

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

STINGRAY GROUP INC. AND STINGRAY MUSIC USA, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

EDWIN A. HERNANDEZ-MONDRAGON,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

Record of Oral Hearing
Held: March 12, 2026

Before: TERRENCE W. MCMILLIN, JASON M. REPKO, and
BRIAN P. MURPHY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)
IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)
IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER:

STEVEN T. JUGLE, ESQ.
Alavi & Anaipakos PLLC
609 Main Street
Suite 3200
Houston, TX 77002
(713) 751-2362
sjuggle@aatriallaw.com

ON BEHALF OF THE PATENT OWNER:

ROBERT L. DROLET, ESQ.
RL Drolet Patent Prosecution Services, PLLC
515 East Las Olas Boulevard
Suite 120
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301
(561) 267-5596
rob@rldpatents.com

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on March 12, 2026,
commencing at 1:00 p.m.

P R O C E E D I N G S

- - - - -

JUDGE REPKO: This is an oral hearing for IPR2025-349, IPR2025-350, IPR2025-351. I'm Judge Repko. I'm joined by Judges McMillin and Murphy. Judge McMillin has the file and he can see the podium, but he can't see the display screen. So, you know, you need to announce the slides that you're on and anything you're referencing on the display screen for him.

At this time we'd like Counsel to introduce themselves at the podium and anyone with them. So I'll begin with Petitioner's Counsel.

MR. JUGLE: Steven Juggle for Petitioners, Stingray Group, Inc., and Stingray Music USA, Inc.

JUDGE REPKO: Thank you.

Patent Owner?

MR. DROLET: Good afternoon, Your Honors. Rob Drolet for Patent Owner, Dr. Edwin Hernandez-Mondragon. And with me today is Dr. Hernandez-Mondragon.

JUDGE REPKO: Thank you. All right. So our hearing order gave each party 90 minutes to present their arguments. We have a timer behind me, and I'll set that for each party. And the light changes to yellow when you have -- you're nearing the end of your time, whether opening or rebuttal. You've run out of time when the light is red.

Petitioner's Counsel will begin, followed by Patent Owner's Counsel. Both parties may reserve some rebuttal time, but you may not

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 reserve more than half your time for the rebuttal, unless there's some special
2 circumstance you could bring to my attention. If you have objections, please
3 wait and raise them during your rebuttal. Don't interrupt the other presenter.

4 With that, I'm going to invite Petitioner's Counsel to begin at the
5 podium, and I'll need to know how much time you wish to reserve for
6 rebuttal.

7 MR. JUGLE: I'll be reserving about a half an hour. So let's go
8 with 60 minutes for the opening presentation and a half hour for rebuttal.

9 JUDGE REPKO: Thank you. Tell me when you're all set up, and
10 I'll start the clock.

11 MR. JUGLE: All right. I'm ready.

12 JUDGE REPKO: You may begin.

13 MR. JUGLE: Steven Jugle, for Petitioners. Starting at Slide 2, I'm
14 going to go through a brief overview of the challenged patents. So at a high
15 level the challenged patents all share the same specification. And they're
16 directed to a method for obtaining content from a webpage and assembling
17 that content into a media stream for delivery to a content provider.

18 Patent Owner amended the claims during prosecution to describe
19 this process, and specifically to almost every -

20 JUDGE MURPHY: Counsel, just do me a favor, please.

21 MR. JUGLE: Sorry.

22 JUDGE MURPHY: Reference the slide for the court reporter.

23 MR. JUGLE: Thank you.

24 Moving on to Slide 4, during prosecution the Patent Owner

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 amended the claims, and this amendment finds its way into almost every
2 single dependent claim with one exception. And that amendment calls for
3 rendering a webpage by a browser, and then generating a temporal sequence
4 of screen captures of the rendered webpage, and then assembling a media
5 stream from those screen captures.

6 According to the challenged patents, and I'm at Slide 5 now, this
7 rendering and screen capture process can be implemented using commonly
8 known software tools. For example, browsers using WebKit, which is the
9 underlying software behind Safari, or it says any other browser capable of
10 rendering HTML. Likewise, the capturing process can be done using tools
11 similar to PhantomJS or simply capturing screen frame buffers from a
12 machine running any software tool. So those methods for rendering and
13 screen capture will be commonly known. Likewise, the assemble -- the
14 patent describes the assembly step as being performed by commonly known
15 tools such as FFmpeg, VLC, or any proprietary tool that can multiplex audio
16 and video files into an MPEG transport stream.

17 At Slide 7 I have an overview of -- in my slides an overview of the
18 primary prior art. I'm going to skip over that in the interest of time and
19 move directly to Slide, I think it's 17, where we'll start the invalidity
20 analysis.

21 I'm going to begin with primary art reference, Avellan, as it applies
22 to Claim 1 of the '074 Patent. This claim is fairly representative of the vast
23 majority of the remaining independent claims across all three patents. So
24 I'm going to talk about it first. Then I'll discuss a few of the nuances that are

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 made in other independent claims, as well as the dependent claims of the
2 '074 Patent, and any dependent claims of the other two patents that depend
3 from similar claims to Claim 1.

4 So at Slide 19, beginning with element 1A of Claim 1. This
5 element requires receiving from a content provider a request for at least one
6 media stream for playback on a broadcast media channel. Avellan's user
7 computers can request media streams for delivery via broadcast device 102,
8 which is passed through receivers 132 to its gateway server 134.

9 At Slide 20, the gateway receives the request from broadcast
10 device 102 and broadcast receiver 132. This request is then processed at the
11 gateway server 134, which obtains contents for the web, for the stream from
12 the internet 150 or browser 152.

13 Slide 21. The claim -- the second part of Element 1A says that
14 "wherein at least one of the media streams includes a plurality of multimedia
15 items of different types." So Avellan discloses that it can broadcast live-
16 streaming television feeds and other live content. And it gives some
17 examples of those, such as country music or military television. So live-
18 streaming television, movies, are going to include a plurality of multimedia
19 items because they'll have video, they'll have audio. And likewise,
20 something like a country music station is going to have multiple country
21 music songs and probably an identifier of what song you're listening to, the
22 channel you're on, et cetera. So we -- so Avellan meets the plurality of
23 multimedia items.

24 Next, at Slide 22, Element 1B requires obtaining "content

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 corresponding to the plurality of multimedia items from at least one source
2 offering the content in at least one first format." Avellan discloses that it
3 obtains content from the internet or private cloud. So that's the internet 150
4 or private cloud 152. This is similar to how the challenged patents describe
5 obtaining content, which it describes as obtaining content from websites or
6 cloud-based servers.

7 JUDGE MURPHY: Well, in Avellan, what is the content being
8 captured here?

9 MR. JUGLE: So it can be webpages. It discloses that it captures
10 webpages. And those webpages can include live-streaming such as CNN,
11 ESPN. There could be other content it captures, I don't think it's limited to
12 webpages, but that's a form that it explicitly discloses.

13 JUDGE MURPHY: And what's your response to Patent Owner's
14 argument that Avellan only transmits static webpages?

15 MR. JUGLE: Well -

16 JUDGE MURPHY: Not the underlying content, if you will.

17 MR. JUGLE: I think that that is just not accurate, and we're going
18 to get to that shortly. But at a high level, Avellan discloses taking a series of
19 screen captures for moving content such as video or live-streaming, and
20 saving a series of those screen captures. And then transmitting that as a
21 broadcast. And its purpose is to provide that broadcast to its downstream
22 users. So it's not just transmitting a static image. It's transmitting all of what
23 it captures.

24 JUDGE MURPHY: All right. Take us through that in detail,

1 please.

2 MR. JUGLE: All right. So on my way there, I'm going to just
3 briefly touch on Element 1C at Slide 23, which is rendering a webpage by
4 browser using the content. Avellan discloses that there's a browser software
5 in 106, residing on the gateway server, and it explicitly discloses that that
6 browser can render webpages. So 1C is met. All right.

7 JUDGE REPKO: So is it rendering the webpage for the purpose of
8 capturing it?

9 MR. JUGLE: That's correct.

10 JUDGE REPKO: Can you point to a citation from Avellan
11 -- Avellan, I guess, where it says that?

12 MR. JUGLE: So yeah, so in this -- in the cited portion I have, it
13 says it "renders webpages, images, and documents from the network. The
14 gateway server then images those webpages," so it's referring to the
15 webpages, "to a video or image frame format." And Avellan -

16 JUDGE REPKO: Full webpage, but I'm talking about the
17 streaming part of that webpage.

18 MR. JUGLE: So -

19 JUDGE REPKO: The sequence of images that define streaming
20 content, not just a static webpage.

21 MR. JUGLE: Correct. So next, and this is in the same paragraph
22 continuing on, I'm at Slide 24 from the citation I had on the previous slide.
23 So Avellan at column 4, lines 65 through column 5, line 4, says, "The
24 gateway server images those webpages to video frame format. This is

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 preferably done by taking an image of the entire webpage from top to
2 bottom." So there it says it gets the entire webpage, not just stuff that is on
3 the screen, but the whole webpage.

4 And I'm going a little out of order with Element 1D because it gets
5 to the temporal part in Avellan next. So okay, so then Avellan says
6 immediately after that, at column 5, lines 5 through 12, that "in addition,
7 webpages often have information which is rendered over a period of time
8 such as video, streaming information or an animated display. Accordingly,
9 the gateway continuously captures images of the webpage until it detects a
10 repeating pattern of the information on webpage." In other words, until the
11 video stops.

12 JUDGE REPKO: Are you interpreting that as when the video
13 stops or as the webpage changes in some way? Like the video can provide a
14 sequence of frames within the static webpage. Where does it talk about the
15 frames of the video in the webpage?

16 MR. JUGLE: So it's telling you that it's continuously capturing the
17 entire webpage with a video on it. So you're going to be capturing the
18 frames of that video. The claims don't require that you are only capturing
19 specifically frames of a video on a webpage. It says that you just generate a
20 temporal sequence of screen captures of the rendered webpage. So if you're
21 capturing the webpage and the webpage has a video on it, as the video
22 changes you're capturing new images, and that's your temporal sequence of
23 screen captures of the rendered webpage.

24 JUDGE REPKO: Why would you want to capture the entire

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 webpage when only a portion of it's moving? Say you have a video playing
2 within a larger screen, why would you want to capture the static part of it?
3 Why would Avellan want to do that?

4 MR. JUGLE: Avellan doesn't go into it in great detail. I think at
5 the time you have a fixed capture space, you're not -- different websites have
6 videos located at different places on the screen. So I'm only, you know,
7 surmising here, but at the time of Avellan specifically directing a capture to
8 just the video portion of a webpage, it might have been more efficient for
9 what they were trying to do to capture the whole page. Because part of the
10 purpose of Avellan was sending a broadcast of a webpage to a downstream
11 user so the user could view that entire webpage on a dumb browser that
12 wouldn't have to do all the heavy lifting of rendering the webpage.

13 JUDGE REPKO: So if a video is playing within the webpage,
14 your position is, Avellan does not specifically teach capturing just that
15 video.

16 MR. JUGLE: I don't think what we're relying on, Avellan teaches
17 that, no.

18 JUDGE REPKO: So in your view the entire webpage is like a
19 -- it's like a movie of the entire static part and moving part, if there is any
20 moving parts.

21 MR. JUGLE: That's correct.

22 JUDGE REPKO: Like if there is any, you know, animation or
23 something on the screen. What part of Avellan discusses that? Apart from
24 what you just showed me. We have to make some inferences from that,

1 right, from what you've shown me because it doesn't really talk about the
2 streaming part --

3 MR. JUGLE: Well, so it's -

4 JUDGE REPKO: -- in column 5 --

5 (Simultaneous speaking.)

6 MR. JUGLE: -- it says that you're capturing webpages that have
7 information, which is rendered over time, and you're continuously capturing
8 that. So I think just on the basis of it, it's changing over time and you're
9 continuously taking screenshots, at times you're going to capture that
10 moving image.

11 JUDGE REPKO: So webpages often have information in the, such
12 as, video. So that information that's rendered over a period of time is the
13 video streaming information and animated display.

14 MR. JUGLE: Right. So those are examples of information that
15 could be on the webpage that changes over time.

16 JUDGE REPKO: So when it's detecting that repeating pattern of
17 information on the webpage, you're talking about the repeating pattern that's
18 created by the video playing?

19 MR. JUGLE: Well, if a video's playing it's not a repeating pattern.
20 Our interpretation of -- because it says it captures the images until it detects
21 a repeating pattern. So a repeating pattern over time would be something
22 like motion ceases, because it's repeating then.

23 JUDGE REPKO: And just stops.

24 MR. JUGLE: It just stops.

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 JUDGE REPKO: So then how would it handle streaming video
2 like a broadcast, like something on CNN or ESPN, like you pointed to?

3 MR. JUGLE: Well, in that case you wouldn't have a repeating
4 pattern, you'd have a changing pattern, so it would continue to capture to
5 generate its stream.

6 JUDGE REPKO: Okay. And where does it discuss that? Is it line
7 10, that continues over a period of time, is that what you're referring to, a
8 repeating -

9 MR. JUGLE: So I'm -

10 JUDGE REPKO: -- pattern?

11 MR. JUGLE: Right. So at line -- I apologize, I don't have the
12 lines in front of me in my presentation. I can grab the reference if you like.
13 So that's at line 5 of column 5.

14 JUDGE MURPHY: So that's Avellan, column 5, line 5 -

15 MR. JUGLE: Right, through -

16 JUDGE MURPHY: -- continuing.

17 MR. JUGLE: Through -- continuing, at least through line 12. So
18 at the end of that, it says, "The gateway will be certain to capture all of the
19 information on a webpage even if that webpage information continues over
20 time."

21 JUDGE REPKO: So would that be the static part of the webpage?
22 I'm looking at, again, column 5, lines 10 through 12. So it's -- one way you
23 could potentially read this is that it's saying the static parts, if they're
24 continuing, if they continue to be displayed unchanged, it's going to capture

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 that continuously. In the previous line it's only talking about repeating
2 animations, right? Like you're talking about something that repeats over a
3 short period of time -

4 (Simultaneous speaking.)

5 MR. JUGLE: I -- no, I think it's broader than that. I think it says,
6 look, websites can have information that renders over a period of time.
7 Whether that's a video that renders over two hours or an animation that
8 renders over 15 seconds. Avellan discloses all of that. And it says you can
9 continuously capture those images to capture all that information. So as
10 long as your video information is continuing, you're going to be
11 continuously capturing that information. And that's, to be certain to capture
12 all of the information even if that information continues over a period of
13 time, like a video that continues over a period of time.

14 JUDGE REPKO: Why would they use the words "even if"? It
15 doesn't really suggest -

16 MR. JUGLE: Well, because it's -

17 JUDGE REPKO: -- that it's like looking at something that's a
18 continuing animation. It seems like that -- you know, even if the static
19 image continues to be displayed. Because the previous sentence talks about
20 repeating patterns. It -- it's -- we know that the -- we don't think it's
21 repeating. You're saying that the video streaming information, animated
22 display -- if it's streaming, that's not repeating. ESPN, CNN, that's not
23 repeating. So that particular sentence doesn't say anything about -- doesn't
24 speak to the feature that you're relying upon. That would be line 7, 8, and 9

1 of column 5, right?

2 MR. JUGLE: Right.

3 JUDGE REPKO: So that's out of it. So we're basically just
4 pinning everything on lines 10, 11, and 12. And I'll repeat what it says.
5 "The gateway server will be certain to capture all the information on the
6 webpage." You're talking about everything. You're not talking about a
7 portion of a webpage, you're talking about the entire webpage, "even if that
8 information continues." It seems like one way to read that could be, the
9 previous sentence was talking about animations that repeat. And that
10 sentence talks about static parts that don't repeat, that stay the same, even if
11 it continues. So how would you respond to that?

12 MR. JUGLE: I don't think so. I think you have to read that in
13 reference to the entire paragraph, which talks about, again, capturing video
14 by continuously -- by -- sorry. Like it -- right. The whole paragraph is
15 talking about capturing information which is rendered over time, such as
16 video. And I think this sentence about continuously capturing the
17 information -- capturing all the information, even if that information
18 continues over time, is talking about that same subject of this paragraph. It's
19 not talking about the preceding sentence, which from my interpretation, I
20 mean, I -- like I said, we've interpreted this as: It's continuously capturing
21 something that's changing until it stops and it detects a repeating pattern in
22 the stopped image.

23 JUDGE REPKO: Is this the only sentence that you have in the
24 entire reference that talks about, you know, capturing something that's a

1 stream, and taking images of that stream?

2 MR. JUGLE: No. So -

3 JUDGE REPKO: Are there any other parts of --

4 (Simultaneous speaking.)

5 MR. JUGLE: So there are other parts of the reference. And there's
6 other examples in Avellan. So at Slide 27 as an example, it talks about a
7 "large number of viewers choosing to select a hockey game," as an example.
8 And that's at column 8, lines 34 through 36. And that is immediately after it
9 gives an example of other types of content from webpages that it can image,
10 such as live television feeds, movies, music downloads, or ESPN. If it's
11 broadcasting a hockey game, you have to be seeing that video some way,
12 right? And the way Avellan discloses that you do that is you are imaging the
13 webpage continuously.

