct from the “plurality of individual command function entries” and the data contained ~~in the command function entries.~~ (~~Id.~~) therein.

~~Second,~~ 55. I have reviewed the specification of the ‘083 patent ~~confirms.~~
The specification

~~IPR2022-01289~~

Patent Owner's Response

supports that the claimed “protocol and formatting information” is separate and distinct from the claimed

“plurality of individual command function entries” and the data contained in the command function entries. ~~(EX2001, ¶ 55.)~~

56. The specification ~~discloses~~teaches a codeset record 706 that comprises “a block of protocol and formatting information 752 which may describe the physical protocol requirements for transmitting the command data elements which comprise this codeset...” (EX1001 at 10:47-51.) The specification further ~~discloses~~teaches that following block 752 is “a series of individual command function entries 754.” (*Id.* at 10:54-55.) ~~As shown below, the~~

57. The “protocol and formatting information 752” is separate and distinct from the “plurality of individual command function entries 754” and the data contained in the command function entries ~~754~~according to Figure 7b:

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.].




Figure 7b

(*Id.* at FIG. 7b; ~~EX2001, ¶ 57.~~)

~~Notably, the~~ 58. The specification of the ‘083 patent does not ~~disclose~~ teach that the “protocol and formatting information” ~~can be~~ is part of the “plurality of individual command function entries.” (~~EX1001~~ *Id.* at FIG. 7b, 10:47-11:3; ~~EX2001, ¶ 58.)~~ Rather, the.) The specification ~~uniformly discloses~~ consistently teaches that the “protocol and formatting information” is separate and distinct from

the “plurality of individual command function entries” and the data contained in the command function entries. (*Id.*)

~~Third, 59.~~ I have reviewed the prosecution history of the ‘083 patent ~~confirms~~. The prosecution history of the ‘083 patent supports that the claimed “protocol and formatting information” is separate and distinct from the claimed

“plurality of individual command function entries” and the data contained in the command function entries.

~~command function entries. (EX2001, ¶ 59.)~~

60. The limitation “the provisioned codeset record comprising protocol ~~and~~ and formatting information and a series of individual command function entries” was added during prosecution to overcome a prior art obviousness rejection. (EX1002 at 165-173.) ~~Notably, the~~ The Applicant repeatedly argued ~~several times~~ that the prior art “does not disclose providing *individual command function entries* within a codeset record, i.e., a data structure that also provides protocol and formatting information...” (*Id.* at 255 (emphases in original); *see also id.* at 267, 282, 352, 397-398, 426.) The Applicant’s argument and the claim amendment ~~again~~ confirm supports that the claimed “protocol and formatting information” and the claimed “individual command function entries” are separate and distinct components of the claimed codeset record. (*Id.*)

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.]

24

Universal Electronics Inc. Exhibit 2001, Page 29 of 77

Universal Electronics Inc. Exhibit 2001, Page 30 of 77
Universal Electronics Inc. Exhibit 2001, Page 30 of 77
Roku, Inc. v. Universal Electronics Inc., IPR2022-01289
Roku, Inc. v. Universal Electronics Inc., IPR2022-01289

~~(Id.; EX2001, ¶ 60.)~~

~~Accordingly, the Board should construe the Challenged Claims to clarify that the claimed “protocol and formatting information” is separate and distinct from the claimed “plurality of individual command function entries” and the data contained in the command function entries.~~

B. The Claimed “protocol and formatting information” Must Be Included In The Claimed “provisioned codeset record” Itself.

61. The claimed “protocol and formatting information” must be included in the claimed “provisioned codeset record” itself in view of the plain language of

~~Based on the plain language of~~ the Challenged Claims, as well as the specification of the ‘083 patent, ~~the Board should construe~~.

62. I have reviewed the Challenged Claims of the ‘083 patent. The plain language of the Challenged Claims supports that the claimed “protocol and

~~to require that the claimed “protocol and formatting information” must be included in the claimed “provisioned codeset record” itself. (EX2001, ¶ 61.)~~

record” itself.

63. Challenged Claims 1 and 12 recite: “the provisioned codeset record comprising protocol and formatting information” and “the provisioned codeset record comprises protocol and formatting information,” respectively. ~~(EX1001 at claims 1 and 12.) Thus, the~~ The

Challenged Claims are clear and unambiguous that the claimed “protocol and formatting information” must be included in the claimed “provisioned codeset ~~record” itself. (EX2001, ¶ 63.)~~

record” itself.

64. I have reviewed the specification of the ‘083 patent. The specification
~~The specification of the ‘083 patent further confirms~~ also supports that the claimed “protocol and formatting information” must be included in the claimed “provisioned codeset record” itself.

65. The specification teaches a codeset record 706 that comprises “a block of protocol and formatting information 752 which may describe the physical protocol requirements for transmitting the command data elements which comprise

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.]

this codeset...” (EX1001 at 10:47-51.) As shown below, the “protocol and formatting information 752” is included in codeset record 706:




Figure 7b

(Id. at FIG. 7b; EX2001, ¶ 65.)

C. The Claimed “protocol and formatting information” Is “the set of procedures needed to transmit commands from one device to another in a way that the receiving device can make sense of and use the commands.”

66. The Board should construe the term claimed “protocol and formatting information” as “the set of

~~“the set of~~ procedures needed to transmit commands from one device to another in

a way that

the receiving device can make sense of and use the commands.”

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.]

~~(EX2001, ¶ 66.)~~

~~Petitioner's expert, Mr. McNair, testified that protocol and formatting information is the set of procedures needed to transmit commands from one device~~

67. I understand that Mr. McNair testified that protocol and formatting information is the set of procedures needed to transmit commands from one device to another in a way that the receiving device can make sense of and use the commands. (See, e.g., EX2002 at 32:19-33:3, 33:22-34:9, 36:5-21.) ~~At a high level,~~ I agree with Mr. McNair ~~is correct. (EX2001, ¶ 67.)~~

~~68.)~~ Protocol information is the set of procedures needed to establish a link between two or more electronic devices for the purpose of communication and information exchange. ~~(Id.~~

~~., ¶ 68.)~~ 69. Formatting information is the set of procedures for transforming digital data into a physical signal (e.g., pulse timing, shaping and duration, the type of carrier to use such as radio or light waves, carrier frequencies, modulation scheme, etc.). ~~(Id., ¶ 69.)~~

70. The ~~specification and claims of the '083 patent~~ Challenged Claims are consistent with ~~the parties' experts'~~ Mr. McNair's and my understanding of the term protocol and formatting information. ~~(EX2001, ¶¶ 70-71.)~~ The Challenged Claims specify that the claimed protocol and formatting information is information that is used, along with command data, to transmit a command communication from the controlling device. (EX1001 at claims 1 and 12.) ~~Similarly,~~

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.]

~~the~~ 71. The specification of the '083 patent is also consistent with Mr. McNair's and my understanding of the term protocol and formatting information. The specification of the '083 patent teaches that protocol and formatting

27

Universal Electronics Inc. Exhibit 2001, Page 32 of 77
Universal Electronics Inc. Exhibit 2001, Page 32 of 77
Roku, Inc. v. Universal Electronics Inc., IPR2022-01289

information describes the physical protocol requirements for transmitting the command data elements (*e.g.*, command codes or code sequences) in the codeset record. (EX1001 at 10:47-54 (“protocol and formatting information ... describe[s] the physical protocol requirements for transmitting the command data elements which comprise this codeset”).) The specification also teaches that the claimed protocol and formatting information may include “items such as carrier frequency,

bit encoding, data frame size and structure, appliance address, parity or CRC requirements, etc.” (*Id.*)

~~Accordingly, “protocol and formatting information” is “the set of procedures needed to transmit commands from one device to another in a way that the receiving device can make sense of and use the commands.”~~

VX. PETITIONER HAS FAILED TO ~~SHOW~~ MEET ITS BURDEN OF PROVING THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OF THE ‘083 PATENT ARE UNPATENTABLE ~~AS OBVIOUS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103.~~

A. Ground 1: Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky In Combination With Stammler Renders Challenged Claims 1-6, 8-10, And 12-18 Obvious.

1. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky ~~In Combination~~ Discloses, ~~With Stammler Discloses, Teaches, Or Suggests Every Limitation Of Challenged Claims 1 And 12.~~

~~(a) Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky Discloses, Teaches, Or Suggests “the provisioned codeset record comprising protocol and formatting information.”~~

~~(ia) Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky~~

~~Discloses, Teaches, Or Suggests “the provisioned codeset record comprising protocol and formatting information” Under Patent Owner’s Construction.~~

72. I understand that Petitioner and Mr. McNair rely solely on Aginsky

~~Petitioner relies solely on Aginsky~~ for the limitation “the provisioned codeset record comprising protocol and formatting information.” (Petition at 36-37; EX1003, ¶¶ 123-124.) Petitioner and

~~Petitioner asserts that Aginsky “discloses the provisioned codeset record comprising protocol and formatting information.” (*Id.*)~~

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.]

~~Petitioner has failed to show~~ Mr. McNair assert that Aginsky “discloses, ~~teaches, or suggests~~—“ the provisioned codeset record comprising protocol and formatting information” ~~under Patent Owner’s construction.~~” (*Id.*)

~~As discussed above, the~~ 73. The Board should construe the Challenged Claims to clarify that the claimed “protocol and formatting information” is separate and distinct from the claimed “plurality of individual command function entries” and the data contained in the command function entries.