14 JUDGE REPKO: But does it say it's imaging that hockey game, or
15 streaming or anything other than going back to column 5 that we've talked
16 about?

17 MR. JUGLE: So column 5 is the main support for the imaging
18 continuously.

19 JUDGE REPKO: Is it the only support? Again, we have these
20 -- we know that these webpages have live-streaming feeds, movies, music
21 downloads, ESPN. Column 8 tells us that. But the issue is, is that being
22 captured? Are all the frames of that live-streaming feed, movie download,
23 whatever you're going to call it, is that being captured? Or is column 5 the
24 only place where it says that?

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 MR. JUGLE: Give me a second.

2 JUDGE REPKO: Just that sentence. Again, looking at column 5,
3 line 10. I'll give you a moment. If you want to -

4 MR. JUGLE: No.

5 JUDGE REPKO: -- respond in the rebuttal, that's fine. If you
6 don't have it at your fingertips, but -

7 MR. JUGLE: So -

8 JUDGE REPKO: Again, if you could work in other parts of
9 Avellan that would help us better understand your position, that would be -

10 JUDGE MURPHY: Yeah, could you turn to your next slide, 28?

11 MR. JUGLE: Yes.

12 JUDGE MURPHY: I was just looking and tell me if that impacts
13 or answers Judge Repko's question.

14 MR. JUGLE: So look, I think it does. Because how Avellan
15 discusses capturing webpages, is taking images of those webpages. It
16 doesn't describe creating a video broadcast by another means, right? And it
17 says that it can provide things like hockey broadcasts. So to do that by
18 capturing images of webpages, you're going to have to create a temporal
19 sequence of screen captures. And that's what Avellan describes at columns
20 5 -- or column 5, lines 5 through 12.

21 And then for example, our expert opined that if you want to show a
22 hockey game, screen capture time one, followed by screen capture time two,
23 is going to illustrate a dynamic change such as the movement of the players.
24 So if Avellan's disclosure of broadcasting this hockey game or broadcasting

1 live TV by virtue of doing it by webpage captures, especially understood
2 with -- in connection with its explanation at column 5, we think discloses
3 this element.

4 JUDGE REPKO: And again, I'll go back. If it's like column 5,
5 column 5 says repeating, hockey game isn't repeating, it changes. And if it's
6 the other sentence that you're relying upon, if there is a possible reading that
7 that is just the static images. So if you could find something other than that
8 one sentence that potentially could be read multiple ways to help your point,
9 I'd like to see that.

10 MR. JUGLE: Okay.

11 JUDGE REPKO: You may proceed with your presentation.

12 MR. JUGLE: Okay. Thank you.

13 Moving on to our Slide 28. Claim 1 requires assembling at least
14 one media stream using the temporal sequence of screen captures and
15 providing at least one media stream to the content provider. So Avellan
16 discloses that its gateway can assemble the captured images into a digital
17 video format. That's at Avellan column 5, 12 through 15, and 5, 16 through
18 22.

19 So another place that Avellan discloses, it discloses that it's
20 capturing multiple images. So at column 5, 15 -- or 16 through 22, it's
21 saying, "In non-limiting aspect of the invention, a web to HD video protocol
22 may be used to capture and transmit images, audio of a webpage, including a
23 full multimedia webpage regardless of the size original format." So it's
24 saying that it's transmitting images. It is not saying that it transmits a static

1 image. And I think that even though -- I'm sorry, I'm back to Slide 26.

2 This passage at the beginning of column 5, lines 5 through 12, read
3 in isolation may be open to multiple interpretations. We don't think it is read
4 in reference to the entire reference, because what we think it clearly
5 discloses is that you're taking multiple screen captures to capture any of the
6 live content that it consumes.

7 All right, I'm moving on to slide -- let's see. Oh, finally, that
8 stream that is created from those images is then broadcast via broadcast
9 transmitter 132 and broadcast device 102, to the downstream users 106. Or
10 104, excuse me.

11 Next, at Slide 29, I will discuss a few of the other independent
12 claims that make small variations on Claim 1 of the '074 Patent, as well as
13 the dependent claims. So I'm going to start with the '074 Patent at Slide 30.
14 Our analysis is Claim 1 also applies to Independent Claims 12 and 17.
15 Dependent Claim 8 adds a few limitations that require detecting a change in
16 a website and updating the screen captures. So Avellan at column 8, line 63
17 through column 9, line 6, discloses this.

18 It says that the "gateway server can track updates. It then can
19 continuously or periodically compare the broadcast data stored in the cache
20 with the broadcast data stored at the networks 150 and 152, and recapture
21 any broadcast data which is updated. As the information is updated, the
22 broadcast data is compressed, saved to a cache and broadcast to the user
23 computers." So it's updating its screen captures and then -- in response to a
24 change, and then it's broadcasting the new -- the updated screen captures out

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 to the user computers.

2 With regard to the remaining dependent claims of the '074 Patent,
3 they have well known and common features. For example, use of audio
4 multimedia items, the use of metadata, the use of common standards such as
5 MPEG. I'm not going to address these in the interest of time. Specifically,
6 if you have any questions about particular dependent claims, I'm happy to
7 address them. But otherwise, I am going to move to the '002 Patent. It is the
8 same thing with the challenged claims here. Claim 1 adds some common
9 standards such as MPEG and HLS.

10 The remaining dependent claims also add common and well-
11 known features, unicast addresses rendering in parallel, use of virtual
12 machines. So briefly discussing Claim 1 of the '002 Patent, for example, it
13 adds separate elements that require the use of HTTP live-streaming, referred
14 to as HLS, and rendering in parallel using multiple threads.

15 JUDGE MURPHY: Counsel, you're referencing Slide 33 now?

16 MR. JUGLE: Yes. I'm sorry.

17 So during prosecution the examiner concluded that the use of HLS
18 wasn't known -- or was not new. It was known. And the petition cites the
19 Ma reference, which is also in the field of media distribution for the use of
20 that well-known protocol. Likewise, at Slide 34, the requirement of
21 rendering in parallel using multiple threads was well known. We rely on the
22 Fain reference for that, which is a manual about Java programming. And it
23 makes a note that Java can start multiple threads or execute things that run in
24 parallel, and as well as a statement that any web browser works in a

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)
IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)
IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 multithreaded mode.

2 And I believe our expert opined on this as well, multithreading was
3 well known at the time of these patents. It wasn't a big technical hurdle to
4 implement this into the gateway servers of Avellan. Likewise, for the '441
5 Patent, the dependent claims that depend from the independent claims for
6 which Avellan is a primary reference also recite well-known and common
7 features. Again, virtualization, audio and video multimedia items, metadata,
8 channel identifiers, the use of MPEG, and that the content provider is a
9 satellite operator, the use of failure monitoring. We think these are common
10 and well known.

11 So moving to 37 as a summary, the remaining dependent claims
12 for which Avellan is a primary reference add well known and common
13 features. Patent Owner doesn't seem to contend that they invented any of
14 these features, which are routinely implemented by people of skill in the art.
15 And those features are either directly disclosed in Avellan or plainly
16 disclosed in the cited primary -- the cited secondary references. Very
17 briefly, I'm going to touch on a couple of Patent Owner's attempts to
18 distinguish Avellan that we believe are unavailing. So at Slide 39, the first
19 is the contention that Avellan's content provider does not initiate the request.

20 The claims don't require this. It's not in the language of the claims.
21 The challenged patents and the specification don't require -- don't describe
22 the request as being initiated or originating at the content provider. So
23 Patent Owner, we think, is adding a limitation that's unsupported by the
24 claims or the specification. They haven't pursued a specific claim

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 construction. They just said this falls into the plain ordinary meaning of that
2 term. They didn't seek to amend the language. We just don't think it's
3 supportable that the content provider has to initiate the request.

4 Likewise, in their response, Patent Owner argued that Avellan did
5 not disclose a browser that rendered a webpage. But column 4 of Avellan
6 specifically discloses that the Browser 106 that resides at the gateway,
7 renders webpages. There's more differences -- areas of disagreement. I'm
8 going to skip over them for now and go directly to the Farber reference at
9 Slide 53, in the interest of time. So I'm going to talk about Farber as it
10 applies to Claim 1 of the '441 Patent. This, I believe, is the only independent
11 claim that does not hold onto the temporal sequence of screen captures
12 limitation that was added to the previous claim I talked about during the
13 prosecution.

14 So at Slide 54, Claim 1 of the '441 Patent requires creating a
15 plurality of multimedia assets at a caching unit. Farber discloses an audio
16 broadcast system that performs the claimed method. And I want to be clear
17 on something here. We're pointing to the audio broadcast system of Farber,
18 of which there's two embodiments as the caching unit. Not simply the
19 storage unit that is added in one of the embodiments as the sole caching unit,
20 because the whole system performs the method, which is all that's required
21 by the claim. And that system includes storage, which the caching unit and
22 as a claim can do, but it is more than just the block of the storage unit.

23 All right. Farber discloses that it can cache and transmit music
24 channel broadcasts over networks such as a cable television network or a

1 satellite network.

2 JUDGE MURPHY: Counsel, let me just -- to go back to your last
3 point. Is that in your petition? Did you make clear what you were relying
4 on for the caching unit?

5 MR. JUGLE: Yeah. I believe so, because this is -- it -- the -- all of
6 these actions are occurring at a caching unit, and the petition points to the
7 functionality of the system to satisfy all the limitations of the claim. So I
8 think that's clear in the petition.

9 JUDGE MURPHY: But your point is you're relying on the audio
10 system being, excuse me, described in Farber?

11 MR. JUGLE: That's correct.

12 All right. At Slide 55, "Each music channel includes audio data
13 and an accompanying user interface that displays a channel and song." So
14 that's from Farber. Those music channels are the multimedia assets of the
15 claim. Next, Element 1B is "Determining there's sufficient storage space
16 from multimedia asset at the caching unit." And Farber discloses an
17 embodiment of its audio system that includes a storage/play
18 -- storage/playout device 150. And it says that, "In applications where
19 playout is desired at a later time, the storage playout device 150 may be
20 implemented utilizing many methods, including any rewritable storage
21 media."

22 Slide 57, so this element isn't connected to any other elements of
23 the claim. There's no requirement on when it falls in time. There's no
24 dependency on this being executed before something else happens. The

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 mere act of retrieval of the playback at a later time is an indication that there
2 was sufficient storage space. We think it's inherent in Farber's disclosure.
3 Like I said, the determination doesn't need to be made at a particular point in
4 time or have any dependencies upon it.

5 It doesn't even say that you have to have sufficient storage space
6 without overwriting something else. It just says there's sufficient storage
7 space. If you can store and play a file back, there was sufficient storage
8 space, that's an inherent determination.

9 JUDGE MURPHY: But Patent Owner's point is that, you know,
10 the law of inherency for anticipation is strict, right? Must necessarily always
11 be the case, not just a probability or in most cases. So here, why is it
12 necessarily present, the element of determining sufficient storage?

13 MR. JUGLE: So I want to be clear on something. I think Patent
14 Owner's inherency argument is directed to some of the obviousness
15 arguments we made, which is, hey, it's common in systems to make a
16 determination before you store something, and it would be --

17 JUDGE MURPHY: Well, that's Vermeulen in combination.

18 MR. JUGLE: That's Vermeulen in combination.

19 JUDGE MURPHY: That's Ground 2, right? I just --

20 MR. JUGLE: That's Ground 2 --

21 (Simultaneous speaking.)

22 MR. JUGLE: So with Ground 1, the playback itself -- sorry, I
23 apologize.

24 JUDGE MURPHY: Yeah. Go ahead.

1 MR. JUGLE: The playback itself, if that occurs, there's sufficient
2 storage space. You couldn't play back if there wasn't space to store the file.

3 JUDGE MURPHY: But what if you can't play the entire file back?
4 What if you loaded several multimedia files and the last one didn't fully load
5 -

6 MR. JUGLE: It -

7 JUDGE MURPHY: -- you can't play it back. How would you
8 know?

9 MR. JUGLE: -- so I think this -- it doesn't say that there's -- if
10 -- one, it doesn't say that there's enough space for the entire multimedia
11 asset. That's our take on it. This is a very broad term. It's unconnected to
12 the rest of the claim. And if you can do that playback, you have an inherent
13 determination that's indicated by the fact that playback is occurring that
14 there was sufficient space.

15 But as you mentioned, Ground 2 at Slide 58, even if the board
16 doesn't agree with us, we think it's obvious to combine Farber with
17 Vermeulen, which is directed to a system for storing content in web-based
18 systems and network-based systems. Vermeulen discloses that it has a
19 nodepicker that can assess whether there's sufficient storage space prior to
20 storage to develop a right plan.

21 And Mr. Lipoff opined on this as well, this is a common known
22 feature. It's something -- commonly known feature. It's something that
23 happens at an incredibly low level of almost every computer system we use.
24 If you save a file on Windows, it just does it. So this isn't beyond the skill of

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)
IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)
IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 a POSITA to implement into -

2 JUDGE MURPHY: Counsel, just a technical question for you.

3 Your Ground 2, which is obviousness over Farber and Vermeulen, the
4 challenge is to Claims 1 and 2 in this '441 Patent, right? But Claim 7 is not
5 included in Ground 2, although it is included in Ground 1. So if we don't
6 agree that there's an inherent disclosure of this limitation in Claim 1, what
7 does that mean for Claim 7?

8 MR. JUGLE: Well, we think since Claim 7 depends on Claim 1, if
9 Claim 1 is rendered obvious, then you only need the disclosure of Farber to
10 get to Claim 7. And -

11 JUDGE MURPHY: But that's not in the petition.

12 MR. JUGLE: -- so I won't disagree with you on that. I think the
13 petition may have been inartfully drafted with respect to that. But
14 nonetheless, I think you get there, because I don't think you need anything
15 from Vermeulen on Claim 7, and the petition doesn't say you do.

16 JUDGE MURPHY: Well -

17 MR. JUGLE: So if you get -

18 JUDGE MURPHY: -- we need -- you need your inherency
19 argument, right? That's why I'm focused on the inherency and the technical
20 legal standard. And I just want to make sure I understand the position, that's
21 all. Because I'm looking at your petition, and you've said what you've just
22 recapped for me -

23 MR. JUGLE: Yeah. So -

24 JUDGE MURPHY: -- inherency --

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 MR. JUGLE: -- look, our position is that it's inherent. Our
2 position that is Claim 1 is disclosed on Ground 2 with Vermeulen. If you
3 don't believe it's inherent, we think because Vermeulen -- the combination of
4 Vermeulen and Harp -- and Farber renders obvious Claim 1, you get there
5 with just Farber on Claim 7.

6 But I will freely admit that, given the drafting of the petition, that
7 was probably an oversight that Claim 7 should have been included in
8 Ground 2. But no additional information from Vermeulen is needed for
9 Claim 7.

10 JUDGE MURPHY: Thank you.

11 PARTICIPANT: Please stand by. We've lost Judge McMillin.

12 JUDGE MURPHY: Yeah. We lost the connection to Judge
13 McMillin.

14 PARTICIPANT: Judge McMillin, can you hear me?

15 JUDGE MCMILLIN: I can. Thank you.

16 PARTICIPANT: Okay. And you should be on screen now.
17 Thank you.

18 JUDGE MCMILLIN: All right. Thank you. Sorry.

19 MR. JUGLE: Is everyone ready?

20 JUDGE MURPHY: Yeah. Go ahead.

21 MR. JUGLE: All right. I'm going to move on to -

22 JUDGE MCMILLIN: I'm ready.

23 MR. JUGLE: -- Slide 60 for Element 1C, which is generating a
24 channel identifier for the multimedia asset. Farber discloses that there's a

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 numerical channel identifier associated with music genre. For example,
2 Farber gives an example of Channel 1 for a channel associated with soft
3 rock. This is similar to what the '441 Patent says. It discloses using
4 numerical channel identifiers associated with music genre. Next to Element
5 1D is Slide 62. Element 1D requires, "Retrieving from a cloud service of
6 plurality of media files to be included in the multimedia asset, including a
7 media identifier for each one of the media files."

8 So each of Farber's music channels can include a plurality of
9 songs, that's at Farber column 4, 33 through 36. And for each song, Farber
10 retrieves audio content as well as the associated album art. So we think no
11 matter how you slice this, there's a plurality of media files for each
12 multimedia asset, because there's multiple songs. And for each song, there's
13 at least audio content and associated album art in Farber. Farber discloses
14 that this includes a media identifier, and that a media identifier can be
15 numbers or simple streams.

16 For example, for a song, it has a song title, an artist, record label,
17 all this stored, and then there's a unique value stored for each media item.
18 Moving on to Slide 65, likewise, for -- the '441 Patent discloses using simple
19 streams for media identifiers. So it provides a very similar example with an
20 artist, a duration, a title, and then a music ID, which is just a number. So
21 moving on to Slide 66, the data sources that Farber obtains its media items
22 from can be accessed remotely.

23 As Farber says they can -- they don't need to be located in a single
24 location and may or may not be co-located. It also refers to them having

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 connections to servers. So we think that meets the retrieving from a cloud
2 service portion of this element.