~~In the Petition,~~ 74. Petitioner ~~asserts~~ and Mr. McNair assert that “Aginsky discloses data structures in tables 115’ and 116’” and that “[e]ach row of the data structures represents an individual command function entry...” (Petition at 37-38; EX1003, ¶¶ 121, 126.) Petitioner and Mr. McNair also ~~asserts~~ assert that Aginsky’s alleged “individual command function entries” include “protocol and formatting information.” (~~Id.~~ Petition at 36-37; EX1003, ¶ 124.)

75. Petitioner ~~does~~ and Mr. McNair do not assert that Aginsky discloses, teaches, or suggests any “protocol and formatting information” that is separate and distinct from Aginsky’s alleged “plurality of individual command function entries.” (*Id.*)

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.]

76. Because the claimed “protocol and formatting information” must be separate and distinct from the claimed “plurality of individual command function entries” and the data contained therein under the proper interpretation of the Challenged Claims, Petitioner ~~has~~and Mr. McNair have not shown (and cannot show)

29

that Aginsky discloses, teaches, or suggests “the provisioned codeset record comprising protocol and formatting information.”

~~information.” (EX2001, ¶ 76.)~~

(iib) Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky Discloses, Teaches, Or Suggests “the provisioned codeset record comprising protocol and formatting information” Under Any Construction.

~~Even if the Board does not adopt Patent Owner’s proposed construction, Petitioner has still failed to show that Aginsky discloses, teaches, or suggests “the provisioned codeset record comprising protocol and formatting information.”~~

77. Challenged Claims 1 and 12 recite that the codeset record provided to ~~the~~ the controlling device ~~must comprise~~comprises protocol and formatting information. (EX1001 at

claims 1 and 12.)

78. As discussed above, the Challenged Claims ~~are clear and unambiguous~~ that require that the claimed ~~both the claimed~~ protocol information and formatting information ~~must be~~are each in the claimed codeset

~~claimed codeset~~ record itself. (*Id.*; see also *id.* at FIG. 7b; ~~EX2001, ¶ 78.~~)

~~Further, as~~ 79. As also discussed above, the claimed protocol and formatting ~~information~~

information is the set of procedures needed to transmit commands from one device to another in a way that the receiving device can make sense of and use the commands. (*See, e.g.*, EX2002 at 32:19-33:3, 33:22-34:9, 36:5-21; EX1001 at 10:47-54; ~~EX2001, ¶ 79.~~)

~~According to-~~ 80. Petitioner, and Mr. McNair assert that Aginsky's data structures 115' ~~and 116' (i.e., the~~

and 116' (i.e., the alleged codeset records) include "SIGNAL columns 112-1 and 112-2" that "denote

the type of signal as well as the code or code sequence of the signal,” and that the type of signal denoted in Aginsky’s SIGNAL columns 112-1 and 112-2 discloses the claimed protocol and formatting information. (Petition at 36-37 (citing EX1004 at 8:63-9:10); *see also id.* at 25; [EX1003, ¶ 124](#); EX2002 at 28:14-29:1.) Petitioner ~~does~~and Mr. McNair do not assert that “the code or code sequence of the signal” in Aginsky’s SIGNAL columns 112-1 and 112-2 reads on the claimed “protocol information and formatting information.” (Petition at ~~36-37~~36-37; [EX1003, ¶¶ 123-124](#); EX2002 at 46:16-47:2, 47:11-20.) ~~Petitioner also does not propose modifying Aginsky to meet the “protocol information and formatting information” limitation. (*Id.*)~~

81. Petitioner ~~asserts~~and Mr. McNair assert that the type of signal denoted in [Aginsky’s](#) SIGNAL columns 112-1 and 112-2 “‘can be any type of signal required for control purposes’ such as a frequency set, a coded IR signal, or a Bluetooth signal.” (~~Petition at 36-37~~*Id.*) Petitioner and Mr. McNair also ~~asserts~~assert that IR and Bluetooth include a protocol and a format, and thus a POSITA would have understood that Aginsky’s example signal types (*i.e.*, frequency set, IR, and Bluetooth) “require protocol and formatting information as defined in [the] ‘083 [patent].” (~~*Id.*~~Petition at 37; [EX1003, ¶ 124](#).)

82. Petitioner ~~has~~and Mr. McNair have failed to show that Aginsky discloses, teaches, or suggests “the provisioned codeset record comprising protocol and formatting

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.]

information” because Petitioner ~~has~~ and Mr. McNair have failed to show (and cannot show) that the type of signal

28

Universal Electronics Inc. Exhibit 2001, Page 33 of 77
Universal Electronics Inc. Exhibit 2001, Page 33 of 77
Roku, Inc. v. Universal Electronics Inc., IPR2022-01289
Roku, Inc. v. Universal Electronics Inc., IPR2022-01289

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.]

denoted in Aginsky's SIGNAL columns 112-1 and 112-2 discloses both protocol information and formatting information ~~stored~~ in the alleged codeset record itself.

31

83. As Petitioner and Mr. McNair note, Aginsky's SIGNAL columns 112-
~~As Petitioner notes, Aginsky's SIGNAL columns 112-1~~1 and 112-2 denote the type of signal that is used to communicate with a controllable device for control purposes. (EX1004 at 8:63-9:10.) The indicated signal type may be a frequency set, a coded IR signal, or a Bluetooth signal. (*Id.*) However, an indication of a type of signal that is transmitted (*e.g.*, ~~frequency set~~, coded IR, Bluetooth, etc.) is not itself the set of procedures needed to transmit commands from one device to another via the indicated signal type (*i.e.*, protocol and formatting information). (~~EX2001, ¶¶ 83-84.~~) The actual set of procedures must still be received, obtained, looked up, etc. (~~*Id.*~~) Thus, a POSITA would not ~~have~~ ~~considered~~consider an indication of the type of signal that is transmitted to disclose the claimed protocol and formatting information. (~~*Id.*~~)

84. U.S. Patent No. 9,716,853 to Arling et al. ("Arling"), which has a priority date of October 28, 2011, further illustrates the above point. Arling discloses a universal control engine ("UCE") that includes a command matrix 700. (EX2003 at 7:19-22, FIG. 7.) The command matrix 700 comprises a series of data cells, each of

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.]

which corresponds to a specific command 702 and a specific appliance to be controlled 704. (Id. at 7:22-26.) Each data cell comprises an indication of a signal type (e.g., IR, CEC, etc.). (Id. at 7:26-42, FIG. 7.)

Command data and formatting information are stored elsewhere in memory 502. (Id.)

Arling confirms that an indication of a signal type is not itself the set of procedures needed to transmit commands from one device to another via the indicated signal type. The actual set of procedures for transmitting a command via the indicated signal type must still be received, obtained, looked up, etc.

85. Petitioner's and Mr. McNair's assertion that Aginsky's example signal types "require protocol and formatting information" ~~is irrelevant to the Challenged Claims and~~ fails to fill in the gaps in Aginsky's disclosure. (Petition at 37; EX1003, ¶ 124.) ~~As noted above~~ Again, the Challenged Claims expressly recite and require that the claimed protocol information and formatting information must be ~~stored~~ in the claimed codeset record itself. (EX1001 at claims 1 and 12; ~~EX2001, ¶ 85.~~) The Challenged Claims also expressly distinguish between the claimed protocol and formatting information stored in the codeset record and a command communication transmitted from the controlling

device. (*Id.*) That a Bluetooth or IR transmission allegedly requires protocol and formatting information has no bearing on whether Aginsky's data structures 115' and 116' (*i.e.*, the alleged codeset records) store any protocol and formatting information anywhere—let alone in Aginsky's SIGNAL columns 112-1 and 112-2, as per Petitioner's theory. (~~EX2001, ¶ 85.~~) Aginsky's SIGNAL columns 112-1 and 112-2 merely indicate a signal type and a code or code sequence (EX1004 at 9:~~8-10~~8-10), neither of which reads on the claimed protocol and formatting information. (~~EX2001, ¶ 85.~~) ~~Aginsky simply does not disclose, teach, or suggest that protocol or formatting information is stored in Aginsky's SIGNAL columns 112-1 or 112-2, and Petitioner has identified no such disclosure, teaching, or suggestion. (EX2001, ¶¶ 86, 89-91; Petition at 25-26, 36-37.)~~

33

86. Aginsky does not disclose or teach that its SIGNAL columns 112-1 and 112-2 contain protocol and formatting information. (See, e.g., EX1004 at 8:21-9:14.)

~~Additionally,~~ 87. Petitioner's and Mr. McNair's statement that Aginsky discloses that its data structure may include “protocols, rules, or other information useful to carrying out remote control of the controllable device” is misleading ~~and does not help~~

Petitioner. (Petition at 26 (quoting EX1004 at 13:40-43); EX1003, ¶ 108.) The “protocols” and “rules” mentioned in the above quote refer to (i) user/device permissions and restrictions (*e.g.*, password requirements, child permissions, etc.); and (ii) customized control layouts for devices (*e.g.*, how the buttons are arranged). (EX1004 at 6:7-7:16, 9:~~15-28~~15-28, 10:27-50, 11:49-54; *see also id.* at FIG. 1C (at 121-1 and 121-2); ~~EX2001, ¶ 87.~~) These “protocols” and “rules” are in no way related to the claimed protocol and formatting information, which again is the set of procedures needed to transmit commands from one device to another.

88. I understand that neither Petitioner nor Mr. McNair have asserted that a POSITA would have modified Aginsky’s SIGNAL columns 112-1 and 112-2 to include protocol and formatting information, and I understand that Petitioner and Mr. McNair are barred from raising this argument.

89. I also understand that neither Petitioner nor Mr. McNair have asserted that Aginsky suggests that its SIGNAL columns 112-1 and 112-2 contain protocol and formatting information, and I likewise understand that Petitioner and Mr. McNair are barred from raising this argument. Nevertheless, to the extent Petitioner attempts to argue in its Reply that Aginsky suggests that its SIGNAL columns 112-1 and 112-2 contain protocol and formatting information, such an argument would be without merit.

90. Protocol and formatting information is information that is common to all communications over a particular communication method. The entries in Aginsky’s SIGNAL columns 112-1 and 112-2, however, contain a code (or code sequence) that

is highly specific to the performance of a certain function (e.g., power on, volume up, etc.). Storing protocol and formatting information in the entries in Aginsky's SIGNAL columns 112-1 and 112-2 would be redundant, impractical, and non-sensical because the same information would need to be repeated each time a specific signal type is indicated. No POSITA would interpret Aginsky's SIGNAL columns 112-1 and 112-2 to contain protocol and formatting information. Thus, Aginsky does not suggest that its SIGNAL columns 112-1 and 112-2 contain protocol and formatting information.

91. Aginsky does not disclose, teach, or suggest that protocol or formatting information is stored in SIGNAL columns 112-1 or 112-2, and Petitioner and Mr. McNair have identified no such disclosure, teaching, or suggestion. (Petition at 25-26, 36-37; EX1003, ¶ 124.)

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.]

~~formatting information, which again is the set of procedures needed to transmit commands from one device to another. (EX2001, ¶ 87.) Tellingly, Petitioner does not assert that the “protocols” and “rules” mentioned in Aginsky read on the claimed protocol and formatting information, and does not even mention these “protocols” and “rules” in its analysis of the protocol and formatting information limitation. (Petition at 26, 36-37.)~~

~~Thus, Petitioner has failed to show that Aginsky discloses, teaches, or suggests “the provisioned codeset record comprising protocol and formatting information.”~~

~~(b)~~ **2. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky In Combination With Stammler Discloses, Teaches, Or Suggests “wherein each of the plurality of individual function entries within the codeset record comprises ... data which comprises a phonetic representation of a function name corresponding to the standard function identifier, and a plurality of data each of which comprises a phonetic representation of a unique one of a plurality of synonyms of the function name” (“Phonetic Representations Limitation”).**

92. I understand that Petitioner ~~has failed to show that~~ and Mr. McNair rely on Aginsky in ~~combination with Stammler~~

~~discloses, teaches, or suggests the Phonetic Representations Limitation of Challenged Claims 1 and 12.~~

~~Petitioner relies on Aginsky in~~ combination with Stammler for the Phonetic Representations Limitation. (Petition

at 40-42; EX1003, ¶¶ 133, 139.) Petitioner ~~asserts~~ and Mr. McNair assert that Universal Electronics Inc. Exhibit 2001, Page 41 of 77 Roku, Inc. v. Universal Electronics Inc., IPR2022-01289

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.]

~~IPR2022-01289~~

Patent Owner's Response

modified by Stammler “teaches” the Phonetic Representations Limitation. (*Id.*)

93. The Phonetic Representations Limitation requires that each of the

~~According to the Phonetic Representations Limitation, each of the~~ plurality of individual command function entries within the claimed codeset record ~~must~~

comprise, *inter alia*: (i) a phonetic representation of a function name; and (ii) phonetic representations of a plurality of synonyms of the function name.

(EX1001 at claims 1, 12; ~~EX2001, ¶¶ 93-94.~~)

94. The Phonetic Representations Limitation also requires that the

~~According to the Phonetic Representations Limitation, the~~ claimed phonetic representations ~~must~~ be stored: (i) in a specific codeset record (i.e., the

~~(i) in a specific codeset record (i.e., the~~ codeset record provisioned to the controlling device for use in commanding

functional operations of the target appliance and comprising protocol and formatting information and a plurality of command function entries); and (ii) in a

(ii) ~~in a~~ specific location within that specific codeset record (*i.e.*, in each of the command function entries within the provisioned codeset record). (*Id.*)

95. Petitioner ~~reads~~ and Mr. McNair read the claimed codeset record on either of the data structures in tables 115' and 116' of FIG. 1B of Aginsky. (Petition at 21-23, 35, 37; EX1003, ¶ 121.) Petitioner and Mr. McNair also ~~asserts~~ assert that each row in tables 115' and 116' represents an individual command function entry. (~~*Id.*~~ Petition at 27, 37-38; EX1003, ¶ 126.)

96. Petitioner ~~asserts~~ and Mr. McNair assert that Aginsky as modified by Stammler teaches the Phonetic Representations Limitation. (Petition at 40-42; EX1003, ¶¶ 133, 139.) Petitioner and Mr. McNair assert that Aginsky's remote device 107-1 is generally capable of voice control (~~*id.*~~ Petition at 40 (citing EX1004 at 6:2-6, 8:8-12, 9:60-65); EX1003, ¶ 135), but ~~concedes~~ agree that

Aginsky does not disclose, teach, or suggest the Phonetic Representations Limitation. (~~Id.~~Petition at 40, 42; *see also id.* at 20-29 (Petitioner failing to assert that Aginsky’s data structures include any information relating to voice commands); EX1003, ¶ 135; *see generally* EX1004 at 7:58-10:2 (Aginsky failing to disclose, teach, or suggest that its data structures include any information relating to voice commands).)

97. Petitioner and Mr. McNair also ~~asserts~~assert that Stammeler “discloses a speech dialog system for automatic control or operation of one or more devices by voice commands” that may be based on “phonetic word subunits” and may include

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.]

“synonymous words.” (Petition at 29-30; [EX1003, ¶ 113](#).) According to Petitioner [and Mr. McNair](#), “Stammler specifically teaches data structure inputs that would allow Aginsky’s system and methods to advantageously implement voice control.” (~~Id.~~ [Petition](#) at 32; [EX1003, ¶ 114](#).)

98. Petitioner ~~has~~ [and Mr. McNair have](#) failed to show that Aginsky in combination with Stammler discloses, teaches, or suggests the Phonetic Representations Limitation because neither Aginsky nor Stammler discloses, teaches, or suggests phonetic representations of function names (or synonyms of function names) stored in a codeset record (~~or, more particularly, in command function entries within a codeset record~~), as the Challenged Claims require.

~~With respect to~~ 99. [Regarding](#) Aginsky, Petitioner ~~concedes~~ [and Mr. McNair agree](#) that Aginsky does not disclose, teach, or suggest that its alleged codeset records include any information related to voice commands. (Petition at 40, 42; *see also id.* at 20-29 (Petitioner failing to assert

that Aginsky’s data structures include any information relating to voice commands); [EX1003, ¶ 135](#); *see generally* EX1004 at 7:58-10:2 (Aginsky failing to disclose, teach, or suggest that its data structures include any information relating to voice commands).) Petitioner [and Mr. McNair](#) also ~~concedes~~ [agree](#) that Aginsky does

not disclose, teach, or suggest phonetic representations of function names (or synonyms of function names). (Petition at ~~2029~~20-29, 40-42; EX1003, ¶¶ 133-142.)

100. Regarding Stammler, Petitioner and Mr. McNair argue that “Stammler

~~With respect to Stammler, Petitioner argues that “Stammler explicitly discloses storing phonetic representations in memory...” (Petition at 41~~

~~(citing EX1005 at 12:19-27); EX1003, ¶ 137.) I disagree with Petitioner is wrong because the~~ and Mr.

McNair. The cited portion of Stammler does not “explicitly disclose[] storing phonetic representations in memory.” ~~(EX2001, ¶ 100.)~~ Rather, the cited portion of Stammler ~~merely~~

discloses that a memory may be connected to Stammler’s digital signal processor. ~~(Id.; EX1005 at 12:19-27.) In any case, Stammler does not disclose, teach, or suggest~~

(EX1005 at 12:19-27.)

101. As Mr. McNair testified, a codeset record is a data structure that contains command data. (EX2002 at 14:5-14.) Stammler does not teach a data structure that contains command data. Stammler does not disclose, teach, or suggest a codeset record. Stammler likewise does not disclose, teach, or suggest storing phonetic representations in a codeset record (or in command function entries within a codeset record). ~~(EX2001, ¶ 101.) Indeed, Stammler does not even disclose, teach, or suggest a codeset record. (Id.)~~

~~Accordingly, Petitioner cannot show that Aginsky in combination with Stammler discloses, teaches, or suggests the Phonetic Representations Limitation.~~

(e) 3. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky In Combination With Stammler Discloses, Teaches, Or Suggests “a speech recognition engine.”

~~Petitioner has failed to show that Aginsky in combination with Stammler discloses, teaches, or suggests “a speech recognition engine.” Independent~~

102. Independent Challenged Claims 1 and 12 both recite providing voice data to a “speech recognition engine.” (EX1001, ‘083 patent, at claims 1 and 12.)

103. I understand that Petitioner and Mr. McNair do not assert that

~~Petitioner does not assert that~~ Aginsky discloses, teaches, or suggests a “speech recognition engine.” (Petition at

45-46; *see also id.* at 51 (“Aginsky does not explicitly disclose how remote device 107-1 receives voice input or creating voice data.”); EX1003, ¶¶ 150-151.)

~~voice data.”).~~

104. While Petitioner and Mr. McNair assert that Stammer discloses a

~~While Petitioner asserts that Stammer discloses a~~ “speech recognition engine,”
Petitioner and Mr. McNair do not propose modifying

~~engine,” Petitioner does not propose modifying~~ Aginsky to have a “speech
recognition engine.” (~~*Id.*~~ Petition at 45-46; *see also id.* at

32 (Ppetitioner proposing only ~~proposing~~ to modify Aginsky in view of Stammer to
include

phonetic representations in Aginsky’s data structure); EX1003, ¶¶ 150-151.)