3 JUDGE MURPHY: Well, does it disclose that anywhere expressly
4 in Farber? I mean, one of Patent Owners arguments is that, you know, this
5 notion of the data carousel subsystem isn't suggested necessarily in Farber.
6 What's your response to that?

7 MR. JUGLE: So our response to that is, one, it says it can be
8 remote or it can be a server, and there's nothing specifically limiting about
9 what form that cloud service needs to take. And we think a person of
10 ordinary skill would read this claim and interpret cloud services essentially
11 anything remote, and Farber discloses that. And there's nothing more
12 specific required about the claim.

13 JUDGE MURPHY: And tell me again, I'm sorry, because I was
14 looking at the slides. Where does Farber disclose the connection to a remote
15 source for the files?

16 MR. JUGLE: So it says that the data sources may or may not be
17 located in a single location so they don't need to be onsite or local. They can
18 be remote.

19 JUDGE MURPHY: Where are you referring to?

20 MR. JUGLE: So that's Farber column 5 at lines 35 -- 36 through
21 38.

22 JUDGE MURPHY: 36 through 30 -

23 MR. JUGLE: 38.

24 JUDGE MURPHY: -- 8.

1 MR. JUGLE: And then at column 5, lines 26 through 32, Farber
2 discloses that the data source may also be associated or connected to a server
3 or other computer managing the database or facilitating communications
4 with the data carousel subsystem 46. So we think Farber discloses remotely
5 located data sources and use of servers.

6 JUDGE MURPHY: All right. And just so I'm clear, Farber
7 doesn't use the word remotely located?

8 MR. JUGLE: Well, it says not located in a single location. It does
9 not use the word remotely located. It doesn't use the word cloud explicitly.

10 JUDGE MURPHY: But what else could it be?

11 MR. JUGLE: Right.

12 JUDGE MURPHY: Okay.

13 MR. JUGLE: So moving on to Slide 67, Element 1E. For each of
14 the media files Farber require -- or the Claim 1 requires creating a custom
15 Hypertext Transfer Markup Language user interface that includes video. So
16 Farber discloses that for each song, it creates a custom HTML interface, or a
17 custom HTML template. So it has a screen with embedded assets, for
18 example, it's shown in Farber Figure 1. And Farber discloses that it can
19 create those templates which may be coded utilizing HTML.

20 And these are user interfaces, because they can include buttons and
21 other assets that a user can interface with. For example, a download button,
22 an add song button, a personalized channel choice button. Those are things
23 that allow the user to interface with the screen and with the system. Farber's
24 templates can also include video. The assets referred to with respect to the

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 templates specifically says can include motion picture video, and then it
2 gives the example of a promotion and advertising panels that may contain
3 motion picture video content.

4 Moving on to Slide 70, Element 1F. "Encoding each of the media
5 files and encapsulating them together using an MPEG transport stream
6 format." So Farber encodes and encapsulates its media files using an MPEG
7 transport stream format. It has an MPEG encoder 47 that creates an MPEG
8 transport stream for all the channels. Then it multiplexes that with the audio
9 stream to output the video broadcast. Or Claim 1 -- I'm at Slide 71 now,
10 Element 1G requires storing each one of the multimedia assets at a caching
11 unit.

12 So Farber discloses storing the assets at the storage playout device
13 150 for later playback. Finally, Slide 72, with respect to Elements 1H and
14 1I. "Require receiving a request at the caching unit for one of the
15 multimedia assets from the broadcasting unit." Farber discloses receiving a
16 request from a broadcasting unit, so it says, "in applications where playout is
17 desired at a later time," so it's receiving some indication that play out is
18 desired at a later time. Also, as I referenced earlier, Farber discloses that its
19 user interface panels can have buttons like request song or personalized
20 channel buttons that a user can use to pass requests to Farber.

21 So Farber receives the request to generate its multimedia assets.
22 To the extent we don't -- the board doesn't agree that Farber explicitly
23 discloses receiving requests, we think this is also obvious in light of
24 Vermeulen, which describes a web services interface configured to receive

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 client requests for access to data objects. So this providing something
2 -- providing data in response to a client request was well known in the art
3 and Vermeulen discloses that.

4 JUDGE MURPHY: What's your response to Patent Owner's
5 argument that that's not a request from a content provider?

6 MR. JUGLE: So Farber, at a high level, describes what it is
7 broadcast being played out over a broadcast media system like a cable
8 television provider. So again, this goes back to the does it have to initiate
9 with the content provider? We don't think it does. It's not required by the --

10 JUDGE MURPHY: And just for Farber, just walk me through
11 quick to refresh me. How does the Farber system -- as opposed to Avellan,
12 how does the request work its way through the content provider?

13 MR. JUGLE: So Farber doesn't explicitly disclose the content
14 provider providing that request to the -- its broadcast system. We know that
15 it's outputting music broadcast into a broadcast, and it says that it can do
16 things in response to those. And we know that the users are retrieve -- are
17 receiving Farber's output by a content provider.

18 So when they provide anything back through those user interfaces,
19 those are also provided through the content provider. There isn't a figure
20 with an explicit line saying this is the path from the content provider to the
21 system of Farber.

22 JUDGE MURPHY: Okay. Thank you.

23 MR. JUGLE: But we think that is obvious in light of Vermeulen.
24 Finally, the caching unit provides a multimedia asset in MPEG transport

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 stream format. Farber discloses this. It discloses that the output of its
2 MPEG encoder is in the MPEG transport stream format. And then, that's
3 multiplexed with an audio file and sent out for broadcast, either from the
4 storage play out unit or in one embodiment, that that doesn't exist straight to
5 broadcast.

6 With respect to the dependent claims of the '441 Patent Claims 2
7 through 9, much like what I discussed with respect to Avellan, the -- these
8 add well known and common features. The use of the REST API, the use of
9 JavaScript or WebKit browser or engine. Encoding at a specific bit rate, the
10 use of common standards such as H.264, inclusion of video. As with the
11 Avellan dependent claims, these are well known and common features.
12 Patent Owner doesn't contend that they invented any of these features, and
13 they're either directly disclosed in Farber or plainly disclosed in the cited
14 secondary references.

15 And that was at Slide 76. Moving on to Slide 77, I will briefly
16 address a few of the arguments from the Patent Owner response, attempting
17 to distinguish Farber. So first, Patent Owner response that Farber's
18 embodiments are limited to a CD player or CDROM. At Slide 79, that's not
19 true. Farber discloses using any re-writable storage medium, not just a
20 CDROM. Patent Owner's Response argued that Farber does not use the
21 media identifier to retrieve media files.

22 But the claims don't -- at Slide 81, if we review the claim language,
23 it just requires that the media identifier is included for each one of the media
24 files, and that the media files are retrieved. It doesn't require that the media

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 identifiers are used for retrieval. It's not in the claim.

2 JUDGE REPKO: So the media identifier, that's also related to the
3 cloud service of 1D -

4 MR. JUGLE: Yes.

5 JUDGE REPKO: -- in the claim? And then in Farber, it's -- you're
6 just basically relying on the fact that the data sources are not co-located, that
7 term co-located that you were talking about earlier. So how does the media
8 identifier relate to these other data sources, 42 and 44 in Farber?

9 MR. JUGLE: Well, so it's -- so what we said is it's included in the
10 media files that are retrieved. So you have an identifier for the media when
11 you retrieve it from the data sources, and that's to provide information to the
12 user.

13 JUDGE REPKO: So it's not used by the cloud service or
14 something?

15 MR. JUGLE: I'm not saying it's not used by the cloud service.
16 What I'm saying the claims don't require it to be used. It just requires it to be
17 included when you retrieve the plurality of media files, included in the
18 media asset.

19 JUDGE REPKO: So what exactly is the identifier in Farber and
20 how is that identified in the media? It's just, like, a song title?

21 MR. JUGLE: A song title, there's a unique -

22 JUDGE REPKO: Something like that?

23 MR. JUGLE: -- ID that Farber discloses. So if Farber at Figure 6,
24 for each song, it discloses a unique ID, so a number. In Farber it's like -

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 JUDGE REPKO: A tracking number.

2 MR. JUGLE: -- 3,000,000 something, like, a track number. And

3 the -

4 JUDGE REPKO: It's more than just the title though, right? It's not

5 just -

6 MR. JUGLE: Well, we think the title would be enough.

7 JUDGE REPKO: -- a catalog.

8 MR. JUGLE: But Farber discloses that it's a unique ID. The '441

9 Patent describes the media identifiers including a unique ID. So we think

10 Farber gets us there, even under a narrow read of the term.

11 JUDGE REPKO: You don't think it requires, like, to get a

12 database index or anything like that?

13 MR. JUGLE: That's not in the claim.

14 JUDGE REPKO: Just some piece of information. Thank you.

15 MR. JUGLE: And I don't think Farber precludes using that

16 information as a database index or something like that, but it's not required

17 by the claim. It doesn't need to be explicitly disclosed in Farber.

18 JUDGE REPKO: Thank you.

19 JUDGE MURPHY: So when you capture that file, you need to

20 capture the identification as well?

21 MR. JUGLE: Correct.

22 JUDGE MURPHY: What you do with it after that in the system is

23 -

24 MR. JUGLE: It's not in the claim.

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 JUDGE MURPHY: -- not a limit of the claim?

2 MR. JUGLE: Right. Okay. In the interest of time, because I think
3 I only have about 13 minutes left, I'm going to move to Slide 92 and discuss
4 Wannamaker with reference to the '002 Patent at Claim 7. So at Slide 93,
5 limitation first element, "A multicast server configured to generate
6 parameters relating to at least one of video content, image content, and audio
7 content, and configured to output the parameters via MPEG outputs."

8 So Wannamaker discloses a system that delivers web content to
9 cable television subscribers. Moving to Slide 94, it has an -- Wannamaker
10 discloses an Application Server 94 that has a multimedia streamer for
11 multicasting content. So we know it's the server of Wannamaker is doing
12 multicasting. Slide 95, the server has a -- the application server has a cache
13 manager that generates parameters relating to the requested content.

14 Some of those parameters include parameters to resolve the URL
15 request and obtain that content. Additionally, at Slide 96, those parameters
16 can include the content's modification date. And at Slide 97 can include
17 parameters relating to the content's layout size. And Slide 98 also talks
18 about layout size.

19 JUDGE REPKO: So layout size itself is a parameter. And where
20 is that stored in these files that Wannamaker uses?

21 MR. JUGLE: So it's stored in -- number one, the claims don't
22 require that the parameters be stored in a particular location, so.

23 JUDGE REPKO: You're relying upon that to be part of the image
24 files, right, the FMBs?

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)
IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)
IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 MR. JUGLE: So they are stored in -- either in the image files or in
2 conjunction with the image files. But we think that with respect to this
3 element of configured to output the parameters via MPEG outputs, Patent
4 Owner seems to be reading this very broadly. That as long as the content
5 being output is defined by a set of parameters, that's an inclusion of the
6 parameters.

7 So even to the extent that Wannamaker doesn't disclose explicitly
8 storing those parameters somewhere, using the parameters to generate the
9 content meets that limitation.

10 JUDGE REPKO: But then they have to also be MPEG output as
11 well, parameters themselves, right?

12 MR. JUGLE: There has to be an MPEG output, but -- and the
13 parameters that define that MPEG output are included in there.

14 JUDGE REPKO: Okay. So the layout size?

15 JUDGE MURPHY: Well, but the claim says, output the
16 parameters -

17 MR. JUGLE: So -

18 JUDGE MURPHY: -- via MPEG output.

19 MR. JUGLE: -- I'm going to -- let me just bring up -- give me one
20 second. This particular piece of claim language, you know, it's a little
21 knotty, right? So what we've done, if you look at Exhibit 1012 to the 350
22 IPR, which is -- let me get to this and go to page 1859. So this is Plaintiff's
23 Second Amended Complaint, which included claim charts.

24 JUDGE MURPHY: One second. You said which page again?

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 MR. JUGLE: 1859.

2 JUDGE MURPHY: That's the individual page number of that
3 document?

4 MR. JUGLE: So that's the individual page number of that PDF
5 document. It might have been filed in four sections and I -- forgive me, I'm
6 not sure which.

7 JUDGE MURPHY: It doesn't matter. Okay. Go ahead. Sorry.

8 MR. JUGLE: Okay. So Plaintiff's infringement read basically
9 says, this limitation is met by having audio and video content that's output as
10 MPEG outputs. No identification of parameters. If the parameters are used
11 to define the MPEG output, that meets the limitation.

12 JUDGE MURPHY: Well, but that's your district court complaint,
13 right? I mean, the burden here is on you. We take the claim as they wrote it,
14 and if you want us to construe that claim or understand how it's being
15 applied here, that's fine.

16 MR. JUGLE: So again, we think that those parameters are
17 included in the MPEG output. Screen size is one of them. When you output
18 the MPEG frame, it's going to have the screen size in it because the receiver
19 needs to know what the size is, so.

20 JUDGE REPKO: Does Wannamaker say that?

21 MR. JUGLE: So -

22 JUDGE REPKO: Do you rely on the part of Wannamaker to say
23 that FMB file has that? I just want to -

24 MR. JUGLE: So the FMB file is then -- later on in this

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 presentation, or I can skip ahead to it, is those images -- those FMB image
2 files are converted into an MPEG transport stream.

3 JUDGE REPKO: Okay. You said MPEG has -- did Wannamaker
4 actually say that though anywhere? Looking at your Slide 98, you've
5 pointed us to the layout size. That's what you mean by parameters here,
6 right?

7 MR. JUGLE: Right.

8 JUDGE REPKO: That's, like, you're trying to tell me that. 264
9 tells me that you have the MPEG syntax. So I assume you mean the
10 parameters are in that MPEG, because it says via MPEG output. And then -

11 MR. JUGLE: Right.

12 JUDGE REPKO: -- you've also two -- you've also excerpted
13 another part that says, height is guaranteed to be the height of the screen. So
14 I mean, how does that second quote relate to the first quote, just in terms of
15 the height being this guarantee have anything to do with the MPEG?

16 MR. JUGLE: Well, so the MPEG is -- the MPEG contains the
17 FMB files, right? So the output of the MPEG also has a height and a width,
18 and that guarantee is included in that MPEG output.

19 JUDGE REPKO: So it's inherency -- inherent. And then, the
20 MPEG file format has -- is that your -

21 MR. JUGLE: Look, I don't think it's inherent because I think
22 Wannamaker discloses that you have this layout and it says that the FMBs
23 are compressed into an MPEG syntax. And that's included in the FMB, so it
24 gets included into the MPEG syntax.

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 JUDGE REPKO: Where does it say it's going to be included in the
2 FMB? And what if the FMB just has -- just an image, right? It just has so
3 many pixels and that's it, has a resolution.

4 MR. JUGLE: And a resolution is one of those parameters. There's
5 parameters --

6 (Simultaneous speaking.)

7 JUDGE REPKO: -- parameters in the FMB file?

8 MR. JUGLE: Correct.

9 JUDGE REPKO: Does it say that anywhere?

10 MR. JUGLE: Do you mind if I answer this on rebuttal? I'll take a
11 look at this.

12 JUDGE REPKO: Sure.

13 MR. JUGLE: All right. So the application server outputs the
14 parameters via MPEG outputs by delivering an MPEG stream to its
15 downstream users. Moving on to Slide 100, let me just take a quick look at
16 Slide 97. Yeah, I don't think that answers your question. So moving on to
17 Slide 100, Element -

18 JUDGE REPKO: Are there any other -- I just -- going back to
19 that. Are there any other parameters other than size you think are in
20 -- would meet that limitation segment?

21 MR. JUGLE: Well, again, so, yeah, because we think there's
22 numerous parameters that are generated at the application server that are
23 passed to retrieve the content. So the parameters for resolving the URL, the
24 modification dates of the files that it fetches. And then, at least given the

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 broad interpretation that Patent Owner seems to have given to this claim,
2 that generating an MPEG output defined by those parameters and it includes
3 that, those parameters in the MPEG.

4 JUDGE REPKO: Is that your interpretation? Is that how we
5 should interpret -- is that the correct interpretation of the claim?

6 MR. JUGLE: We think so, yes.

7 JUDGE REPKO: Okay. So you agree with Patent Owner's district
8 court construction? And so, the URL parameters, you're saying because
9 they define the file in some way, they're also via MPEG output?

10 MR. JUGLE: That's correct.

11 JUDGE REPKO: Okay. Thank you. I have no further questions
12 on that.

13 MR. JUGLE: All right. So moving on to Slide 100, Elements 7B
14 and 7C require a caching server communicatively coupled to the
15 multicasting server and configured to receive and store the parameters. So
16 Wannamaker discloses a Content Processor 23 that's coupled to Application
17 Server 24. This content processor produces and caches content requested by
18 the application server, so it is the portion that receives and stores those
19 parameters. And in doing so, uses them to retrieve the content.

20 At Slide 101, the content processor produces and caches content
21 requested by the application server. It checks local rendered cache that the
22 content notifies the application that the content is present. So the content
23 processor is storing and retrieving the content. All right. At 102, Claim
24 Element 7d, create a temporal sequence of screen captures similar to Claim 1

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 of the '074 Patent. I think this claim -- this element is notable because it has
2 a slight difference from the one we talked about before, which is it doesn't
3 require you to capture all of the content of a rendered webpage.

4 It just says the screen capture defines content of a rendered
5 webpage at a given time. So unlike Claim 1 where you had to get all of the
6 content, here you have to get some of the content. Content processors
7 Renderer 36 produces rendered web content. So content processor produces
8 rendered web content from the standard, from the web. And it does that by
9 parsing and rendering HTML to produce output image files, which
10 Wannamaker refers to as FMB. So at Slide 103, the rendered web content
11 includes animated images and gives an example of animated GIFs or JIFs.

12 I don't really have a dog in that fight. And to do so, to render these
13 animations, it describes, "Render them as separate frames and then saving
14 each frame in a format, an image format with a timestamp and a sequence
15 number." So that tells us to render the animation. It is taking a temporal
16 sequence of screen captures that illustrate dynamic change because your
17 sequence that it says you're saving is going to illustrate the dynamic change
18 in that animation.

19 Moving to Slide 106, Element 7E requires assembling the temporal
20 sequence of screen captures. So Wannamaker discloses that the renderer
21 assembles the sequence of screen captures into MPEG frames. Next,
22 Element 7F, requires providing at least one of the video content, image
23 content, audio content to the multicast server for generating a multicast
24 stream. So those MPEG frames are then provided to the application server,

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 which generates MPEG streams for multicasting.

2 Again, the multimedia streamer consists of an audio-video terminal
3 server, which is part of Application Server 24, and that's responsible for
4 delivering MPEG video or and Dolby Audio streams to a set-top box.

5 Finally, there's a requirement of, at Slide 109, Element 7G, a monitoring
6 system that's configured to maintain video generation -- or generation of
7 video and audio files even in failure cases. Wannamaker discloses a
8 monitoring system that provides for fault tolerance. It has a system that's
9 capable of detecting fatal faults and restarting itself without human
10 intervention.

11 It also describes various levels of fault tolerance, including
12 subsystem redundancy. And that if a server fails, and this is at Wannamaker
13 paragraph 101, "The transactions are routed to another server in the server
14 group." So if one fails, it goes over, keeps going.

15 JUDGE REPKO: Thank you. Rebuttal time?

16 MR. JUGLE: I'm just -- let me use, like, 30 more seconds and then
17 I'll sit down. So finally, all the dependent claims of Claim 7, as with
18 Avellan and Farber, well-known common features, multiple servers,
19 multicast, MPEG encoding, addition of metadata. We think these are well
20 known and common, and they're either directly disclosed in Wannamaker or
21 the cited secondary references. With that, I'll wrap up and save my
22 remaining time for rebuttal.

23 JUDGE REPKO: Thank you.

24 Let me know when you're ready, I'll start the clock. Now, we need

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 to know how much time you wish to reserve for it.

2 MR. DROLET: Yeah. Give me a second to set up this -

3 JUDGE REPKO: Of course.

4 MR. DROLET: I'll be doing 65 minutes and then 25 for a rebuttal.

5 JUDGE REPKO: Thank you.

6 MR. DROLET: Just give me a second while I set up, please. Can
7 you all see my screen okay?

8 JUDGE REPKO: That looks good. Thank you.

9 MR. DROLET: I'm ready, Your Honor.

10 JUDGE REPKO: You may begin.

11 MR. DROLET: Good afternoon, Your Honors, and may it please
12 the Board. I'm Rob Drolet, appearing on behalf of Patent Owner Edwin
13 Hernandez-Mondragon in all three proceedings, IPR2025-349, 350, and 351,
14 covering Patents 10,123,074, 10,524,002, 11,140,441. Present with me
15 today is the inventor and owner of the patents, Dr. Edwin Hernandez-
16 Mondragon. I understand I have 90 minutes. I intend to organize my time
17 as follows, 15 minutes for threshold questions that apply to all three patent
18 -- all three proceedings and majority of the independent claims.

19 I'll then spend about 50 minutes of the patent specific arguments
20 for each of these three patents. I ask to reserve 25 minutes for rebuttal time.
21 Before we begin, I acknowledge there's a lot of material and ground to
22 cover. However, our entire focus fundamentally across all matters is that
23 proper claim construction was not followed, not in accordance with Phillips.
24 It wasn't attempted at all by Petitioners.

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)
IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)
IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 Further, upon a review of all evidence developed during the inter
2 partes review proceeding and upon application of Phillips and construing all
3 key claim elements of the challenged patent claims, all 60 have challenged
4 claims or patent claims. From the submission of Petitioner's petition to
5 institute these inter parties review proceedings through today, Petitioners
6 have ignored the challenged patent specification. Petitioners have ignored
7 the express language in the patent specification.

8 Petitioners have failed to construe claims in accordance with
9 Phillips. Petitioners have failed to adhere to what a person ordinarily skilled
10 in the art is required to do in construing patent claims. Slide 3, let me begin
11 with three arguments in Slide 3. Each of these operates independently,
12 meaning any single one standalone sufficient to defeat the grounds in each
13 case. Together they are in Patent Owner's view insurmountable.

14 First, the evidentiary foundation for all three petitions is tainted.
15 Petitioner's expert received a draft of the petition before writing his
16 declaration. Adopted Petitioner's attorney framing wholesale, and then
17 materially altered sworn testimony after confirming with Counsel overnight.
18 Under *Broadcom v. InvenSense* -

19 JUDGE MURPHY: Counsel, let me stop you there for a minute. I
20 saw that in your pages. Can you tell me what happened at the deposition in
21 your view?

22 MR. DROLET: Certainly. Would you like me to actually give
23 specifics out of the -- out of the deposition or generally?

24 JUDGE MURPHY: No. Just -- I mean, you've cited the pages and

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 -

2 MR. DROLET: Certainly. I can have more in detail, Your Honor,

3 but -

4 JUDGE MURPHY: Just tell me your -

5 MR. DROLET: -- upon confronting the deponent, the expert, with

6 reviewing the actual specification for areas of where it described key terms,

7 he admitted he did not do that. Matter of fact, he wasn't instructed, nor was

8 his scope of work to construct any claim whatsoever, any patent term.

9 He acknowledged he was directed to go ahead and perform

10 analysis on one sub-element and the remaining elements -- sub-elements of

11 all the claims he depended upon what was provided by Counsel.

12 JUDGE MURPHY: And which sub-element was it that he was -

13 MR. DROLET: 1D. Let me refer to my notes. Element 1 Delta,

14 that he was actually instructed to provide input on. The remaining elements

15 of the first independent claim, he relied solely on what was provided. And

16 again, I have specifics concerning that. Is that sufficient on the other?

17 JUDGE MURPHY: No, no. I mean which patent claim?

18 MR. DROLET: This is the first one, '074. The first claim -

19 JUDGE MURPHY: That's fine. That's fine.

20 MR. DROLET: -- the entire first claim of the first independent

21 claim he went ahead and admitted he was not directed to go ahead and do

22 any analysis whatsoever. Is that sufficient, Your Honor?

23 JUDGE MURPHY: Yes.

24 MR. DROLET: Okay. So the evidentiary foundation for all three

1 petitions is tainted. Petitioner's expert received a draft of the petition before
2 writing his declaration, adopted Petitioner's attorney's framing wholesale,
3 and then materially altered sworn testimony after confirming with Counsel
4 overnight. That declaration is entitled to zero or minimal weight. Without
5 it, Petitioner is left with naked attorney argument that cannot satisfy the
6 preponderance standard under 35 U.S.C. Section 316.

7 Second, the term "content provider," as used in all independent
8 claims across all three patents, means a cable television or satellite television
9 operator, not a transmission gateway, or internet intermediary. Three
10 independent lines of intrinsic evidence compel by construction. No cited
11 reference discloses a cable or satellite operator requesting, receiving, and
12 broadcasting a media stream. That simple construction eliminates
13 independent claim grounds in all three proceedings.

14 Slide 4, Avellan only transmits static webpage screenshots. It is
15 not a multimedia streaming system. It does not receive requests from
16 content providers. It does not assemble media streams. It does not provide
17 streams for broadcast on broadcast media channels and does not deliver live-
18 streaming content. Petitioners claim that Avellan discloses live stream
19 -- live-streaming televisions feeds is a complete misreading.

20 Column 8, lines 18 through 21 of Avellan merely lists CNN, BBC,
21 and ESPN, live-streaming television feeds as websites whose pages Avellan
22 can screenshot. Those four foundational gaps doom every Avellan-based
23 ground in all three cases. I'll address each one of these in order before
24 turning to patent-specific matters. Slide 5, expert testimony does not

1 disclose the underlying facts or data on which the opinion is based, is
2 entitled to little or no weight. That standard comes directly from Federal
3 Rules of Evidence 702(b), and is not in dispute. Both parties cited it.

4 The burden in a final written decision is preponderance of the
5 evidence under 35 U.S.C. Section 316(e). That burden never shifts to
6 Patent Owner and cannot -- cannot be carried by attorney argument alone.
7 Deposition testimony with Petitioner's expert, Mr. Lipoff, confirmed three
8 independent defects in his declaration. First, Petitioner provided Mr. Lipoff
9 with the draft of the petition before he prepared his declaration. He was
10 given Petitioner's legal theory, Petitioner's attorney's training, and his
11 declaration reflects it. This is not how independent expert testimony works.

12 Second, Mr. Lipoff selectively adopted Petitioner's positions on
13 multiple claims and elements without conducting full independent analysis
14 of the references. He was tasked only with addressing certain sub-evidence,
15 and he said so under oath. His declaration incorporated Petitioner's pre-
16 packaged analysis without disclosing that reliance. Third, after conferring
17 with Counsel between the first and second day of testimony and disposition,
18 Mr. Lipoff materially altered the prior sworn testimony. The board should
19 weigh that alteration against him.

20 JUDGE MURPHY: Well, what are you alleging he altered
21 overnight exactly?

22 MR. DROLET: The next day he offered up to clarify several
23 comments he made the day before. One of them was concerning his tasking
24 in assessing his declarations that there was anticipation and obviousness. So

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)
IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)
IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 without being prompted, he went ahead and came back with that, as well as
2 several other points, which prompted me to ask him that he talked to
3 Counsel the night before, which he -- said he did.

4 JUDGE MURPHY: Okay.

5 MR. DROLET: Slide 6, Slide 6 shows why this matters across all
6 three cases and all grounds. The entire evidentiary backbone of these three
7 petitions is a single comprised expert declaration. Every ground claim,
8 mapping of prior art claim elements relies in this declaration. The Petitioner
9 has no independent expert support, who remains after the declaration is
10 discounted in attorney argument, which cannot carry the preponderance
11 standard as a matter of law. Patent Owner stands ready to provide explicit
12 statements made by Petitioner's expert, Mr. Lipoff, that undeniably
13 disqualified Mr. Lipoff's testimony.

14 However, Patent Owner submits overwhelming evidence on the
15 merits alone that all claims in the '074, '002, and '441 Patent claims, survive
16 Petitioner's challenges. Patent Owner only asks the board to recognize that
17 this defect pervades every ground. And wherever the board has a close call
18 in their prior art analysis, the quality of the expert report should weigh
19 heavily in that assessment. It is notable that Petitioner never responded to
20 this argument in its reply.

21 It was fully and specifically developed in the Patent Owner
22 response across all three proceedings. At pages 10 through 11 in IPR349,
23 pages 12 to 13 in IPR331, and 7 through 8 in IPR350, Petitioner's silence is
24 notable. The argument stands un rebutted. Slide 7. Slide 7, Patent Owner's

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 construction of content provider is a third party such as a cable television or
2 satellite television operator.

3 JUDGE MCMILLIN: Excuse me. This is Judge McMillin. With
4 regard to claim construction, I'm looking at your petition in IPR2025-00349.
5 And the claim construction section is very short and doesn't offer a claim
6 construction of anything. It appears to -

7 JUDGE MURPHY: Oh, we just lost Judge McMillin's audio.
8 Pause this until we can get him back up.

9 JUDGE REPKO: He froze.

10 JUDGE MURPHY: Yes. Judge McMillin, can you hear us?

11 JUDGE MCMILLIN: I can hear you now.

12 JUDGE REPKO: Could you please repeat your question? I'm
13 going to start the time again.

14 JUDGE MCMILLIN: Okay. I'm sorry.

15 My question was that I've looked back at the petition -- can you
16 hear me?

17 MR. DROLET: Yes, Your Honor.

18 JUDGE MCMILLIN: I've looked back at the petition in the 349
19 case, and the claim construction section does not seem to offer any
20 constructions. Specifically with regard to this argument, it does not offer a
21 construction for "content provider."

22 MR. DROLET: With respect to petition, you're correct. They did
23 not offer any. In fact, I think the Petitioner stated that their claim to survive
24 any claim construction. We -- and then -

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 JUDGE MCMILLIN: I -

2 MR. DROLET: Yes, Your Honor?

3 JUDGE MCMILLIN: -- I misspoke. I'm sorry. I was referring to
4 the Patent Owner's Response that the claim construction section is very
5 short. It's at page 23 of the Patent Owner's Response in the 349 case. And
6 there is no claim construction offered of any term, including content
7 provider.

8 MR. DROLET: Your Honor, I have to refer that during the
9 rebuttal as far as the specific section. But in the Patent Owner Response, we
10 call out that certain keywords, certain terms of art that are used specifically
11 in the actual patent terms themselves are not disclosed and are not suggested
12 or taught by the Petitioner in all their -- in all the different references. So it's
13 specifically -

14 JUDGE MCMILLIN: It appears to me that you did make an
15 argument on content provider. It begins at page 49 of your Response. It
16 does not appear to be framed as a claim construction argument as you're
17 doing now, but as an argument to distinguish the prior art.

18 MR. DROLET: I would disagree with that assessment, Your
19 Honor. I'll have to look at exactly how it's written up in the different
20 sections. But the intent of the Patent Owner's Response, as well as the Sur-
21 reply is consistent with respect to certain key terms of art that are in the
22 actual patent claims that are not disclosed. And that we're asked -- and we
23 asked for proper construction that looks to the specification to construe those
24 terms.

1 So with respect to the actual location specifically in our Response
2 and Sur-reply, I'll address that specifically during rebuttal. But I have
3 -- strongly insist that we across all of our documents, go ahead and push
4 back and say specifically that those key terms are not properly construed in
5 accordance with Phillips.

6 JUDGE MCMILLIN: Well, I would ask again that you look at
7 page 23 of the Patent Owner's Response. There's a section entitled "claim
8 construction," but there's no constructions offered. And there is a discussion
9 of content provider, but that begins at page 49 of your response and it's not
10 clearly, at least in my mind, framed as a construction argument.

11 MR. DROLET: I'll have to go ahead and revisit exactly how it's
12 phrased, but I'll go ahead and again, insist that it isn't -- it's consistent
13 throughout all of our documentation with respect to pushback, is that these
14 key terms have not properly been construed in accordance with Phillips.
15 Thank you.

16 JUDGE MCMILLIN: And thank you. Please.

17 MR. DROLET: So Patent Owner's construction of content
18 provider is a third party such as a cable television, or satellite television
19 operator, or any other multimedia outlet that requests and receives
20 multimedia content for playback on a broadcast media channel. Three
21 independent lines of intrinsic evidence support that construction. You'll
22 need one to decide the issue in Patent Owner's favor, but all three point in
23 the same direction. Three -- first, the specification expressly states it.

24 Column 2, lines 57 reads, "An example, computer implemented

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 method can receive from a content provider, such as a cable or satellite
2 operator, a request for at least one media stream for playback on a broadcast
3 media channel." That is not an embodiment. That is the inventor describing
4 his invention using the exact words of the claim. Column 1, line 16 through
5 23 adds, "The present disclosure provides a mechanism for delivering
6 multimedia content from a cloud-based system to cable with satellite content
7 providers."

8 Column 8, lines 15 to 22 closes the loop, "The media stream can be
9 provided to the content provider for broadcast on the broadcast media
10 channel." Those three passages in the same specification used identically in
11 all three challenged patents, the content provider requests, the content
12 provider receives, the content provider broadcasts. There is nothing
13 ambiguous about that. Second, Dependent Claim 9, in all three patents,
14 expressly limits the independent claims content provider to -

15 JUDGE MURPHY: Well, Counsel, let me stop you there. Which
16 -- what's your response to Counsel for Petitioner's answer to that, which is
17 that the claim doesn't say the request has to be initiated or originated by the
18 content provider?

19 MR. DROLET: I believe in reading the claim terms in light of the
20 specification, it's clear that the content provider is actually requesting,
21 making that request. If you're asking can it have been from an initial source
22 before the content provider and then the content provider making a request,
23 that's analogous to a doctor making a request for something going through a
24 pharmacist, for instance.

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 Who's actually making the request? It's clear here in the
2 specification that the content provider is making that request. That answer
3 your question, Your Honor?

4 JUDGE MURPHY: Yeah, thank you.

5 JUDGE REPKO: I have a question, Mr. Drolet. Do you believe
6 these passages here that you reproduced on Slide 7 are definitional? Are we
7 talking about lexicography when you defined content provider to be this
8 specific?