~~Aginsky’s data structure).~~ ~~Petitioner’s failure to identify any reason why a POSITA~~

105. Petitioner and Mr. McNair have also failed to identify any reason why

a POSITA would have modified Aginsky to have a “speech recognition engine,”
~~further~~

which further confirms that Petitioner and Mr. McNair have not proposed

~~confirms that Petitioner has not proposed~~ modifying Aginsky to have a “speech
recognition engine.” (Petition at 45-46;

~~recognition engine.”~~ (~~*Id.*~~ at 45-46; *see also* EX1003, ¶¶ 149-151.)

~~Because Aginsky does not disclose, teach, or suggest a “speech recognition
engine,” and because Petitioner has not proposed modifying Aginsky in view of~~

~~Stammler to include a “speech recognition engine,” Petitioner cannot show that Aginsky in combination with Stammler discloses, teaches, or suggests “a speech recognition engine.” For the same reasons, Petitioner has also failed to explain how the references would be combined to arrive at the claimed invention. See *Metalcraft*, 848 F.3d at 1367.~~

~~(d)~~4. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky Discloses,

Teaches, Or Suggests “a processing device having associated instructions stored on a non-transient readable media which instructions, when executed by the processing device, cause a codeset record to be provisioned to the controlling device” (“Processing Device Limitation”).

106. I understand that Petitioner ~~has failed to show that~~ and Mr. McNair rely solely on Aginsky ~~discloses, teaches, or suggests the~~

~~Processing Device Limitation of Challenged Claim 12.~~

~~Petitioner relies solely on Aginsky~~ for the Processing Device Limitation. (Petition at 46-47; EX1003, ¶¶ 183-184.)

~~(Petition at 46-47.)~~ Petitioner asserts and Mr. McNair assert that Aginsky “discloses” the Processing Device

Limitation. (*Id.*)

40

Universal Electronics Inc. Exhibit 2001, Page 45 of 77

~~According to the~~ 107. The Processing Device Limitation, requires that a processing device ~~must~~

execute stored instructions that cause a codeset record to be provisioned to a controlling device. (EX1001 at claim 12.)

108. Petitioner and Mr. McNair assert that Aginsky discloses a controllable

~~Petitioner asserts that Aginsky discloses a controllable~~ device 101-1 that includes a processor 102-1 and a memory 103-1, and that “[p]rocessors execute various logical operations of controllable devices and are well-known to operate on an instruction set.” (Petition at 47; EX1003, ¶ 184.)

~~an instruction set.” (Petition at 47.) However, regardless~~ 109. Regardless of whether processors ~~purportedly~~ “execute various logical operations of controllable devices,” Petitioner and Mr. McNair have ~~has~~ provided no evidence or argument that Aginsky discloses, teaches, or suggests a processor on controllable device 101-1 that specifically causes a codeset record to be provisioned to a ~~be provisioned to a~~ controlling device, as ~~the Challenged Claims require~~ claimed. (*Id.*) Thus,

~~Petitioner has failed to show that Aginsky discloses, teaches, or suggests the Processing Device Limitation.~~

~~2. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That A POSITA Would Have Been Motivated To Combine Aginsky With Stammler To Arrive At The Claimed Invention Of The ‘083 Patent.~~

~~Petitioner has failed to show that Aginsky in combination with Stammler renders Challenged Claims 1-6, 8-10, and 12-18 obvious because Petitioner has failed to show that a POSITA would have been motivated to combine Aginsky with Stammler to arrive at the claimed invention of the ‘083 patent.~~

~~In an obviousness analysis, the petitioner must demonstrate that a POSITA would have been motivated to pick out the references relied upon and combine them~~

~~IPR2022-01289~~

Patent Owner's Response

~~in the manner claimed. *Personal Web Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc.*, 848 F.3d 987, 993-94 (Fed. Cir. 2017). It is not enough to merely show that a POSITA, “once presented with the two references, would have understood that they *could be* combined.” *Id.* at 993 (emphasis in original).~~

~~(a) Petitioner Has Failed To Show That A POSITA Would~~

5. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That A POSITA Would Have Been Motivated To Combine Aginsky With Stammler To Arrive At The Phonetic Representations Limitation.

110. The claimed invention of the ‘083 patent requires that phonetic representations of a function name and synonyms of the function name be stored in a specific codeset record on the controlling device (*i.e.*, the codeset record provisioned to the controlling device for use in commanding functional operations of the target appliance and comprising protocol and formatting information and a plurality of command function entries), and in a specific location within that

41

specific codeset record (*i.e.*, in each of the command function entries within the provisioned codeset record). (EX1001 at claims 1 and 12; ~~EX2001, ¶ 110.~~)

~~According to Petitioner, a POSITA would have been motivated to modify~~

111. According to Petitioner and Mr. McNair, a POSITA would have been motivated to modify Aginsky in view of Stammler: (i) to enable voice control in general, which was

purportedly a known replacement for the alleged drawbacks of user interfaces; and (ii) to take advantage of Stammler’s larger, expanded vocabulary to improve upon prior speech dialog systems that allegedly suffered from limited vocabularies, which would purportedly have improved command recognition accuracy and user friendliness.

~~(purportedly a known replacement for the alleged drawbacks of user interfaces~~

~~(Petition at 32-33; see also *id.* at 40 (“such that voice command is enabled”), 41 (“to~~

~~enable voice commands”)); and (ii) to take advantage of Stammler’s larger,~~

~~expanded vocabulary to improve upon prior speech dialog systems that allegedly~~

Universal Electronics Inc. Exhibit 2001, Page 50 of 77
Roku, Inc. v. Universal Electronics Inc., IPR2022-01289

~~suffered from limited vocabularies, which would purportedly have improved command recognition accuracy and user friendliness (*id.* at 32; *see also id.* at 33 (“the use of numerous different voice commands”), 41 (“responsive to a variety of voice command inputs”), 42 (“allow a user to use alternate words or phrases”).)~~

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.].

~~Petitioner has failed to show that a POSITA would have been motivated to combine Aginsky with Stammeler to arrive at the Phonetic Representations Limitation because (i) Petitioner's asserted reasons for modifying Aginsky in view of Stammeler fail to explain why a POSITA would have modified Aginsky in the specific manner of the claimed invention; and (ii) a POSITA would not have used Stammeler's alleged phonetic representations in the data structures provisioned to Aginsky's controlling device.~~

~~First, Petitioner's asserted reasons for modifying Aginsky in view of Stammeler fail to explain why a POSITA would have modified Aginsky *in the specific manner of the claimed invention*. Petitioner fails to explain why a POSITA would have added phonetic representations to the specific data structures on Aginsky's controlling device that Petitioner relies on in its obviousness analysis (*i.e.*, either of the data structures in tables 115' 116'), as opposed to different data structures in the controlling device's memory, some construct in the controlling device's memory other than a data structure, or to a different device altogether (*e.g.*, to a remote server). (Petition at 31-33, 40-42.) Similarly, Petitioner fails to explain why a POSITA would have specifically added phonetic representations to each of the alleged command function entries in these data structures, as opposed to some other location in the data structures, to only a subset of the alleged command function entries, etc. (*Id.*)~~Petition at 32-33, 40-42; EX1003, ¶¶ 114-116, 137-138.)

~~Rather than explain why a POSITA would have modified Aginsky in the specific manner of the claimed invention, at best, Petitioner has merely provided generic reasons for adding voice control support and synonym support to Aginsky in general, which cannot support a finding of obviousness as a matter of law. See *ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. Verizon Commun., Inc.*, 694 F.3d 1312, 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (“testimony [that] is generic and bears no relation to any specific combination of prior art elements” is insufficient); *Toyota Motor Corp. v. General Electric Co.*, Case IPR2019-00018, Paper 7 at 15 (PTAB May 7, 2019) (denying institution of review where petitioner’s expert’s testimony “merely provide[d] generic reasons for adding another converter in Mitsutani’s hybrid vehicle 100, but not specifically for connecting Mitsutani’s AC power generator to the DC/DC converter via port 4 in Robinson.”). Adding voice control support to Aginsky is also a legally insufficient reason to combine because, as Petitioner admits, Aginsky already discloses voice control support (Petition at 3, 18, 25), and the Federal Circuit has held that a POSITA would not be motivated to modify a prior art reference to add a feature the reference already has. See, e.g., *Henny Penny Corp. v. Frymaster LLC*, 938 F.3d 1324, 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2019); *In re Anova Hrg. Labs, Inc.*, 809 Fed. Appx. 840, 843 (Fed. Cir. 2020).~~

In 112. I understand that in the Institution Decision, the Board stated that “we understand Petitioner to be asserting that Aginsky suggests that the voice command-relevant information for

a particular command would be included in the command function entry for that command in tables 115' and 116,' because the command function entry includes data related to that particular command.” (Institution Decision (“ID”) at 32 (citing Petition at 25).) ~~However, there~~

113. I disagree. There is simply no evidence or argument in the Petition or in Mr. McNair’s declaration that Aginsky ~~purportedly~~ “suggests” that voice command-relevant information for a particular command would be included in the command function entry for that command. (*See generally* Petition at 25, 31-33, 40-42.; EX1003, ¶¶

42

Universal Electronics Inc. Exhibit 2001, Page 47 of 77

114-116, 137-138.) At best, Petitioner and Mr. McNair broadly ~~states~~state that Aginsky “leaves it to a POSITA to ... integrate[] voice command-relevant information into the data structure...” (Petition at 25 (citing EX1004 at 9:30-33, 13:34-36).) ~~As noted above, however, the;~~ EX1003, ¶ 106.) The Phonetic Representations Limitation requires that the claimed phonetic representations be stored in a specific location within a specific codeset record. (~~EX2001, ¶ 113.~~) Merely adding voice command information to a data structure is not enough. (~~Id.~~)

~~Second, a~~ 114. A POSITA would not have used Stammmler's alleged phonetic representations in the data structures provisioned to Aginsky's controlling device. (EX2001, ¶ ~~114.~~)

~~In the speech recognition field, vocabulary~~ 115. Vocabulary size is a critical factor in the selection of the type of basic units used for speech recognition. ~~(EX2001, ¶ 115.) The vocabulary in Aginsky's remote-control system is limited to a small, pre-defined collection of individually spoken words (e.g., "on," "off," "menu," etc.). (See, e.g.,~~ Such systems have been classified as small vocabulary (up to approximately 100 words), moderate vocabulary (up to approximately 500 words), and large vocabulary (more than 500 words). (EX2004 at 6.)