9 MR. DROLET: Our understanding is that when you look at the
10 specification itself, you're looking at everything. What specific definitions
11 are given? What functionality is disclosed? What's the relationship? All
12 these things are in context with each other, so it needs to be looked at the
13 entirety of the actual specification, including how it's used in dependent
14 claims and independent claims to understand how the actual inventor -- and
15 that's the whole crux of this.

16 Trying to understand what the inventor meant in his writings, in his
17 words, in the actual patent itself. So definitional, not like saying that, you
18 know, this is that. No, but it informs that decision. It informs someone
19 reading the specification when looking at the claims, what those claim terms
20 mean.

21 JUDGE MURPHY: Well, two -- one question and one comment,
22 right? To Judge McMillin's point, what you just described is traditionally
23 set forth in a claim construction argument, which is not in any of your briefs.

24 MR. DROLET: I'll have to pull up exactly the terminology and the

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 arguments presented in the Reply and Surreply. But it was definitely Patent
2 Owner's intent to put on the record that the construction of the actual claim
3 elements and what they meant was to look at the specification in accordance
4 with Phillips, determine what these key terms are. Whether it was
5 definitionally defined in a section of either of our reports or replies in a
6 certain section, you know, it's mislabeled.

7 I can't answer that until I look at that specifically. And I think
8 clearly the substance of our communication across the board through
9 surreply indicates that our intent of looking at specification, that -- those
10 steps was missed. The Petitioner offers nothing of that.

11 JUDGE MURPHY: All right. Let me ask you a question about
12 Avellan, the Avellan reference -

13 MR. DROLET: Yes, Your Honor.

14 JUDGE MURPHY: -- with regard to this limitation of a request
15 being made from a content provider. Your response that this is in the
16 IPR351 petition, but it's a common response across provisions. You say that
17 Avellan's gateway platform does not originate the content, but acts as a
18 distribution intermediary. Receiving, processing, and delivering the
19 webpage images to end users and you say this is not a request from a content
20 provider?

21 MR. DROLET: That's correct.

22 JUDGE MURPHY: Where does it say in the claim that the request
23 has to originate and cannot be a distribution intermediary -- through a
24 distribution intermediary?

1 MR. DROLET: So reading the claim and receiving a request from
2 a content provider means receiving a request from a content provider. If the
3 request is from an upstream entity, and it's a pass-through content provider,
4 it's not a request from the content provider. It's a transmission of a request.
5 Reading the claim, it's a -- from the content provider. That's our
6 interpretation.

7 JUDGE MURPHY: Okay. Thank you.

8 MR. DROLET: Let me finish off with the Claim 9. So Dependent
9 Claim 9 and all three patents expressly limits the independent claims content
10 provider to a cable television operator or satellite television operator. Under
11 the doctrine of claim differentiation, the independent claim must already
12 carry a meaning that encompasses cable and satellite operators as
13 representative samples. Otherwise, Claim 9 has no narrowing effect. Claim
14 9 makes no sense unless the independent claim already contemplates cable
15 and satellite operators as the paradigm case.

16 Slide 8, internal logic requires it. The claim requires the content
17 provider to perform three functions: request a media stream, receive the
18 assembled media stream, and then broadcast it on a broadcast media
19 channel. It would be logically nonsensical for the content provider to
20 request and receive something it itself creates. Petitioner's ordinary meaning
21 construction collapses these roles into one entity. That same entity
22 requesting what it already made, that cannot be right, and not what the
23 specification teaches.

24 I'll note additionally, Petitioner waived any competing

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)
IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)
IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 construction. No petition across these three cases have advanced or
2 proposed construction. Petitioner now cannot in oral argument offer
3 construction that's never briefed. Slide 9. Let me go to Slide 22.
4 Apologize.

5 JUDGE MCMILLIN: This is Judge McMillin.

6 MR. DROLET: Yes.

7 JUDGE MCMILLIN: I have a question about your Claim 9 claim
8 differentiation argument. If a plain and ordinary meaning in the context of
9 this patent for Content Provider is a cable television operator or a satellite
10 television operator, why would it be necessary to define it as such in Claim
11 9? If that's already in Claim 1, then Claim 9 serves no purpose.

12 MR. DROLET: So Claim 9 specifically states TV -- cable
13 television operator or satellite television operator. The construction is a
14 third party, such as, and it goes on to be broader: any other entity
15 performing that commercial function.

16 JUDGE MCMILLIN: Yes, I understand that because Content
17 Provider is said to be a cable television operator or a satellite television
18 operator in Claim 9, that means that Content Provider in Claim 1 must be
19 broader than that. But if your argument is that in Claim 1 and all the other
20 claims, Content Provider means those two things, then Claim 9 serves no
21 useful purpose.

22 MR. DROLET: Your Honor, I agree that Claim 9 further limits
23 -- has a limitation with respect to being a TV satellite operator or TV cable
24 operator. The actual claim construction we propose is a third-party

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 commercial entity carrying out functions such as. So I think it's broader in
2 our specification and broader in construction. I think Claim 9 further limits
3 and differentiates it even further.

4 JUDGE MCMILLIN: Let's look at the specification of the '074
5 Patent. The specification says, column 3, line 43 to 44, "The intention is not
6 to limit the present technology that the particular embodiments describe."
7 The specification says, at column 14, line 31, 32, and 33 and 34, "No
8 limitation of the claims should be implied based on particular features or
9 arrangements in such examples as one of ordinary skill would be able to use
10 these examples to derive a wide variety of implementations."

11 It appears to me that, in the specification, Applicant said that the
12 specification should not be used to limit the claims.

13 MR. DROLET: That section that you went ahead and read,
14 recited, allows a person ordinarily skilled in the art to read the specification
15 in its entirety and to go ahead and construe things that are commensurate
16 with the entire specification. It's not limit them or limit the interpretation to
17 be specific examples that's stated in this -- in the -- in the actual
18 specification. But it still has to be congruent. It still has to be applicable. It
19 has to be coherent with what the specification says.

20 So I agree that language gives some latitude, interpretation of what
21 other embodiments can come from this, the specification as applied to the
22 claim language, but does not give free license to go ahead and expand to
23 something that is nonsensical. Did I answer your question, Your Honor?

24 JUDGE MCMILLIN: Yes.

1 MR. DROLET: Thank you.

2 JUDGE MCMILLIN: Thank you.

3 JUDGE REPKO: If you don't mind, I want to make sure we get to
4 an issue that's important to me. Do you mind skipping ahead to Slide 10?

5 MR. DROLET: Okay, Your Honor.

6 JUDGE REPKO: I'd like you to talk a little bit about the live
7 streaming of Avellan -

8 MR. DROLET: Yes, Your Honor.

9 JUDGE REPKO: -- a little bit, and what is actually capturing?
10 Can you go ahead and present that?

11 MR. DROLET: Sure. Out of context here, but in general, what
12 Avellan is, is a screenshot mechanism. Specifically, if you read the actual
13 background and the actual summary of this invention in the time it was
14 made, Avellan is trying to go ahead and work around the bandwidth issue at
15 the time of being able to go ahead and do live web interactions because of
16 the transmission rate capacity of the satellites. It was too -- it's like dial-up,
17 you couldn't do it.

18 Avellan was a workaround to use heavy servers at some sort of
19 gigabyte megafarm to go ahead and interact with the web pages themselves,
20 make those screenshots, and then use those screenshots and transmit those
21 images to someone like an end-user to be able to go ahead and at least see
22 the images. That's what Avellan's doing.

23 So right here, what Avellan's talking about, and I can go through
24 the actual specification, but that's what it is. Avellan, in fact, teaches away

1 from our -- from our claim. Avellan teaches, because of the restrictions with
2 the satellite and bandwidth capacity, it can't at the time. Remember this is
3 back what, 20 -- or early 2000s. It couldn't go ahead and interact with -- no,
4 I'm sorry, 2011. It couldn't interact through the satellite systems with live
5 web pages. It was too slow. So this is a workaround. So Avellan is purely a
6 screenshot system. That's all it does.

7 JUDGE REPKO: And I want to talk about column 8. You cited
8 column 8 here, and it -- lines 14 through 30 of column 8 talk about a
9 broadcast mode. And this is what Petitioner was telling me earlier, and they
10 said that, you know, there's music downloads, there's ESPN. And then on
11 line -- looking at line 27 of column 8, it says, "The user can then tune the
12 browser to one of the broadcast channels to receive that content." That's
13 what Avellan says, that content, referring back to ESPN.

14 So how do they view ESPN or these live television feeds if it's not
15 being captured somewhere?

16 MR. DROLET: The television feeds, whatever is being
17 represented on a web page, whether it be live television feed or CNN or web
18 page, are these mega -- you know, fast server farms, they're capturing these
19 web -- these images. Those images then sent -- get sent out. In broadcast
20 mode, they're doing it proactively. They're taking already CNN, ESPN, a
21 hockey game, a soccer game, and already broadcasting those out or at least
22 sending out those series of images from that website. That's what it's talking
23 about. That's what it's sending out.

24 JUDGE REPKO: It's sending out the video captures?

1 MR. DROLET: Sending out images of whatever's being
2 represented on the -- on that website or the live streaming feed. The live
3 streaming feed itself is being shown somewhere. It's being rendered, and
4 those images from that feed is what's being sent. There is no -- and again,
5 Avellan doesn't -- it can't do that. It doesn't have the bandwidth. It's only
6 sending, actually, screenshots of those things in repetitive fashion. So -

7 JUDGE REPKO: But how can the user tune the browser to receive
8 that content, to receive the live hockey game -

9 MR. DROLET: Because -

10 JUDGE REPKO: -- if it's not screenshotting the hockey game?

11 MR. DROLET: Because in broadcast mode, they proactively go
12 ahead and say, okay, we'll take CNN, for instance, and we'll take ABC, Fox
13 3, and go ahead and initiate transmission of screenshots on specific channels.
14 And the end users themselves, again, on these terminals, can choose which
15 stream they want to get to, right? That's what the broadcast channel is about.
16 That's what Avellan teaches.

17 JUDGE REPKO: It says on lines 43 and 44, it captures that data,
18 including audio to a video frame format.

19 MR. DROLET: So the tag files are what accompanies the actual
20 images themselves. They get tagged. They get brought along with the
21 actual screenshots, and they get broadcast to the actual end users. That's
22 what they're receiving.

23 JUDGE REPKO: They're receiving that video -

24 MR. DROLET: They're -

1 JUDGE REPKO: -- the original hockey game video plus the
2 images of the capture.

3 MR. DROLET: They're receiving some sort of tag file that -- and
4 again, Avellan doesn't talk a whole lot about it, but some sort of tag file that
5 associates either some sort of information that's being displayed along with
6 that website feed to the end-user.

7 JUDGE REPKO: Thank you.

8 MR. DROLET: Yes. Again, because of reading the abstract
9 -- reading the background, reading some of this invention, Avellan can't do
10 the -- can't do what we do because they don't have the bandwidth on the
11 actual satellite. This is a workaround. Okay. So -

12 JUDGE MURPHY: Well, if we were to read this as Petitioner
13 would have us read it, I mean, Avellan also discloses compressing the image
14 or video frame. Why wouldn't that help, if you will, with the limited
15 bandwidth issue?

16 MR. DROLET: I'm not sure I understand the -

17 JUDGE MURPHY: They're compressing the frames to send it out
18 via the browser.

19 MR. DROLET: Well, they're compressing the actual image of
20 whatever it is to be sent out. That's what they're overcoming the
21 transmission restrictions on the satellite.

22 JUDGE MURPHY: And why would that prohibit doing the same
23 thing for a live video feed?

24 MR. DROLET: Well, live video feed, just like interaction with a

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 website, requires a whole bunch of handoffs back and forth with respect to
2 all the different items on the actual feed or on a website. That's the type of
3 interaction that the satellite system, at that time, couldn't handle. It couldn't
4 handle that traffic. So that's their workaround, that's Avellan's workaround,
5 that's the solution to the technology at this time to -- in order to get at least
6 some sort of emulation. And again, Avellan talks about this. It's an
7 emulated screenshot. It's an emulated feed of what's actually occurring.
8 Does that answer your question, Your Honor?

9 JUDGE MURPHY: Yes. Thank you.

10 MR. DROLET: Let me go back to 22 if I could. Let me address
11 the board's claim construction, institution's decisions. The direction was
12 explicit. The board stated that a trial could produce additional evidence that
13 may support information in the final written decision that unpatentability has
14 not been proven. Everything that's in this decision should be read in that
15 context and should not be understood to be a final decision.

16 Determination: The board is deciding on an incomplete record
17 without full briefing, without depositions, they want the complete
18 specification analysis the Patent Owner has now provided. Trials produced
19 the evidence that was a complete institution. The specification passages are
20 now before the board, fully briefed, and with our expert support. Dependent
21 Claim 9 was not analyzed through a claim differentiation lens at the
22 institution. The complete claim logic analysis was not before the board.
23 This is precisely the posture the board anticipated when it said its findings
24 were preliminary.

1 Slide 23. If the board's institutional construction of Content
2 Provider as a broad term encompassing a transmission gateway were correct,
3 Claim 9 would have no narrowing of a function at all. It would be
4 superfluous. Superfluous claim language is impermissible under several
5 things such as doctrine. The board cannot adopt a construction that makes
6 an express dependent limitation meaningless.

7 I'll go to Slide 11. I think it's continuing your last question
8 concerning Avellan. So here we capture the critical distinction of capturing
9 an image of a CNN web page is categorically different from transmitting a
10 live CNN video stream. A static web page screenshot is not a media stream.
11 This is not a close technical question. It's a categorical distinction
12 -- categorical distinction between two entire types of systems.

13 Petitioner argues that Avellan in columns 8, lines 8 -- 18 to 21
14 discloses live-streaming television feeds by listing CNN, BBC, and ESPN.
15 This arguably is textually incorrect. Those lines of Avellan list the
16 broadcasters as suitable sites, meaning websites that Avellan's rate can
17 -- gateway can screenshot. Avellan captures images from those websites. It
18 does not stream live television. It transmits static images of web pages that
19 happen to belong to television broadcasters.

20 Petitioner's expert conflated a website owned by CNN with a live
21 CNN broadcast stream. Those are different things. A person ordinarily
22 skilled in the art would understand immediately that screenshotting cnn.com
23 is nothing like receiving a live broadcast feed from CNN for cable
24 distribution.

1 JUDGE REPKO: But in broadcasting that, they are pointing to the
2 data that comes from the video, right? I mean, there are -- there's live
3 streaming feeds that the user can tune into. I think that's what their position
4 is. If they're going to see the user -- an end-user's actually going to be able
5 to view the hockey game. They're not focused on the static.

6 MR. DROLET: They're -- the end-user's seeing screenshots,
7 repetitive screenshots of the live hockey game. They're not receiving live
8 transmission feed. That's the difference. That's a difference between a
9 remote desktop and any of us do a remote desktop to somewhere else. Same
10 thing. We're not engaging directly with that website. We're receiving a -- an
11 emulation of what that website is. It's a static image. We as humans can see
12 so many frames per second. That's what the emulation is. That's what it's
13 doing. It's a workaround against a live feed. Live feed can't be handled by
14 the infrastructure of a satellite.

15 JUDGE MURPHY: But why would Avellan -- I think Judge
16 Repko's point is why would it characterize streaming a live television feed as
17 broadcast mode if it were doing what you say it's doing?

18 MR. DROLET: So stand by the interpretation that Avellan cannot
19 go ahead and transmit that. Not capable because of the satellite. And what
20 it's actually stating that says is taking static images of the -- of that live
21 feeds, those websites, and translating to those series of those screenshots.

22 JUDGE REPKO: So going back, the claim notation we're talking
23 about is Claim Notation Element 1D: "Generating a temporal sequence of
24 screen captures." Does Avellan teach that? You just said like it -- it's static.

1 Is that what you're saying? It's not temporal? I guess I just want to make
2 sure I -- tied to -- your argument to the claim language. That's what you're
3 talking about?

4 MR. DROLET: Right. Your Honor, I'll -- I couldn't get that
5 rebuttal, so I have the -- specifically the terminology that I have written, so I
6 don't misconstrue what we said in our reply. Our contention is still that
7 there are two different things. So if you're asking -

8 JUDGE REPKO: What's two different things?

9 MR. DROLET: -- if you're asking -- if you're asking does Avellan
10 teach Sub-element 1D -

11 JUDGE REPKO: Yes.

12 MR. DROLET: -- because it's temporal, I'll take -- let me answer
13 that in rebuttal once I look at our response, please.

14 JUDGE REPKO: Okay. So what are you actually saying in this
15 -- on this slide, Avellan's actually missing? What claim element?

16 MR. DROLET: So this right here, it's the fact that it's -- when they
17 say that they're actually capturing a live stream, it's not a live stream.
18 They're capturing static images from a live stream. Two different things.
19 It's not a media stream. A media stream consists of a packetized
20 information. It's temporal. It's actually coded. It actually has some sort of
21 ability to go ahead and meet the code on the other end. It's not a media
22 stream. This is just successive transmissions of static images, two distinct
23 things. It's not a -

24 JUDGE REPKO: It says it's capturing the video frame format,

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 though. In column 8 of Avellan, line 44, it says, "In broadcast mode, this
2 server captures video frame format." That's not static.

3 MR. DROLET: No, but it's a compressed file that's being sent. It's
4 not a live stream. It's not a media stream. That's my distinction here.

5 JUDGE REPKO: You're saying we should read media stream to
6 exclude compressed files.

7 MR. DROLET: Yes. The media stream itself, by its nature, has a
8 temporal relationship to each different piece of information. It's all time-
9 related and it's actually coded and it has packetized information. It's sent
10 with the ability to be sent, coded, and to be decoded on the other side.

11 JUDGE REPKO: And it's not compressed. That was my question.

12 MR. DROLET: If you're asking specifics about whether or not a
13 media stream itself has any sort of compression, I can't comment on that
14 right now. What I'm stating is that a media stream is different than sending
15 successive files of compressed, or succession -- a succession of compressed
16 files, whether it be video compressed files or static files. A video file is just
17 that. It's a compressed video file and it's sent. It's not an actual media
18 stream. I guess that's my distinction.

19 JUDGE REPKO: Okay. Well, 1D says generating the screen
20 captures, and then 1E requires assembling the media stream using those
21 stream captures.

22 MR. DROLET: Correct.

23 JUDGE REPKO: Right? And their position is that Avellan
24 creates the screen captures of the streaming feed -- of video and then

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 assembles a new stream from those screen captures of the streaming video
2 on the screen.

3 MR. DROLET: Well, that's an incorrect reading because a media
4 stream, by its actual definition, again, one -- another term that we talk about
5 in our surreply -- in our reply, a media stream reading national specification
6 means specific thing, which is not disclosed by Avellan.

7 JUDGE REPKO: It says the word streaming video feeds. In other
8 words, the words that Avellan uses is streaming television feeds.

9 MR. DROLET: So -

10 JUDGE REPKO: Line 20, for example, of Avellan column 8.

11 MR. DROLET: So I'm not sure I answer -- I understand your
12 question, Your Honor.

13 JUDGE REPKO: How can that not be a media stream? It says
14 streaming television feeds.

15 MR. DROLET: It's not sending streaming television feeds. It's
16 sending files, compressed files, capturing images of -- or video compressed
17 files from that feed. It's not the same thing.

18 JUDGE REPKO: Okay. Thank you.

19 MR. DROLET: So Petitioner's demonstrative cite Avellan states
20 that, "The broadcast channel can be configured to receive live content." The
21 Board should note that this -- what this passage actually says. It says the
22 channel can be configured to receive live content. Not that the channel
23 transmits the live media stream to a cable operator. Configuring Avellan's
24 broadcast channel to pull from a live streaming website still results in

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 Avellan's gateway screenshot, whatever the browser renders from that URL
2 at a given moment. There's a screenshot of video player's web page, not a
3 live media stream assembled for cable broadcast. Column 8, lines 27-31,
4 changes nothing about Avellan's fundamental screenshot delivery
5 architecture.

6 Slide 12. Avellan fails on four independent claim elements, any
7 which -- any one of which is sufficient. First, no request from Content
8 Provider. Every request in Avellan originates from user computers 104.
9 Individual end users: the direction of information flows reversed from the
10 claims. In the patents, the cloud system receives requests from operators. In
11 Avellan, end-users request content from a gateway server. There is no cable
12 or satellite operator anywhere in the Avellan system. Second, no playback
13 of a media stream. The word playback does not appear in Avellan's
14 specification. Avellan transmits a sequence of static web page images, not a
15 temporally continuous media stream. Discrete images are not a media
16 stream. Playback requires temporal continuity, synchronization into coding.
17 Avellan -

18 JUDGE REPKO: No, there's playback. I just want to interrupt
19 you. It says, "The user can view the streaming broadcast." How is that
20 possible if there's no temporal continuity? It's a hockey game.

21 MR. DROLET: So the end-user can see succession of static
22 images being sent. It emulates the live streaming feed. It is not by the
23 actual nature of Avellan existing in the content -- context of what it
24 represents, it cannot do that.

1 JUDGE REPKO: Temporal continuity is there, though. Even if
2 they're static images -

3 MR. DROLET: If -

4 JUDGE REPKO: -- they may be temporally continuous?

5 MR. DROLET: So if you're asking, is there a temporal continuity
6 with static images? Yes, but there's no -- there is no correction mechanism.
7 There's no correction mechanism, whether there's five frames missing, two
8 frames missing, ten seconds go by. The fact that you have a succession of
9 different screenshots is temporal in that sense, but I'm making the point that
10 it's not temporal with respect to a media stream.

11 JUDGE REPKO: So you think that the user is watching a hockey
12 game, they're seeing, like, a part of the hockey game, and then it stops for a
13 few frames, and then they see another part, and it's, like, all discontinuous?

14 MR. DROLET: Well, that'd be a difference. That's a difference in
15 media stream and actual what Avellan teaches. Avellan teachings, whatever
16 -- whatever's being sent. Whatever some -- whether someone sees a ten-
17 second lapse between frames, one-second lapse between frames, the end-
18 user doesn't know. It's just receiving whatever compressed images are
19 coming through in this data transmission.

20 JUDGE REPKO: Getting these compressed images and so they're
21 not -- they can't even watch the hockey game because it's all disjointed.

22 MR. DROLET: Well, whether the refresh rate's one second, five
23 seconds, I don't know. All I'm saying is that Avellan, in its teaching, doesn't
24 comply with anything just with what I've just said. It's taking the

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 screenshots, sending them off through the end-user, the end-user sees them,
2 it emulates seeing the thing in live.

3 JUDGE REPKO: Yeah. So I mean, line 66, column 8 of Avellan,
4 they say, "Continuously captures the broadcast data at the networks." So
5 you think that means it's just, it's discontinuous in a way that the user might
6 see, like, parts of the action of the hockey game, but won't see -- they'll be
7 missing a couple seconds because of lag and stuff.

8 MR. DROLET: It's asking me to guess. I can't opinion on -- I
9 can't provide an opinion on that, Your Honor.

10 JUDGE REPKO: Okay.

11 MR. DROLET: All I'm saying is I'm contrasting what Avellan
12 teaches to what our claim language is.

13 JUDGE REPKO: So you think that's what Avellan teaches,
14 though, it's discontinuous playback?

15 MR. DROLET: You don't know. It's sending screenshots of a
16 different website within its own capacity.

17 JUDGE REPKO: Okay. So it says, "broadcast data." So you
18 think that's just sending -- I just want to make sure I understand what you're
19 arguing and what you're -- what you believe the word media conveys versus
20 what Avellan's actually teaching. So the hockey game, again, the users
21 choose a certain hockey game, that page of the website can be sent in
22 broadcast mode. This is what Avellan's teaching. Stored at the storage
23 device, and then the gateway server retrieves video frame format. So that
24 video frame format is not temporally continuous? It's disjointed, it's not

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 media stream?

2 MR. DROLET: It's not a media stream.

3 JUDGE REPKO: Okay.

4 MR. DROLET: That's for sure. And that's our point of contention.

5 It's not a media stream, and that's one of the areas that it fails our patent.

6 JUDGE REPKO: Thank you.

7 MR. DROLET: Slide 13. There's no assembling the media

8 stream. Avellan compresses a single web page image at a time.

9 Compression of a single image is not assembling the media stream. The

10 claim invention requires assembling a plurality of multimedia items of

11 different types, audio, video, metadata, into a stream for cable or satellite

12 broadcast. Avellan has no assembly step.

13 Fourth, no broadcast in a broadcast media channel. Avellan

14 operates in unicast mode, one user one image, or broadcast mode, the same

15 cached web page image pushed to multiple desktop computers. Neither

16 mode is a broadcast media channel in the cable or satellite sense. Neither

17 delivers a multimedia stream to cable headend for distribution on a cable or

18 satellite channel. These are architecturally unrelated systems.

19 JUDGE REPKO: You've made that point. I just want to

20 emphasize that you have about 16 minutes left, so you may want to adjust

21 how you're -

22 MR. DROLET: Yes, Your Honor.

23 JUDGE MURPHY: Yeah, let me direct you to the Farber

24 reference, please. If you have Farber at column 5. We were having this

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 discussion earlier with Petitioner's Counsel, so I wanted to get your response
2 to what Counsel said.

3 MR. DROLET: So let me get to Farber.

4 JUDGE REPKO: And I also want to remind you, I'd like to leave
5 time to also talk about the parameters in the other 350 case.

6 JUDGE MURPHY: So we're in Farber at column 5, lines 33
7 through 38. Are you with me, Counsel?

8 MR. DROLET: Yes, Your Honor. I'm sorry. I'm trying to get to
9 my -- yes, Your Honor.

10 JUDGE MURPHY: You have your screen up? Okay. Or the -

11 MR. DROLET: Now in Slide 17, as we're going to talk -- I'm
12 sorry.

13 JUDGE MURPHY: So in Farber, we had the discussion with
14 Counsel about a remote source being a cloud service source. And Counsel's
15 argument, as I understand it, is that Farber says the data sources may or may
16 not be located in a single location, may or may not be co-located with the
17 data carousel subsystem. And so in Farber's system, that means if it's not
18 located in the single location, it's a cloud service. What's your response to
19 that?

20 MR. DROLET: No, Your Honor. There's no enablement of a
21 cloud service or cloud retrieval device. Again, Farber is purely a solution to
22 prevent screen burnout on a -- on a display. Its intention there to go ahead
23 and get data to go ahead, and act upon is in a -- in discrete locations. It's
24 just, Farber's mentioned it can be local, remote, but it's still a discrete

1 location stored somewhere. There's no enablement of -- or even mention of
2 any sort of cloud engagement to go ahead and get data for Farber.

3 JUDGE MURPHY: So you're saying it can be a remote location
4 but not -

5 MR. DROLET: It can be a remote stored location.

6 JUDGE MURPHY: -- but not necessarily a remote cloud service.

7 MR. DROLET: It's definitely not remote cloud service, and they
8 even mentioned not even enabled.

9 JUDGE REPKO: How -- can you explain what the -- what cloud
10 service means to you? How is that not something that's co-located?

11 MR. DROLET: So cloud service means something that you're
12 engaging either with a web page or some sort of HTML component and
13 allowing to go in and interact with multimedia items, of course, of some sort
14 to extract data. Farber does none of that. Farber is a triggered state system.
15 It actually follows the path. I'm going to go get this, put it here, store it, play
16 it a different time. That's it. There's nothing in -- enabling in Farber even
17 discloses. Yeah, the word says, oh, remote or other -- remote, but it's still a
18 fixed location.

19 JUDGE REPKO: Well, I don't want to get into what Farber says.
20 I'm just -- I'm curious again about the claim construction. If you're thinking
21 about cloud service, you want us to interpret this a certain way. I heard you
22 said a web page, requires a web page?

23 MR. DROLET: No. I said that cloud service means that you'd be
24 engaging with something other than a physical hard location. You'd be

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 actually engaging the web, engaging the website, some sort of online content
2 provider of sorts to go ahead and get that data. And Farber doesn't teach that
3 whatsoever.

4 JUDGE REPKO: So if it says, "not co-located," how is it not
5 engaging with the website or something like that? I don't see how -- can you
6 make that -

7 MR. DROLET: All Farber disclose -- infers taking a stored
8 location. Again, reading the actual specification itself, and what Farber
9 teaches is actually taking physical stored data and pulling that stored data
10 from somewhere, some sort of stored medium. It's not talking about
11 engaging with a real time website or content provider to extract data. It has
12 none of that.

13 JUDGE REPKO: So you think it has to do the content provider as
14 well? You need that as part of the process?

15 MR. DROLET: So I mentioned content provider only as a -- as an
16 example of cloud-based service, which Farber does not teach. So anything,
17 a website, some sort of entity that could provide that data is not taught at all
18 or even inferred.

19 JUDGE REPKO: So if you have some data that's not co-located,
20 how else can you get it other than --

21 (Simultaneous speaking.)

22 MR. DROLET: If it is not located -- stored in location A on a CD
23 disk bank, it's located in location B in another CD bank, or it is located on
24 CD hard drive on this.

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 JUDGE REPKO: I see.

2 MR. DROLET: It's not located on the cloud. It is actually
3 physical location. Again, the technology reading this patent, that's what it is
4 about.

5 JUDGE REPKO: I see. So you're saying like the data in Farber,
6 the non-co-located data, could be sitting on a static media somewhere in -

7 MR. DROLET: Correct.

8 JUDGE REPKO: -- somebody's house, for example.

9 MR. DROLET: Correct.

10 JUDGE REPKO: Okay. I see. Thank you for clarifying that.

11 MR. DROLET: I apologize. You wanted me to go to Farber, and
12 I'm jumping around, Your Honor.

13 JUDGE MURPHY: No. We were following up on exactly what
14 we wanted to follow up on.

15 MR. DROLET: Well, 11 minutes left. Let's go to -

16 JUDGE REPKO: And if you have time to talk about the
17 Wannamaker reference and the parameters in particular -

18 MR. DROLET: Okay, let's -

19 JUDGE REPKO: -- that would be -

20 MR. DROLET: -- jump Wannamaker.

21 JUDGE REPKO: And in particular, it'd be helpful if you could
22 clarify whether the claim construction that Petitioner pointed us to from the
23 District Court claim construction, do you agree with their characterization?
24 Do you agree that we should adopt that construction here in this proceeding?

1 MR. DROLET: I can't comment on that until I look at specifically
2 what the construction entails. I'm not sure. Is there a specific question about
3 that construction you're asking about?

4 JUDGE REPKO: Well, I mean, just as a general matter they said
5 that, you know, parameters via MPEG outputs. How should we construe
6 that here in this proceeding?

7 MR. DROLET: So with Wannamaker, we have to understand
8 what a Wannamaker is. Wannamaker itself was a short-lived solution when
9 a transmission from coax and RF set-top boxes for homes and the emergence
10 of the web. What Wannamaker did is provide a short-term solution that
11 really provided a historical short -- had a short life cycle. It actually went
12 and provided hardware. They had an operator's location to go ahead and try
13 to commercialize website components and such so that traditional, limited
14 set-top boxes, commercial set-top boxes, which were -- didn't have much
15 capacity for computation to do much more, could be -- could -- they could
16 take -- commercialize those assets.

17 So what Wannamaker does, in detail, in this specific thing for the
18 Motorola, is establish hardware, and to head into operator station to go in
19 and emulate some of these webs -- web -- web-based features that they can
20 be commercialized using the existing commercial set-top box. So the entire
21 infrastructure, the reason it is so detailed is because they have so many
22 different things that are trying to emulate a live feed, which can't be done
23 through the traditional set-top boxes. Wannamaker provides a -- at least a
24 short-term solution for the commercial entities to try to commercialize some

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 of these internet things.

2 They could be movies. They could be websites, but the
3 infrastructure at the time, with the existing set-top boxes and the RF cable,
4 the coax, couldn't handle it. Couldn't do it, specifically because how it was
5 set up. So what they do, they set up these different components that went
6 ahead. And the different components are called different things that are
7 similar to our patent plans, but it's not multicasting. It's not doing what our
8 patent does. It goes ahead, and is images and it takes screenshots.

9 It takes different types of information existing on available website
10 resources, and then goes in and offers them up through the -- as you
11 mentioned earlier, like with the framing, the layouts, so that the end user
12 could receive, if they choose to, something that looked like a movie. In fact,
13 they would receive something that looked like the movie, but it wasn't the
14 actual true live feed from the -- from the website. So Wannamaker provides
15 that infrastructure.

16 JUDGE REPKO: All right. So focus on the claim language here.
17 Limitation 7A says, you know, "The multicast server is configured to output
18 the parameters via the MPEG outputs." Do you believe that it
19 -- Wannamaker teaches that?

20 MR. DROLET: No, there's no multicast server in Wannamaker.
21 The term multicast refers to go ahead and send out information that
22 replicates the P&I frames of the different video so that the -- at least the
23 limitations on the set-top boxes could receive something and have something
24 emulates the video on the end-user side. So the multicast feature is taking

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 those videos, and you covered it earlier with the different features that it has.

2 I mean, let me -- I think this one's better here. There we go. I'm
3 now looking at Slide 117. 117, okay? It talks about the different
4 components that's actually Wannamaker is using, okay? And I think that
5 helps answer the question. Utilizing the set-top boxes, the actual -- the TV
6 navigator, and actually going ahead and sending the information to the end
7 user.

8 JUDGE REPKO: Okay. So on page 43 of your Patent Owner
9 response, you're talking about the encoding and it lacks the parameters. Can
10 you kind of discuss that argument?

11 MR. DROLET: So the parameters that Wannamaker discusses is
12 modifying that information that exists from the internet, from the websites,
13 into a format that can be utilized by the restraints on the actual set-top boxes
14 themselves. The actual exercise that Wannamaker does is deliver that
15 images, the sound, to the actual end user. And the reason it's complicated is
16 because it has to go in and could be -- it is constrained by the set-top box
17 restrictions so that's what Wannamaker does.

18 The parameters that it talks about is how to do that, how to actually
19 do that, because the existing infrastructure in commercial set-top boxes and
20 residential houses at the time could not handle the actual webs -- web
21 information itself straight. Mainly because it wasn't set to do that, and
22 because with coax and RF capability of the commercial residences.