~~EX1004 at FIGS. 1B-1C; EX2001, ¶ 118.) A~~116. For a system that uses a relatively small vocabulary of individually spoken words, a POSITA would have known that used a whole-word models are particularly useful for remote control applications such as Aginsky's where the vocabulary used is limited to a small, pre-defined collection of individually spoken words. (EX2001, ¶ 117.) Specifically, model because in this vocabulary range such models (i) have relatively simple and fast computational requirements, making them very efficient; (ii) have a relatively short development time, resulting in efficiencies in development cost; (iii) have relatively small memory requirements; and (iv) can be implemented on simpler and less expensive ~~hardware platforms. (Id., ¶ 116.)~~

⁴³
hardware platforms. (See, e.g., EX2004 at 3-4; EX2005 at 4-5; see generally EX2006; EX2007; EX2008.)

117. Whole-word models are particularly useful for remote-control applications where the vocabulary used is limited to a small, pre-defined collection of individually-spoken words (e.g., "pause," "fast forward," "power on," etc.). Remote-control applications also typically have limited storage capacity and processing capabilities, which whole-word models are also ideally suited for.

118. Aginsky's remote-control system is limited to a small, pre-defined collection of individually-spoken words (e.g., "on," "off," "menu," etc.). (See, e.g., EX1004 at FIGS. 1B-1C.) As shown in FIG. 1B, Aginsky's remote control stores only a handful of controllable device functions comprised of single word or two-word

commands (e.g., “fast forward”). (Id. at FIG. 1B (listing at most fourteen unique commands).) The functions listed in Aginsky’s FIG. 1B make up essentially all the functions that are included in a standard remote control. Even if several additional functions were added to Aginsky (e.g., “play”), and if even synonyms were added for some (or all) of Aginsky’s functions, the total vocabulary would be limited to a relatively small, pre-defined collection of individually-spoken words. As noted above, a POSITA would have used a whole-word model in such an implementation.

119. Unlike Aginsky, Stammer's phoneme-based system incorporates a large vocabulary and is designed to process conversational speech. ~~(EX2001, ¶ 119.)~~

While

Stammer's phoneme-based model is useful in such an application, Stammer's phoneme-based dialog system is undesirable when it comes to handling a limited vocabulary of individually spoken commands because the efficiencies in development cost, computational load, and memory use that a whole-word model provides cannot similarly be achieved with Stammer's phoneme-based model. ~~(Id.)~~

120. Because Aginsky's vocabulary is limited to a relatively small, ~~pre-defined~~predefined collection of individually-spoken words, a POSITA would not have been motivated to modify Aginsky to use Stammer's phoneme-based model. ~~(EX2001, ¶ 120.)~~ Instead, a POSITA would have used a whole-word model to take advantage of the efficiencies in development cost, computational load, and memory use that whole-word models provide over phoneme-based models. In a remote-control application such as Aginsky where functions are provided as isolated commands, discovery of user intention via sentence analysis and hypothesis is not required, making phoneme-based speech recognition unsuitable and unnecessary.

IPR2022-01289

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.].

Patent Owner's Response

45

~~efficiencies in development cost, computational load, and memory use that whole-word models provide over phoneme-based models. (Id.) Simply put, in a remote-control application such as Aginsky, Stammer's phoneme-based approach would have been considered unsuitable and unnecessary. (Id.)~~

~~Accordingly, Petitioner has failed to show that a POSITA would have been motivated to combine Aginsky with Stammer to arrive at the claimed invention of the '083 patent.~~

(b)6. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That A POSITA Would Have Been Motivated To Modify Aginsky To Have A “speech recognition engine.”

121. Petitioner ~~has~~ and Mr. McNair have failed to identify any reason why a POSITA would have modified Aginsky to have a “speech recognition engine.” (Petition at 45-46; ~~see also~~ EX1003, ¶¶ 149-151.)

~~In~~ 122. I understand that in the Institution Decision, ~~the Board stated that a POSITA “would have~~

POSITA “would have understood that a mechanism for recognizing voice ~~commands would have been~~

commands would have been necessary.” (ID at 37.) ~~However, there~~ I disagree. There is no ~~evidence in the Petition or supporting~~

~~expert~~ evidence in the Petition or in Mr. McNair's declaration to support this finding. ~~(Id. (Board failing to cite to any record~~

~~evidence);~~ (Petition at 45-46; EX1003, ¶¶ 149-151.) Neither Petitioner nor ~~its~~ expert Mr. McNair

asserted that a mechanism for recognizing voice commands would have been

necessary. (Id.) Further, even if there were evidence in the record demonstrating

Universal Electronics Inc. Exhibit 2001, Page 50 of 77
Roku, Inc. v. Universal Electronics Inc., IPR2022-01289

~~IPR2022-01289~~

Patent Owner's Response

that an unspecified “mechanism” would be necessary for recognizing voice

commands (there is none), there is certainly no evidence that this unspecified “mechanism” must be the claimed “speech recognition engine.” (*Id.*) ~~Indeed, a~~

~~“123. Additionally, a speech recognition engine” is~~ would not ~~necessary.~~
(EX2001, ¶ 123.) have been

~~Thus, Petitioner has failed to show that a POSITA would have been motivated to modify Aginsky to have a ““necessary.” A speech recognition engine.” In re Cyclobenzaprine, is a turnkey solution for recognizing~~

~~676 F.3d at 1068-69 (holding that a petition must demonstrate “that a skilled artisan would have had reason to combine the teachings of the prior art references to achieve the claimed invention, and that the skilled artisan would have had a reasonable expectation of success from doing so.”)~~

speech with an unrestricted vocabulary. Rather than use a speech recognition engine, a POSITA could have used a speech recognizer using Dynamic Time Warping, Hidden Markov Models, Neural Networks, etc. Such speech recognizers

could be customized for remote-control applications to recognize the specific vocabulary associated with controlling appliances.

37. Petitioner Has Failed ~~to~~To Show That Aginsky In Combination

**With Stammler Renders Dependent
Challenged Claims 2-6, 8-10, And 13-18 Obvious.**

124. Petitioner and Mr. McNair have failed to show that Aginsky in

~~Petitioner has failed to show that Aginsky in~~ combination with Stammler renders ~~dependent~~ Challenged Claims 2-6, 8-10, and 13-18

obvious in view of their dependency on Challenged Claims 1 and 12. ~~Additionally, Petitioner has failed to~~

125. Petitioner and Mr. McNair have also failed to show that Aginsky in combination with Stammler renders dependent Challenged Claims 2-6, 8-10, and 13-18 obvious for the reasons discussed below.

(a) Challenged Claims 6 And 18.

~~Petitioner has failed to show that Aginsky in combination with Stammler discloses, teaches, or suggests every limitation of Challenged Claims 6 and 18.~~

126. For Challenged Claims 6 and 18, Petitioner and ~~its expert~~ Mr. McNair rely entirely on their analysis of Challenged Claim 1. (Petition at 55 (“*See* [1.b.1], [1.c].”); *id.* at 59 (“*See* [1.c], [6].”); EX1003, ¶¶ 170-171, 215-216.) ~~But~~

127. Challenged Claims 6 and 18 are materially different than Challenged ~~Claim 1.~~
(EX2001, ¶¶ 127-129)

Claim 1.

128. ~~+~~ Challenged Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “voice data provided to a speech recognition engine.” (EX1001 at claim 1.)

129. Challenged Claims 6 and 18, on the other hand, recite, *inter alia*, receiving at the speech recognition engine voice data for “*map[ping] each of the*

47

Universal Electronics Inc. Exhibit 2001, Page 52 of 77
Roku, Inc. v. Universal Electronics Inc., IPR2022-01289

Universal Electronics Inc. Exhibit 2001, Page 55 of 77
Roku, Inc. v. Universal Electronics Inc., IPR2022-01289

less than all of the individual command function entries ... to the one or more of the plurality of user input elements of the controlling device.” (EX1001 at claims 6 and 18 (emphasis added).)

130. Petitioner ~~has~~ and Mr. McNair have failed to explain how any received voice data is used for mapping anything, let alone mapping command function entries to user input elements as claimed. (Petition at 43-46, 55, 59.)

~~Thus, Petitioner cannot show that Challenged Claims 6 and 18 are obvious.~~
EX1003, ¶¶ 170-171, 215-216.)

(b) Challenged Claims 8-10.

~~Petitioner has failed to show that Aginsky in combination with Stammeler renders Challenged Claims 8-10 obvious~~131. Challenged Claim 8 recites, *inter alia*, “receiving ... voice data indicative of at least a brand of the target appliance” and “us[ing] the voice data indicative of at least a brand of the target appliance to identify

within a library of codeset records the codeset record that is caused to be provisioned to the controlling device.” (EX1001 at claim 8.)⁺

132. Petitioner ~~argues~~ and Mr. McNair assert that it “would have been obvious to a POSITA to use voice data associated with at least a brand name of a controllable device 101-1 to identify the desired controllable device 101-1, and accordingly, a data structure associated with controllable device 101-1 to be provisioned to remote device 107-1” because “each controllable device 101-1 may contain multiple data structures ... specialized for ‘a specific brand, model, or category of

remote devices 107-1 to 107-N.” (Petition at 56 (quoting EX1004 at 5:22-42);
EX1003, ¶¶ 174-175.)

~~Petitioner's logic is flawed~~133. I disagree with Petitioner and Mr.
McNair. Aginsky does not ~~disclose~~teach that controllable device 101-1 (*i.e.*,
the alleged “target appliance”) stores data structures related to other controllable
devices. (EX1004 at 5:18-45, FIG. 1C; ~~EX2001, ¶ 133.~~) Rather, Aginsky
~~discloses~~teaches that controllable device 101-1 stores data structures specific to
remote devices 107-1 to 107-N and/or to specific users. (*Id.*)

~~+Challenged Claims 9 and 10 are dependent on Challenged Claim 8, and Petitioner has failed
to prove these claims obvious because of their dependency on Challenged Claim 8. (EX1001
at claims 9-10.)~~

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.].

(Modified)

100

CONTROLLABLE DEVICE MEMORY/STORAGE		
REMOTE DEVICE 107-1 = NAME : MASTER		
FUNCTION 119-1	STATUS 120-1	RULES 121-1
ON - OFF	YES	UNLIMITED
VOLUME	YES	UNLIMITED
MENU	YES	-
CHANNEL	YES	ALL
INPUT	NO	-

109-1

117

REMOTE DEVICE 107-2 = NAME : CHILD 1		
FUNCTION 119-2	STATUS 120-2	RULES 121-2
ON - OFF	YES	NOT AFTER MIDNIGHT
VOLUME	YES	OFF AFTER 9PM
MENU	NO	-
CHANNEL	YES	NOTHING ABOVE 100 NO PREMIUM NO PAY-PER-VIEW
INPUT	NO	-

118

FIG. 1C

(Id. at FIG. 1C.)

134. If a user were to provide voice data indicative of a brand of controllable device 101-1, such voice data would not identify a specific data structure within the plurality of data structures stored in controllable device 101-1 because every data structure stored in controllable device 101-1 is related to

49

Universal Electronics Inc. Exhibit 2001, Page 54 of 77
Roku, Inc. v. Universal Electronics Inc., IPR2022-01289

Universal Electronics Inc. Exhibit 2001, Page 55 of 77
Roku, Inc. v. Universal Electronics Inc., IPR2022-01289

controllable device 101-1. (~~EX2001, ¶ 134.~~) ~~Instead, only~~ Only an indication of a specific remote device or user would identify a data structure within the plurality of stored data structures because the data structures in controllable device 101-1 are specific to remote devices ~~107-1~~ 1071 to 107-N and/or to specific users. (~~Id.~~; EX1004 at 5:18-45, FIG. 1C; *see also* Petition at 36 (“controllable device 101-1 selects a data structure based upon the brand, model, etc. of remote device 107-1”).) ~~Thus, it~~ It would not have been obvious to use voice data indicative of a brand of controllable device 101-1 (*i.e.*, the alleged “target

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.]

appliance”) to identify a data structure within the plurality of data structures stored in controllable device 101-1 to be provisioned to remote device 107-1 (*i.e.*, the alleged “controlling device”), as claimed. ~~(EX2001, ¶ 134.)~~

~~Alternatively,~~135. Petitioner ~~argues~~and Mr. McNair alternatively assert that “[w]here remote device 107-1 is ‘programmed’ with a library of the applicable data structures, it would have been obvious to a POSITA to use a brand identification to identify the appropriate data structure entry within memory 109-1.” (Petition at 57~~;~~; EX1003, ¶ 176.) I disagree with Petitioner’s and Mr. McNair’s alternative argument ~~is~~ ~~without merit~~ because it is ~~conclusory and~~ irrelevant to the claims.

136. Challenged Claim 8 requires that “the speech recognition engine use[] the voice data ... to identify ... the codeset record ***that is caused to be provisioned to the controlling device.***” (EX1001 at claim 8 (emphasis added).) Merely identifying a codeset record is insufficient. (*Id.*; ~~EX2001, ¶ 136.~~)

137. While Petitioner ~~argues~~ and Mr. McNair assert that it would have been obvious “to use a brand identification to identify the appropriate data structure entry within memory 109-1,” Petitioner ~~does~~ and Mr. McNair do not identify any subsequent provisioning of a “data structure” to a controlling device. (Petition at 57; EX1003, ¶ 176.) In Petitioner’s and Mr. McNair’s example, the data structures (*i.e.*, the alleged “codeset records”) have already been provisioned to memory ~~109-1~~ 1091 of remote device 107-1 (*i.e.*, the alleged “controlling device”). (~~*Id.*; EX2001, ¶¶ 137-138.~~)

138. Aginsky does not disclose, teach, or suggest that data structures 115’ or 116’ are provisioned anywhere else once they have been programmed to memory 109-1. (EX1004 at 7:58-8:62.) Rather, Aginsky discloses that certain information in the data structures can subsequently be used to send command signals to controllable devices. (*Id.*)

139. Challenged Claims 9 and 10 are dependent on Challenged Claim 8, and Petitioner and Mr. McNair have failed to prove these claims obvious because of their dependency on Challenged Claim 8. (EX1001 at claims 9-10.)

~~Further, Petitioner’s alternative argument simply concludes, without explanation, that “it would have been obvious to a POSITA to use a brand~~

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.]

~~identification to identify the appropriate data structure entry within memory 109-1.”~~
~~(Petition at 57.) Petitioner does not explain **why** it allegedly would have been obvious to~~
~~use a brand identification to identify a data structure in memory. (*Id.*) Petitioner’s~~
~~conclusory argument is legally insufficient to establish obviousness. *ActiveVideo*~~
~~*Networks*, 694 F.3d at 1327.~~

(c) Challenged Claims 13 And 14.

~~Petitioner has failed to show that Aginsky in combination with Stammler~~
~~discloses, teaches, or suggests every limitation of Challenged Claims 13 and 14.~~

140. Challenged Claim 13 recites that the claimed “instructions” that, when executed
by the processing device, cause a codeset record to be provisioned to the controlling device,
“are downloaded to the controlling device in a downloadable

app.” (EX1001 at claims 12-13.) Challenged Claim 14 depends from Challenged Claim 13, and thus incorporates every limitation of Challenged Claim 13. ~~35 U.S.C. § 112(d).~~

141. According to Petitioner and Mr. McNair, “Aginsky discloses

~~According to Petitioner, “Aginsky discloses~~ transferring [a] data structure to ‘a remote control application’” and downloading

from an “app store” to remote device 107-1 “a control application that is designed

to control controllable devices” ~~from an “app store.”~~ (Petition at 58; EX1003, ¶¶ 203-206.) However, ~~Petitioner does not assert—and provides no evidence to~~

Petitioner and Mr. McNair do not assert—and provide no evidence to demonstrate—that the claimed “instructions” are

“downloaded to the controlling device in a downloadable app,” as ~~the Challenged~~claimed. (Id.)

~~Claims require. (Id.)~~

B. Ground 2: Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky In Combination With Stammler And Dresti Renders Challenged Claims 7, 11, And 19 Obvious.

142. Petitioner and Mr. McNair have failed to show that Aginsky in

~~Petitioner has failed to show that Aginsky in~~ combination with Stammler and

Dresti renders Challenged Claims 7, 11, and 19

obvious in view of their dependency on Challenged Claims 1 and 12.

143. Petitioner ~~has~~and Mr. McNair have also failed to show that Aginsky in combination with Stammler and Dresti discloses, teaches, or suggests every limitation of Challenged Claims 7, 11, and 19.

144. Challenged Claim 7 recites “using at least location data to identify the~~codeset~~codeset record that is caused to be provisioned to the controlling device.”
~~record that is caused to be provisioned to the controlling device.”~~ (EX1001 at claim 7.)

145. Challenged Claims 11 and 19 include similar limitations (*id.* at claims 11 and 19), and Petitioner ~~relies~~ and Mr. McNair rely entirely on ~~its~~ their analysis of Challenged Claim 7 for these claims. (Petition at 66; EX1003, ¶¶ 227-230.)

~~claims. (Petition at 66.)~~

146. Petitioner ~~concedes~~ and Mr. McNair agree that “neither Aginsky nor Stammler explicitly disclose using location data to identify [a] codeset record.” (Petition at 64; EX1003, ¶ 224.) Nevertheless, Petitioner ~~asserts~~ and Mr. McNair assert that Dresti “teaches a universal remote provisioned with particular code sets after a user selects an appropriate region.” (~~Id.~~ Petition at 64 (citing EX1007 at [0321]); EX1003, ¶ 225.)