23 JUDGE REPKO: Okay. Thank you. About five minutes left.

24 MR. DROLET: Okay. So I've been jumping around. We've

1 talked Avellan, Wannamaker briefly. We can go to Farber. Oh, we'll go to
2 Slide 28. Try to hit the high points here, we got left. So Slide 28 talks about
3 the question the board asks specifically about whether maintaining
4 generation in failure cases requires continuous generation or encompasses
5 some sort of lag or pause. We believe in Slide 30 specifically answers that
6 question. We cite four critical passages -- passages.

7 The monit block ensures the process running Media Parallel
8 encoder, or plug, keeps running at all times, and it does not stop at the
9 failure. Second, the multicast -- multiblocks contain a recording function for
10 stream-level redundancy, recording for use in case of failure. Third, the
11 fault-tolerant mode provides immediate prerecorded audio playback upon
12 failure detection. Fourth, ping monitoring timeout immediately triggers pre-
13 recorded content with no gap, no lag, no human intervention. Keeping
14 running at all times, do not stop upon failure is not the language of
15 occasional interruption. It's language of continuous uninterrupted operation.

16 The specification answers the board's questions -- question.
17 Maintain generation means uninterrupted generation, not a system tolerating
18 some lag or pause. Slide 31. "Even if the Board adopts a more permissive
19 reading, even if the Board declines to require strict continuity. Wannamaker
20 still" phase -- "fails it. Wannamaker's own disclosure admits its failure
21 response terminates generation." Wannamaker paragraph 320. "The
22 operator can telnet into the system and fix the problem or restart the system.
23 Failure response is restarting the failed component or restarting the entire
24 system as necessary."

1 "Generation that stops and starts is not generation that is
2 maintained under any reading of the term." Slide 43. I want to address the
3 Board's finding concerning the caching unit. The Board institution stated
4 claim one does not limit caching unit in any way. The statement is not a
5 claim construction under Phillips. Under Phillips, the terms are given that
6 ordinary and customary meaning is a certified preferred -- person of ordinary
7 skill in the art, in view of the specification of the entire claim. Limitation is
8 not interpretation as commensurate with the specification.

9 Slide 45. "The '441 specification describes the caching unit across
10 multiple sections with specificity." Column 5, line 6 through 16, "The
11 caching unit encodes and transcodes of multimedia files downloaded from
12 the cloud. Keeps updated admitted metadata, and creates customizable
13 screens for the cable operator." Column 6, lines 33 through 38. "The
14 caching unit is the component that encodes audio and video. Can use the
15 disc space in the media plug." And then Figure 7 shows the caching unit's
16 architecture, which includes HTPTV and RTSP operating system services.

17 Slide 47. "Independent Claim 25 of the '441 Patent expressly
18 defines what a caching unit does. By listing six operational functions, it
19 must perform. Receiving a request from a content provider, obtaining
20 content from external sources, rendering a webpage by a browser, generating
21 temporal screen captures, assembling a media stream, and providing the
22 stream at a multicast unit." Is authoritative evidence that from within the
23 same patent of a -- what a person of ordinary skill in the art would consider a
24 caching unit.

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 Slide 15. "Farber is absolutely silent on the term caching unit.
2 The word does not appear in Farber's disclosure. Anticipation cannot be
3 based on silence. Equating a passive storage device with a computing-
4 intensive cache unit of '441 Patent improperly broadens the claim scope."

5 And I'll reserve the rest of the time for rebuttal, Your Honors.

6 JUDGE REPKO: Thank you.

7 Petitioner, almost 30 minutes for rebuttal. A little shy, 30 minutes.
8 Go ahead and let me know when you're set up and ready to go.

9 MR. JUGLE: Rob, this is mine up here.

10 MR. DROLET: I'm sorry?

11 MR. JUGLE: This was mine not yours, right?

12 MR. DROLET: Not mine. Thanks for asking.

13 MR. JUGLE: All right. I'm ready. So to begin, during my
14 opening presentation the board asked if there was any additional support in
15 Avellan we had around 1D. I want to point to a few other parts of Avellan
16 that I think give the column 5 reference I primarily discussed just a little
17 more context. You already referenced them in Patent Owner's response, but
18 I'll just reiterate them.

19 So first, the abstract describes that in broadcast mode, "A gateway
20 server periodically or continuously images broadcast data, e.g., popular
21 websites, compresses the website images, and stores the compressed website
22 images at the gateway cache." So as an abstract of the entire disclosure
23 Avellan is saying, I'm continuously taking images of what it describes as
24 broadcast data, and it gives an example of popular websites.

1 JUDGE REPKO: Does it say -

2 MR. JUGLE: That --

3 JUDGE REPKO: -- it compresses it to video -- or to images, and
4 then uses the images to create video of the broadcast data in the abstract?
5 That's the thing, it kind of leaves that open.

6 MR. JUGLE: In the abstract -- right. So the abstract just says, I'm
7 going to broadcast all the compressed broadcast data to all of the millions of
8 computer subscribers over a broadcast device. So if we go to column 2,
9 lines 27 through 34, it says, "In a broadcast mode, gateway service
10 periodically or continuously images broadcast data."

11 So the same thing as the abstract, essentially. It says, "The website
12 images", so it is talking about capturing plural images, capture the graphical
13 features at -- and that's at column 2, lines 59 through -- or 58 through 59.
14 Going to column 8 at -

15 JUDGE REPKO: So we know column 2, you said, it compresses
16 images in the cache. So we still just have images at this -

17 MR. JUGLE: Right.

18 JUDGE REPKO: -- point, right, of some broadcast data?

19 MR. JUGLE: Right.

20 JUDGE REPKO: So where do we go from those images and kind
21 of connect it up to the video files?

22 MR. JUGLE: So -- okay. So column 6, lines 50 through -- 52
23 through 54 describe an embodiment in which a webpage responds to this
24 image compressed or turned to the browser using a differential burst video

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 transmission. So there's embodiments where Avellan talks about sending
2 video.

3 JUDGE REPKO: That's what I'm wondering -

4 MR. JUGLE: And that's -

5 JUDGE REPKO: -- about the connection between, like, there are
6 some modes that will download the video, correct? I mean, are we talking
7 about two different things? And you're going to give me some more stuff
8 here, I'm sure. But -- like, what I'm wondering is, are they downloading the
9 streaming videos separate from creating snapshots of the video on the
10 screen?

11 MR. JUGLE: So I think Avellan discloses a unicast mode and a
12 broadcast mode, and mostly we talk about the broadcast mode. Because the
13 unicast mode seems to be directed to, like, projecting images of a fully
14 interactive webpage to a particular user -

15 JUDGE MURPHY: Counsel --

16 MR. JUGLE: -- so that they can click on -

17 JUDGE MURPHY: Can you pull that -

18 MR. JUGLE: I'm sorry, my -- got to push it a little.

19 JUDGE MURPHY: Yeah.

20 MR. JUGLE: Okay.

21 JUDGE MURPHY: Is that -- let me just our -- ask our techs. Can
22 you speak into the podium mic?

23 MR. JUGLE: Yes. Can you hear me?

24 JUDGE MURPHY: Are we good, Greg? Oh, I just got a message.

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 Anyway, just -

2 MR. JUGLE: Okay.

3 JUDGE MURPHY: -- go ahead.

4 MR. JUGLE: So that unicast mode seems to be envisioned as
5 providing a website that a user can interact through. So it's imaging these
6 websites, producing a streaming file that -- of those websites, and it is
7 including these tag files that the users can interact through. I don't think that
8 works if it just sends a package of download, because then there's no
9 interactivity back and forth. But that all aside, we mostly in the petition rely
10 on the broadcast embodiment. And -- so, the broadcast embodiment, for
11 example, at column 8, lines 42 through 46, talks about, "Gateway server
12 retrieves the desired data from Networks 152 -- 150 or 152, capturing that
13 data, including audio to a video or image frame format, compressing that
14 video data, and stores the compressed video data in the gateway of the
15 cache. The cache acts then to send that to the users."

16 I don't think there's anything in Avellan that says, I'm just sending
17 a file, because it is -- it talks repeatedly about providing live-streaming. And
18 I'll also note that there was no claim construction put forth for media stream
19 in Patent Owner's briefing, in Patent Owner's response. And what I heard up
20 here was that this media stream requires a lot of specific requirements, and
21 that wasn't argued. And I don't think there's anything in the claim or Patent
22 Owner's patent specification that supports that narrow of a reading of media
23 stream. So I think Avellan discloses the -- you know, the plain and ordinary
24 interpretation of what a media stream is.

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 Because it describes that -- what the user would receive, and what
2 the user would want to receive, and what its purpose is is to provide this
3 live-streaming broadcast. And the claims don't require much more than that.
4 They don't require that it be a live-streaming video and a media stream or
5 anything like that. What it required was that you render webpages and you
6 take a temporal sequence of screen captures, which it sounded like Mr.
7 Drolet said Avellan does. It sounded like he said you send a continuous set
8 of screen captures that get updated.

9 And the -- or the claims don't require that that's five frames per
10 second or 30 frames per second or enough to be full motion video or enough
11 to give a chunky representation of what's going on. That's not in the claim.
12 It just requires that you have a temporal sequence of screen captures that are
13 continuously captured -

14 JUDGE MURPHY: Well, let me -

15 MR. JUGLE: -- and illustrated dynamic change.

16 JUDGE MURPHY: Yeah. In Limitation 10F in the '441 Patent,
17 for example, it's -- it -- the limitation says assembling the at least one media
18 stream using the temporal sequence of screen captures. Would that include
19 something other than a live stream?

20 MR. JUGLE: I don't think so.

21 JUDGE MURPHY: Like a temporal sequence of static images, for
22 example.

23 MR. JUGLE: Right. So if it's assemble, I think all assembly
24 means is you're putting it into a format to an extent which Avellan says,

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 because it says you can put these into a video frame format. And -

2 JUDGE REPKO: So what if it is like a newspaper, a static image
3 of a newspaper scrolling through, is that -- would that meet the claim?

4 MR. JUGLE: If you're scrolling through it over time, I think so.

5 JUDGE MURPHY: And what about the -

6 MR. JUGLE: As long as that scrolling illustrates some dynamic
7 change, because that's what the claim requires.

8 JUDGE REPKO: The content does have to correspond to the
9 plurality of multimedia items. So it has to be some interactively -- how we
10 view multimedia. It can't be more than text.

11 MR. JUGLE: So it says it is a plurality, so let me make sure I am
12 on the limitation you're talking about.

13 JUDGE REPKO: Well, I guess looking at 1B from the 3 -

14 MR. JUGLE: Yeah, I just want to make sure I have the -

15 JUDGE REPKO: -- 49 case. So that -- it does define media
16 stream, I guess, in 1A, right? The one -- media stream includes a plurality -

17 MR. JUGLE: Oh, do you have -

18 JUDGE REPKO: -- of multimedia items of different types.

19 MR. JUGLE: Right.

20 JUDGE REPKO: So just text seems like the plain language of the
21 claim would exclude that.

22 MR. JUGLE: So I think if you only had just an image of -- well,
23 it's a capability too, right? Or this is a method -- this is a method claim. So
24 yeah, if you just -- if the only disclosure was taking one page of a newspaper

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 and sending that -- an image of that, you probably don't get there with an
2 Avellan.

3 But Avellan discloses a lot more than that. It discloses, as I said at
4 Claim 8, that you're capturing these -- you're capturing video and audio, and
5 audio has to continue over time. You can't have audio that you captured that
6 isn't over time. If you hear an instantaneous sound, it doesn't sound like
7 anything.

8 JUDGE MURPHY: And what's your response to Counsel's
9 argument that Avellan was not technically capable of broadcasting?

10 MR. JUGLE: I don't think there's any support for that in
11 Petitioner's.

12 JUDGE MURPHY: Do you recall if that was argued in the
13 Response or Sur-reply?

14 MR. JUGLE: I mean, I think, as I recall, the Patent Owner made
15 some broad arguments that none of the references are enabled. I don't think
16 they were fully explained. I don't think they were explained with
17 independent analysis. I don't think they were explained with supporting
18 references. So I -- at an extremely high level, maybe that was raised, but I
19 don't think it was raised in full or with evidence.

20 JUDGE MURPHY: Thank you.

21 MR. JUGLE: All right. Next, I'm going to briefly talk about claim
22 construction because there's a lot of claim constructions the Patent Owner is
23 putting forward, and they are -- well, one, never explicitly argued in any of
24 the Patent Owner Responses. And two, I don't think they're really reading

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 Phillips correctly. Phillips is very clear that you're not supposed to read
2 specific embodiment of the inventions into the claim language. And Phillips
3 said, we've warned repeatedly against confining claims to the embodiments.

4 And Patent Owners can say, well, this is an embodiment but it says
5 it is an example. That's pretty much the language of an embodiment. So it
6 strikes us that, A, they're trying to read embodiments into the claim
7 language. And B, most of the arguments they're making are not -- weren't
8 fully raised in the Patent Owner Response, and they waited until the Sur-
9 reply to bring claim constructions, which isn't proper. There were new
10 arguments, new evidence in favor of their claim instructions that could have
11 been brought, given that they knew the Board's position in the institution
12 decisions, and the Patent Owner Response and work.

13 Also, Mr. Lipoff, I will address that here. So Mr. Drolet is correct.
14 We didn't really respond to that in the Reply. They cite one portion of Mr.
15 Lipoff's testimony in all of the Patent Owner Responses, which is to an
16 exhibit that doesn't even exist. But I think from context, it has to be the first
17 day of Mr. Lipoff's testimony, which I think was Exhibit 2053 to the '074
18 Patent. Because that's the only day that had enough pages to include these
19 citations. And what these citations actually say, the first one they reference
20 in their Patent Owner Response, which is column 116, line 23 through 117,
21 18, is literally just Mr. Drolet reading from the specification verbatim.

22 It doesn't tell us anything about Mr. Lipoff's testimony. And then,
23 the second portion in the Patent Owner Response is column 120, line 16
24 through 121, line 11, which I have up here on the screen. Which basically

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 they ask Mr. Lipoff what figures he's relying upon. And he says, I don't
2 recall making any reference to Figure 2. I don't think that supports their
3 argument, and there wasn't really anything to say in response because the
4 argument is just empty.

5 So that's all I have now. Today, Mr. Drolet, excuse me, referenced
6 some statements that Mr. Lipoff made in his second day of deposition that
7 wasn't in the Patent Owner Response, so we couldn't have responded to it.
8 We don't think it should be credited now, but at a high level, all Mr. Lipoff
9 said was, I gave an independent opinion. I looked at the draft of the petition.
10 There were certain things that were said that I didn't think I needed to
11 supplement, and other things that I provided my opinion on.

12 We don't think there's anything improper about that. There isn't
13 any cases they've cited that says an expert's supposed to prepare their
14 declaration in isolation or anything like that. We think it's fairly routine that
15 experts work with Counsel to prepare both the declaration and the petitions.
16 All right. So -

17 JUDGE REPKO: I would like to ask you about Farber.

18 MR. JUGLE: Sure.

19 JUDGE REPKO: The issue of cloud service and a remote location
20 in the cloud service. My understanding from Counsel for Patent Owner is
21 that it -- something that's not co-located or located in a single location could
22 be a separate physical location rather than something cloud-based.

23 MR. JUGLE: Well, I think everything in the cloud is eventually
24 located somewhere physical, so I don't think that argument is particularly

1 availing because -

2 JUDGE REPKO: I mean, is it simply a connection through any
3 network through another source?

4 MR. JUGLE: To the cloud?

5 JUDGE REPKO: Yeah.

6 MR. JUGLE: Cloud wasn't argued for construction, and I think a
7 reasonable interpretation means if you're going out to some other source,
8 yeah, that's retrieving it from the cloud. And a person of skill in the art
9 would recognize that if you can retrieve something remotely, you can also
10 retrieve it from a cloud system.

11 So that remote system, it could be somebody's server at their next-
12 door neighbor that they dial up into, like it's 1994, or it could be a cloud
13 server because it just says it's remote. And a person of ordinary skill in the
14 art would understand how to access a remote system in the form of a cloud
15 server. Even at the time of these patents, which was in the early 2010s, the
16 cloud was a thing at that point.

17 JUDGE MURPHY: So he pointed us to the possibility that it was
18 stored on disc, a CD, and you can do it yourself.

19 MR. JUGLE: I don't think Farber says that. I guess that's a
20 possibility. But I also don't think there's any limitation in the definition of
21 cloud that prevents a cloud remote service from spinning up a tape, or a CD,
22 or other long-term storage to access that information if it needs to.

23 So Farber doesn't limit the remote system to a CD player. It
24 doesn't say that anywhere. But even if a cloud server is going to retrieve that

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 information from a CD, I think that can be the limitation.

2 JUDGE REPKO: But if it is not co-located, it could be your
3 neighbors walking that CD over to your house. Is that fair being a cloud
4 service?

5 MR. JUGLE: No. I don't think so. I -- or is that -- I don't think
6 that's a fair reading of what Farber is doing either. In the context of Farber
7 it's saying, I'm going to retrieve these things. It's not talking about sending a
8 mail-in request or something like that, so.