147. I disagree with Petitioner ~~is wrong~~ and Mr. McNair. Dresti discloses a remote control application that “may be shipped with a world-wide IR code database.” (EX1007 at [0321]; ~~EX2001, ¶~~

147.) The user may select a region and, “[b]ased on this input, the behavior of the remote control application may be adjusted.” (*Id.*) “For example, the order in which IR device codes are presented to the user for testing ... during device setup may be varied from region to region.” (*Id.*)

~~Crucially,~~148. Dresti does not teach provisioning code sets to the remote control application based on the selection of a region. (~~EX2001, ¶ 148~~*Id.*) As noted above, Dresti’s remote control application is shipped with a comprehensive “world-wide IR code database.” (*Id.*) The selection of a region does not cause additional code sets or code databases to be provisioned to the remote control application. (*Id.*) Thus, the

53

prior art does not disclose, teach, or suggest using location data to identify a codeset record that is caused to be provisioned to a controlling device, as claimed. (~~*Id.*~~)

~~Additionally,~~149. Petitioner ~~has~~and Mr. McNair have also failed to explain how Aginsky

would be combined with Stammeler and Dresti to arrive at the claimed invention.

~~*Metalcraft*, 848 F.3d at 1367 (party asserting obviousness must explain how references would be combined to arrive at claimed invention).~~

According to Petitioner and Mr. McNair, “[i]t would have been obvious to a POSITA to implement Aginsky’s methods and systems as modified by Stammeler to thus include location data.” (Petition at 65; EX1003, ¶ 226.) However,

Petitioner ~~does~~and Mr. McNair do not explain how “location data” would (or could) be

Universal Electronics Inc. Exhibit 2001, Page 63 of 77
Roku, Inc. v. Universal Electronics Inc., IPR2022-01289

~~IPR2022-01289~~

Patent Owner's Response

used in Aginsky as modified by Stammmler to identify a codeset record that is caused to be provisioned

to a controlling device. (*Id.*) The alleged codeset records stored on Aginsky’s controllable device 101-1 are specific to remote devices 107-1 ~~to 107-N and/or to~~ to 107-N and/or to specific users. (EX1004 at 5:18-45, FIG. 1C; ~~EX2001, ¶ 149.~~) “Location data” would not identify any of these alleged codeset records—only an indication of a specific remote device or user would. ~~(EX2001, ¶ 149.)~~

C. **Ground 3: Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky In Combination With Hanson Renders Challenged Claims 1-6, 8-10, And 12-18 Obvious.**

~~1. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky In Combination With Hanson~~ **1. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky Discloses, Teaches, Or Suggests Every Limitation Of Challenged Claims 1 And 12.**

~~(a) Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky Discloses, Teaches, Or Suggests~~ **“the provisioned codeset record comprising protocol and formatting information.”**

150. Petitioner and Mr. McNair failed to show in Ground 1 that Aginsky discloses, teaches, or suggests “the provisioned codeset record comprising protocol ~~and formatting~~ and formatting information.” In Ground 3, Petitioner ~~relies~~ and Mr. McNair rely entirely

on ~~its~~ their Ground 1 analysis for this limitation. (Petition at 71; EX1003, ¶¶ 241-~~limitation. (Petition at 71~~242.) Thus, for the reasons discussed above regarding Ground 1, Petitioner ~~has~~ and

Mr. McNair have again failed to show that Aginsky discloses, teaches, or suggests

“the provisioned codeset record comprising protocol and formatting information” ~~in~~ Universal Electronics Inc. Exhibit 2001, Page 63 of 77 Roku, Inc. v. Universal Electronics, Inc., IPR2022-01289

~~IPR2022-01289~~

~~Patent Owner's Response~~

in Ground 3.

(b)2. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky In Combination With Hanson Discloses, Teaches, Or Suggests The Phonetic Representations Limitation.

151. Petitioner and Mr. McNair have failed to show that Aginsky in

~~Petitioner has failed to show that Aginsky in~~ combination with
Hanson

discloses, teaches, or suggests the Phonetic Representations Limitation because neither Aginsky nor Hanson discloses, teaches, or suggests phonetic representations of function names (or synonyms of function names) stored in a codeset record ~~(or in, more particularly, in command function command function~~ entries within a codeset record), as claimed.

152. As ~~noted~~ discussed above, Aginsky alone indisputably does not disclose,

teach, or suggest the Phonetic Representations Limitation. (Petition at 40, 42; *see also id.* at 73-75; *see generally* EX1004 at 7:58-10:2.)

153. Regarding Hanson, Petitioner and Mr. McNair assert that Hanson

~~With respect to Hanson, Petitioner argues that Hanson~~ discloses a “command mapping 240 [that] is a ‘data set’ that includes an ‘arbitrary quantity of commands, synonyms, and/or alternative commands for a function.” ~~synonyms, and/or alternative commands for a function.” (Petition at 68.) Petitioner~~

~~also asserts~~ ⁵⁵(Petition at 68; EX1003, ¶ 234.) Petitioner and Mr. McNair also assert

that Hanson discloses that speech can be processed through “phonetic algorithms” and

Universal Electronics Inc. Exhibit 2001, Page 63 of 77
Roku, Inc. v. Universal Electronics Inc., IPR2022-01289

that a “POSITA would have understood that ‘phonetic algorithms’ index and recognize words according to phonetic representations, such as phonemes.” (Petition at 7374; EX1003, ¶ 256.)

~~phonemes.” (Id. at 73-74.)~~

154. While Hanson’s command mapping 240 is a data set, command mapping 240

is not a codeset record. ~~(EX2001, ¶ 154.) According to Hanson,~~ as claimed because command mapping 240 does not contain any command data. (EX2002 at 14:5-14.) Rather, Hanson’s command mapping 240 enables is a mapping used for automated discovery of speech commands in response to a manual event

by associating a manual event with an available speech command. (EX1006 at [0030], [0037].) For example, when a driver adjusts the air conditioning temperature manually, the command mapping 240 can be used to inform the driver that speech commands are available to adjust the air conditioning. (*Id.* at [0008].) ~~Crucially, Hanson's command mapping 240 does not contain any command codes, and thus it is not a codeset record. (EX2001, ¶ 154; EX2002 at 14:5-14.)~~

~~Additionally,~~¹⁵⁵. Hanson also does not disclose, teach, or suggest that its command mapping 240 contains phonetic representations of commands. ~~(EX2001, ¶ 155.)~~ Hanson's command mapping 240 contains whole words, not phonetic representations of words. (~~*Id.*~~; EX1006 at FIG. 2.) While Hanson discloses that its speech engine 254 can include "phonetic algorithms," the "phonetic algorithms" are used to process the user's speech. ~~(EX2001, ¶ 155; EX1006~~*Id.* ~~at [0040].)~~ The command mapping 240, on the other hand, is

used to present available speech commands to the user that correspond with a manual event. ~~(EX2001, ¶ 155.)~~ The "phonetic algorithms" in the speech engine 254 are unrelated to

the command mapping 240 and do not demonstrate that Hanson discloses, teaches, or suggests that its command mapping 240 contains phonetic representations of commands. ~~(*Id.*)~~

~~Accordingly, Petitioner has failed to show that Aginsky in combination with Hanson discloses, teaches, or suggests the Phonetic Representations Limitation.~~

~~(e)~~ **3. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky In**

Combination With Hanson, Discloses, Teaches, Or Suggests “a speech recognition engine.”

156. Petitioner ~~has failed to show~~ and Mr. McNair do not assert that Aginsky ~~in combination with Hanson~~ discloses,

~~discloses, teaches, or suggests the claimed “speech recognition engine.”~~

~~As noted above, Petitioner does not assert that Aginsky discloses,~~ teaches, or

suggests a “speech recognition engine.” (Petition at 75-76; *see also id.* ~~at 51~~

at 51 (“Aginsky does not explicitly disclose how remote device 107-1 receives ~~voice input~~

voice input or creating voice data.”); EX1003, ¶¶ 264-266.) While Petitioner ~~asserts and~~

Mr. McNair assert that Hanson discloses a “speech recognition engine,” Petitioner ~~does not propose modifying Aginsky to have a~~

and Mr. McNair do not propose modifying Aginsky to have a “speech recognition-engine.” (*Id.*; *see also id.* ~~at 69-70 (Petitioner proposing only~~

~~to modify Aginsky in view of Hanson to include phonetic representations in~~

~~Aginsky’s “data set” or “data structure”).~~ Again, ~~Petitioner’s failure to identify any~~

engine.” (*Id.*)

157. Petitioner’s and Mr. McNair’s failure to identify any reason why a

POSITA would have modified Aginsky to have a “speech recognition engine”

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.]

~~engine~~” further confirms that Petitioner ~~has~~ and Mr. McNair have not proposed modifying

Aginsky to have a “speech recognition engine.” (~~Id.~~ Petition at 69-70, 75-76.); EX1003, ¶¶ 264-266.)

~~Because Aginsky alone does not disclose, teach, or suggest a “speech recognition engine,” and because Petitioner has not proposed modifying Aginsky to include a “speech recognition engine,” Petitioner cannot show that Aginsky in combination with Hanson, discloses, teaches, or suggests “a speech recognition engine.” For the same reasons, Petitioner has also failed to explain how the references would be combined to arrive at the claimed invention. See *Metalcraft*, 848 F.3d at 1367.~~

~~(d)~~4. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky In Combination With Hanson Discloses, Teaches, Or Suggests The Processing Device Limitation.

158. Petitioner and Mr. McNair failed to show in Ground 1 that Aginsky discloses, teaches, or suggests the Processing Device Limitation. In Ground 3, ~~Petitioner primarily relies~~ Petitioner and Mr. McNair primarily rely on their Ground 1 analysis for this on its Ground 1 analysis for this limitation. (Petition at 76; EX1003, ¶¶ 288-290.) While Petitioner ~~adds~~ and Mr. McNair add that Hanson generally discloses “computer program instructions” (*id.*), ~~Petitioner fails~~ Petitioner and Mr. McNair fail to fill in the gaps in ~~its~~ their Ground 1 analysis. (EX2001, ¶ 158.) ~~Thus, Petitioner has failed to show that Aginsky in combination with Hanson discloses, teaches, or suggests the Processing Device Limitation.~~

~~2. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That A POSITA Would Have Been Motivated To Combine Aginsky With Hanson To Arrive At The Claimed Invention Of The ‘083 Patent.~~

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.]

~~Petitioner has failed to show that Aginsky in combination with Hanson renders Challenged Claims 1-6, 8-10, and 12-18 obvious because Petitioner has failed to show that a POSITA would have been motivated to combine Aginsky with Hanson to arrive at the claimed invention of the '083 patent.~~

~~(a) Petitioner Has Failed To Show That A POSITA Would~~

5. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That A POSITA Would Have Been Motivated To Combine Aginsky With Hanson To Arrive At The Phonetic Representations Limitation.

159. The claimed invention of the ‘083 patent requires that phonetic representations of a function name and synonyms of the function name ~~must be~~ stored in ~~stored in~~ a specific codeset record on the controlling device (*i.e.*, the codeset record provisioned to the controlling device for use in commanding functional operations of the target appliance and comprising protocol and formatting information and a ~~plurality of~~ plurality of command function entries), and in a specific location within that ~~specific codeset~~ specific codeset record (*i.e.*, in each of the command function entries within the ~~provisioned codeset~~ provisioned codeset record). (EX1001, ~~‘083 patent,~~ at claims 1, and 12; EX2001, ¶ 159.)

160. According to Petitioner and Mr. McNair, a POSITA would have been

~~According to Petitioner, a POSITA would have been~~ motivated to modify Aginsky in view of Hanson: (i) to achieve a voice control

system that executes a command in response to a variety of synonymous commands, which purportedly would have increased user friendliness; (ii) ~~because would have increased user friendliness (Petition at 70, 75, 77; see also id. at 72 (“to enable recognition of numerous phrases related to the same command”)); (ii) because~~ “implementing a data set with phonetic representations and synonyms” would have ~~would have~~ been “the mere application of a known technique” ~~(id. at 70)~~; and (iii) “to achieve the ~~“to achieve the~~ predictable result of using phonetic representations to process voice commands.” (Petition at 70, 72, 74-75, 77; EX1003, ¶¶ 235-236, 256, 259.) ~~commands” (id. at 74).~~

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.].

~~As with Ground 1, Petitioner has failed to show that a POSITA would have been motivated to combine Aginsky with Hanson to arrive at the Phonetic Representations Limitation because (i) Petitioner's asserted reasons for modifying Aginsky in view of Hanson fail to explain why a POSITA would have modified Aginsky in the specific manner of the claimed invention; and (ii) a POSITA would not have used Hanson's alleged phonetic representations in the data structures provisioned to Aginsky's controlling device.~~

~~First, Petitioner's asserted reasons for modifying Aginsky in view of Hanson fail to explain why a POSITA would have modified Aginsky ***in the specific manner of the claimed invention***. Petitioner fails to explain why a POSITA would have added phonetic representations to the specific data structures on Aginsky's controlling device that Petitioner relies on in its obviousness analysis (*i.e.*, either of the data structures in tables 115' 116'), as opposed to different data structures in the controlling device's memory, some construct in the controlling device's memory other than a data structure, or to a different device altogether (*e.g.*, to a remote server). (Petition at 69-70, 73-75.) Similarly, Petitioner fails to explain why a POSITA would have specifically added phonetic representations to each of the alleged command function entries in these data structures, as opposed to some other location in the data structures, to only a subset of the alleged command function entries, etc. (*Id.*)~~

~~Rather than explain why a POSITA would have modified Aginsky in the specific manner of the claimed invention, Petitioner's asserted reasons for modifying Aginsky amount to nothing more than generic reasons for adding synonym support to Aginsky in general, which cannot support a finding of obviousness as a matter of law. See *ActiveVideo Networks*, 694 F.3d at 1328; *Toyota Motor Corp.*, Case IPR2019-00018, Paper 7 at 15.~~

~~Further, "achiev[ing] the predictable result of using phonetic representations" is a legally insufficient reason to combine because it merely repeats the proposed modification to Aginsky (*i.e.*, adding phonetic representations to Aginsky), fails to explain why a POSITA would have made such a modification, and does not result in the claimed invention. Similarly, whether "implementing a data set with phonetic representations and synonyms" was purportedly a "known technique" cannot support a finding of a motivation to combine because merely demonstrating that something was known in the art is insufficient. See *Kinetic Concepts, Inc. v. Smith & Nephew, Inc.*, 688 F.3d 1342, 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2012).~~

~~Second, for~~ 161. For the same reasons discussed above in Ground 1, a POSITA would

not have used Hanson's alleged phonetic representations in the data structures provisioned to Aginsky's controlling device. ~~(EX2001, ¶ 161.)~~

~~Accordingly, Petitioner has failed to show that a POSITA would have been motivated to combine Aginsky with Hanson to arrive at the claimed invention of the ‘083 patent.~~

~~(b)~~6. Petitioner Has Failed To Show That A POSITA Would

Have Been Motivated To Modify Aginsky To Have A “speech recognition engine.”

162. As with Ground 1, Petitioner ~~has~~and Mr. McNair have failed to identify any reason why a POSITA would have modified Aginsky to have a “speech recognition engine.” (Petition at 69-70, 75-76; EX1003, ¶¶ 264-266.)

~~69-70, 75-76.) Thus, Petitioner has failed to show that a POSITA would have been motivated to modify Aginsky to have a “speech recognition engine.”~~

3~~7~~. Petitioner Has Failed to Show That Aginsky In Combination With Hanson Renders Dependent Challenged Claims 2-6, ~~8-10~~8-10, And 13-18 Obvious.

163. Petitioner and Mr. McNair have failed to show that Aginsky in

~~Petitioner has failed to show that Aginsky in~~ combination with Hanson renders dependent Challenged Claims 2-6, 8-10, and ~~13-18~~13-18 obvious in view of their dependency on Challenged Claims 1 and 12.

~~Additionally, with respect to~~ 164. Regarding dependent Challenged Claims 6, 8-10, 13-14,

and 18,

Petitioner ~~relies~~ and Mr. McNair rely entirely on ~~its~~ their Ground 1 analysis for these

claims. (Petition at 79-80; EX1003, ¶¶ 278-285, 309-312, 319-320.) For the same ~~reasons discussed~~

reasons discussed above regarding Ground 1, Petitioner ~~has~~ and Mr. McNair have

again failed to show that dependent Challenged Claims 6, 8-10, 13-14, and 18 are obvious.

D. Ground 4: Petitioner Has Failed To Show That Aginsky In Combination With Hanson And Dresti Renders Challenged Claims 7, 11, And 19 Obvious.

165. Petitioner ~~has~~ and Mr. McNair have failed to ~~meet its burden of showing~~ show that Aginsky in

combination with Hanson and Dresti renders Challenged Claims 7, 11, and 19

obvious in view of their dependency on Challenged Claims 1 and 12.

~~Additionally, in~~ 166. In Ground 4 Petitioner ~~relies~~ and Mr. McNair rely entirely on ~~its~~ their Ground

2 analysis. (Petition at 80; EX1003, ¶¶ 322-323.) Thus, for the same reasons ~~discussed above~~

discussed above regarding Ground 2, Petitioner ~~has~~ and Mr. McNair have failed to show that Aginsky in combination with Hanson and Dresti renders Challenged Claims 7, 11, and 19 obvious.

~~VIXI. CONCLUSION~~CONCLUSIONS

~~Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Patent Owner respectfully~~

- The Challenged Claims of the ‘083 patent are not obvious in light of the disclosures of the asserted prior art references.

~~requests that the Board confirm the patentability of the~~•The Challenged Claims of the '083 r
'083 patent.

Respectfully submitted,

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.]

properly issued by the Patent and Trademark Office.

I have prepared this Declaration based upon my review of the materials referenced, and my own personal knowledge, education, skill and experience. I declare, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America, that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: July 7, 2023 By: ~~/s/ James J. Lukas, Jr.~~

(Add)


~~James J. Lukas, Jr.
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
77 W. Wacker Dr., Suite 3100~~

Michael S. Scordilis

Chicago, IL 60601
Phone: (312) 456-8400
Fax: (312) 456-8435

Counsel for Patent Owner

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE 62

This paper complies with the requirements of 37
C.F.R. § 42.24 and contains
11,963 words (exclusive of the table of contents, the
table of authorities, the table of
exhibits, the certificate of service, and this
certification).

This paper complies with the typeface
requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 42.6 and
has been prepared in 14 point Times New Roman
proportionally spaced typeface
with normal spacing.

Respectfull
y
submitted,

Dated: July 7, 2023
James J. Lukas, Jr.

By: /s/

James J.
Lukas, Jr.
GREENBE
RG
TRAURIG
, LLP
77 W.
Wacker
Dr., Suite
3100

IPR2022-01289

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.]

Patent Owner's Response

Chicago,
IL 60601
Phone:
(312)
456-8400
Fax: (312)
456-8435

*Counsel
for Patent
Owner*

[Different odd and even pages setting changed from off in original to on in modified.]
Universal Electronics Inc. Exhibit 2001, Page 67 of 77
Roku, Inc. v. Universal Electronics Inc., IPR2022-01289