9 JUDGE REPKO: So your issue is really with how we read Farber.
10 You're saying it's inherent, essentially. If it's not co-located, it's inherently in
11 a cloud -

12 MR. JUGLE: No.

13 JUDGE REPKO: -- on a -- in a cloud service. And that's what the
14 claim says, right? Cloud service.

15 MR. JUGLE: Yeah. I -- what I'm saying is that a person of
16 ordinary skill in the art would read Farber and say, if I'm going out to the
17 cloud, or if I'm going to a remote server, I'm going out to -- I can go out to
18 the cloud to get that.

19 JUDGE REPKO: It doesn't say from a server, it says not co-
20 located.

21 MR. JUGLE: It -- well, Farber has a separate place where it
22 describes the data sources connecting to a server.

23 JUDGE REPKO: So you -

24 MR. JUGLE: So -

1 JUDGE REPKO: -- your argument is you think there's something

2 -

3 MR. JUGLE: So I think when you read that altogether, it would
4 provide a person of ordinary skill in the art with an understanding that this
5 could be a -- this could -- is a cloud system.

6 JUDGE REPKO: I just want to make sure I get your argument
7 clear.

8 MR. JUGLE: Yes.

9 JUDGE REPKO: So you're -- it's two things. One, it's not co-
10 located. And two, there's a server there and that's what leads us to believe
11 that there is a cloud service, essentially. It -- Farber, given there's a server,
12 that precludes their interpretation that there's a neighbor with a CD -

13 MR. JUGLE: Right.

14 JUDGE REPKO: -- that he's going to walk over to your house?

15 MR. JUGLE: Correct.

16 JUDGE REPKO: Is that correct?

17 MR. JUGLE: Yeah.

18 JUDGE REPKO: Okay.

19 JUDGE MURPHY: Yeah. And my only question there is, your
20 ground one in IPR351 for the '441 Patent is anticipation. And so, for that
21 limitation, are you -- I'm trying to check the petition. You're relying on
22 inherency for that?

23 MR. JUGLE: So we're -- I -

24 JUDGE MURPHY: No, we talked about inherency in terms of

1 determining the storage.

2 MR. JUGLE: Yeah, right and -- but inherency requires a

3 necessary -

4 JUDGE MURPHY: It does.

5 MR. JUGLE: -- right? So I -- we didn't make an inherency
6 argument. What we said is that this -- it's disclosed because it's remote, and
7 that's enough. You can understand that remote server to be a cloud server.

8 JUDGE MURPHY: Okay.

9 MR. JUGLE: It's -- and -

10 JUDGE MURPHY: I mean the -

11 MR. JUGLE: -- we didn't construe what cloud means, so this
12 -- saying a remote server is or isn't inherently a cloud server, it's just an
13 argument we didn't make because cloud was interpreted broadly, right? It
14 -- and in other words, cloud can encompass a remote server. That's the
15 construction argument.

16 Is that a person of ordinary skill in the art would look at the cloud
17 and say, this can include a remote server. We didn't -- Patent Owner didn't
18 raise a countervailing construction or have any justification for this narrow
19 reading that they're putting on it now. So -

20 JUDGE REPKO: In claim terms, cloud -- oh, excuse me.

21 MR. JUGLE: I'm sorry. I -

22 JUDGE MURPHY: Yeah, let me just so I'm clear. So the fact that
23 it's remote and it's a remote server connected to the data carousel subsystem
24 is sufficient, in your view, for anticipation?

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 MR. JUGLE: Yes.

2 JUDGE REPKO: I just want to clarify, it's cloud service.

3 MR. JUGLE: Yes.

4 JUDGE REPKO: Not cloud server. So the service, can you
5 explain how that's inherent in Farber?

6 MR. JUGLE: Well, again, we haven't said it's inherent.

7 JUDGE REPKO: Or how -

8 MR. JUGLE: And so -

9 JUDGE REPKO: -- how is --

10 (Simultaneous speaking.)

11 JUDGE REPKO: -- by Farber?

12 MR. JUGLE: So any of the things I just said where I said server, I
13 think if you substitute the word service, my argument holds. I don't think
14 there's any particular construction that's placed on service that requires any
15 more explanation from Farber. When it's broad, when Farber discloses a
16 remote look -- retrieving the data from something that isn't co-located, or in
17 other words is remote, that could include a server, that's enough to satisfy a
18 cloud service.

19 JUDGE REPKO: Cloud service, not co-located and in
20 communication with a -- another server?

21 MR. JUGLE: Correct.

22 JUDGE REPKO: Okay. Thank you. I have no further questions
23 on that.

24 MR. JUGLE: So briefly here, Patent Owner said Wannamaker

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 doesn't have a multicast server. We went through a slide. Wannamaker
2 discloses a multicast server, so I don't feel the need to rebut that.

3 Caching unit of Farber, I think their argument about the
4 requirements of a caching unit only helps them if we were making the
5 argument that everything happens at the storage unit of Farber. And as I
6 said, we're not. So I don't think -- I think that's just two ships passing in the
7 night here.

8 So I think the last thing I have to say on rebuttal is I'm going to
9 briefly address arguments that were made in Petitioner's slides that he didn't
10 quite get to, and also in their Patent Owner response regarding our
11 obviousness combinations. And that is just to note that KSR is pretty clear
12 about when it is appropriate to do an obviousness combination. And we
13 don't think that reading a KSR that's presented in the Patent Owner response
14 or the slides is really fair. KSR is pretty clear that when you have known
15 techniques, it's simple for an -- a person of ordinary skill in the art to
16 improve similar devices the same way, and that when you do have that,
17 using the technique is obvious.

18 KSR also specifically notes that you do not need precise teachings
19 directed to a specific subject matter of the challenge claim. You can take
20 into account inferences and creating steps of a person of ordinary skill in the
21 art. So KSR is not as narrow as Patent Owners make it out to be. There's a
22 whole litany in case law around it. We think our petition and expert
23 declaration provide ample reasons to combine the primary and secondary
24 references. And with that, unless there's any other questions, I am happy to

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 sit down and -

2 JUDGE MURPHY: None from me.

3 JUDGE REPKO: I have no further questions. Thank you.

4 MR. JUGLE: Thank you.

5 JUDGE REPKO: Judge McMillin? Any further questions?

6 JUDGE MCMILLIN: No, thank you.

7 JUDGE REPKO: Patent Owner, you have 25 minutes for your
8 rebuttal. Just let me know and I'll start the clock.

9 MR. DROLET: When Your Honors are ready.

10 JUDGE REPKO: You can proceed right now.

11 MR. DROLET: Thank you. So in brief, I did review our Patent
12 Owner Response, and across 349, 350, 351, we're explicit in calling out that
13 all these different terms, content provider, media stream, playback,
14 assembling, those are not taught. And we specifically reference looking, at
15 the -- at the specification, that an -- a person of ordinary skill in the art
16 would not understand that to be what Petitioner says.

17 So in respect to what he just showed with the KSR, we disagree.
18 Phillips, in all the different cases that I put on the Sur-reply with respect to
19 the Board's decisions over the last two years, with respect to any sort of
20 interpretation of claim terms, that they have to have some sort of connection
21 with the specification. It can't be done just by ordinarily assuming and being
22 divorced. So our whole contention has been from our Patent Owner
23 Response to our Sur-reply, what does the specification teach us? That has
24 not been done at all. So we disagree with Petitioner. We've stated so in our

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 Responses and our Sur-reply. So let me continue with a few things here.

2 JUDGE MCMILLIN: Mr. Drolet, this is Judge McMillin. I also
3 took the opportunity to go back and look at your Responses, and the claim
4 construction sections in each of the responses appear to be the same or at
5 least very, very similar, and I could not find Patent Owner urging or arguing
6 claim construction in any of your Responses. There are arguments relating
7 to those claim terms, but they do not appear to be claim construction
8 arguments, at least not in your Response.

9 MR. DROLET: So -

10 JUDGE MCMILLIN: Can you point me to anything in any
11 Response that says something to the effect of, this claim term should be
12 construed as?

13 MR. DROLET: Page 49 of -- and I know you can't see my screen
14 from where you're at, Judge, I pulled up IPR, my own response -

15 JUDGE MURPHY: Pardon me, Counsel, can you pull that
16 microphone closer to you, please? Thanks.

17 MR. DROLET: Certainly. I pulled up my screen here.

18 JUDGE MCMILLIN: I am looking at page 49 of your -- if you're
19 referring to page 49 of the Response in the 349 case, I'm looking at it. Can
20 we go to claim -- go to page 23 first?

21 MR. DROLET: Yes, I'm there.

22 JUDGE MCMILLIN: Your entire claim construction presentation
23 is on page 23. And again, I don't see any urging of any claim construction.
24 There is simply criticism of what Petitioner did, and you specifically

1 criticize Petitioner for not specifying what constitutes the plain and ordinary
2 meaning of any term.

3 MR. DROLET: Your Honor -

4 JUDGE MCMILLIN: There is no claim construction argument in
5 that Response.

6 MR. DROLET: So I'm looking at page 24, and we state that
7 Phillips should be followed, and it should be read, including the entire
8 specification and prosecution history. We state that. Further, on page 40
9 -- 49, should I say, we begin specifically talking about how those term
10 interpretations are different than what Petitioner has. And I'm showing here
11 on my screen, sorry for the delay. So on page 49, "The intrinsic record
12 confirms that content provider refers to entities such as cable or satellite
13 operators. The specification expressly states an example computer-
14 implemented method can receive from a content provider, such as a cable or
15 satellite operator, a request for at least one media stream for a playback on a
16 broadcast channel." Further, dependent Claim 9 limits Claim 1 to cases
17 where the content provider is a cable television operator or satellite
18 television operator. Under the doctrine of claim differentiation, dependent
19 Claim 9 confirms that content provider in independent Claim 1 must already
20 carry the ordinary meaning of a source entity responsible for supplying
21 content, consistent with industry usage.

22 Petitioner's attempt to relabel a gateway platform as a content
23 provider is inconsistent with intrinsic evidence. A gateway is merely a
24 transmission intermediary, not a content source. A gateway platform, as

1 cited by Avellan, is "an intermediary system that facilitates communication
2 between user computers utilizing information copied from websites." The
3 Avellan gateway platform does not originate content, but acts as a
4 distribution intermediary, receiving, processing, and enabling delivery to the
5 computer end users, images, and webpages. Avellan fails to teach, suggest
6 or disclose receiving from a content provider a request for at least one media
7 stream for playback, as we've cited in Independent Claim 1, 12, and 17.

8 A premise that a request comes from a passive intermediary
9 communication pass-through communication infrastructure, such as a
10 broadcast device, is erroneous. A broadcast device cannot perform any
11 request capability. The broadcast device described in Avellan is merely a
12 passive intermediate communication path. It does not in itself request a
13 media stream, but only transmits computer user-generated requests. As
14 such, it cannot satisfy the active method set of receiving from a content
15 provider a request for at least one media stream, required by the challenge
16 claims. I go on to describe the actually physical -- you know, in actual
17 descriptions and actual specification of Avellan, how that's different.

18 We go on to even talk about, on page 53, a request, a request refers
19 to an active, intentional action taken by a user or a client device to obtain
20 data, services, or content. Further, a request is explicitly initiated by users
21 such as by clicking the play button. Additionally, a request is directed to a
22 remote entity and requires some degree of volition or specific invocation. In
23 Avellan, the only request comes from the user computers, not from a content
24 provider. I go on, on page 54, "A media stream is a continuous, temporally

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 ordered flow of multimedia data transmitted for playback rather than a static
2 file transfer." Further, "Playback is the process of outputting stored or
3 streamed multimedia content for user consumption, including retrieving,
4 decoding, and rendering steps."

5 Avellan does not teach, suggest, or disclose at least receiving from
6 content provider, a request for at least one media stream for playback,
7 because Avellan solely teaches imaging in a webpage, and then transmitting
8 that image to user computers in either unicast or broadcast mode. Some
9 other cases using a compressed file -- video file or compressed video format
10 that is first stored at the gateway's cache as it was a file. There's no playback
11 whatsoever because there is no media stream. So we continue going to
12 different terms, but we've addressed what Petitioner claims meets the -- our
13 claim language, and we're invoking the process that Phillips talks about, and
14 this Board has talked about, as far as looking at the specification about what
15 the claim itself means.

16 So we've articulated the best we can, at least in the Patent Owner's
17 Response, and then in the Sur-reply across the board in all three
18 proceedings, we specifically call out sections of specification. Petitioner has
19 failed, has ignored all specification. This Board, in previous decisions
20 concerning the IPRs, and also for other appeal boards, specifically talk about
21 looking at specification, and having in context of what the inventor has
22 written in the specification. So that's what we're trying to convey here, not
23 only in our Patent Owner Response, what I'm showing right now, but our
24 Sur-reply.

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 JUDGE REPKO: So I realize that's what you're trying to convey,
2 but going back to Judge McMillin's point, on page 7 of your slides, you've
3 given us this construction and you've kind of quoted it from somewhere. So
4 what -- did you quote that from the Patent Owner Response?

5 MR. DROLET: I -

6 JUDGE REPKO: "A third party such as a cable or television"
7 which page of the Patent Owner Response did you quote that from?

8 MR. DROLET: You're talking about my presentation earlier?

9 JUDGE REPKO: Yes. On Slide 7, you say, "Patent Owner's
10 construction of content provider is a third party, such as" -- did you quote
11 that from the Patent Owner's Response?

12 MR. DROLET: Well, I'm looking at Patent Owner's response,
13 then -- as it's written on page 49.

14 JUDGE REPKO: That's what you're citing, page 49. So is that
15 appears on page 49. Page 30 -

16 MR. DROLET: Page 49 for the Patent Owner Response: "The
17 intrinsic record confirms that content provider refers to entities such as cable
18 or satellite operators."

19 JUDGE REPKO: But that sentence -

20 MR. DROLET: Then go on to explain that.

21 JUDGE REPKO: -- that sentence that you have in your slide
22 doesn't appear verbatim on this -- but it -- you're saying it's captured by this
23 somehow? Is that what you're saying? Because I just want to make sure the
24 construction that you're proposing on Slide 7 that you've quoted isn't

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 necessarily a quote from page 49, correct?

2 MR. DROLET: I -- let me look at what was -- what's on the slide,

3 Your Honor, please.

4 JUDGE REPKO: I just want to make sure. I guess my question is,

5 like, where does that quote come from?

6 MR. DROLET: Slide -

7 JUDGE REPKO: 7. At the top, your "construction", in quotes.

8 MR. DROLET: Okay. That comes from the Patent Owner's

9 expert declaration, 2006.

10 JUDGE REPKO: But that doesn't come from the Patent Owner's

11 Response?

12 MR. DROLET: No. I read specifically what was written in Patent

13 Owner's Response right now.

14 JUDGE REPKO: Because you put the construction in the expert

15 declaration.

16 MR. DROLET: In this demonstrative, this was included -- the

17 intent was, is that a content provider is not an intermediary. It is some sort

18 of third party entity. And I'll go back and I'll rely on what was written in our

19 Patent Owner Response, as well as our Sur-reply.

20 JUDGE REPKO: So you're wanting us to adopt this construction

21 from Patent Owner's expert declaration?

22 MR. DROLET: I'm asking to adopt the construction that -- or the

23 definition that we gave in the Patent Owner Response.

24 JUDGE REPKO: But you're -

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 JUDGE MURPHY: But it's not in your Patent Owner Response.

2 That's what we're trying to say.

3 MR. DROLET: Well, no. I'm looking at Patent Owner's
4 Response, page 49, "The intrinsic record" firms -- "refers to entities such as
5 cable or satellite operators." That is what we state in page 49.

6 JUDGE MURPHY: Yes, understood. Judge Repko was saying
7 -- was trying to understand where this quote on the slide came from.

8 MR. DROLET: The quote appears to come from the expert
9 declaration.

10 JUDGE MURPHY: Right.

11 MR. DROLET: So -

12 JUDGE MURPHY: But there's no paragraph cited, so it's
13 somewhere in that declaration?

14 MR. DROLET: Yes. Yes, sir.

15 JUDGE MURPHY: That declaration, Exhibit Number 2006, is not
16 cited on page 49 or the subsequent pages discussing the content provider.
17 That's our point. It has to be in the brief somewhere, because we don't know
18 what you're talking about.

19 MR. DROLET: Understood. I apologize for any sort of confusion
20 with respect to mismatch. My point being is that we -- our position has
21 been, from the Patent Owner Response to the Surreply, to call out all these
22 key terms of art that we believe are instructed or informed by the
23 specification, something Petitioners have not done from day one. So our
24 position has always been that. The intrinsic record shows us what those

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 terms should be.

2 JUDGE REPKO: Would it be fair to adopt this construction if it's
3 in the dec only and not in your Response, just in some paragraph that you
4 didn't even cite in the slide?

5 MR. DROLET: I'm not sure I understood.

6 JUDGE REPKO: Well -

7 MR. DROLET: Say that again.

8 JUDGE REPKO: -- Petitioner has to reply, and they are supposed
9 to respond to your arguments in the Patent Owner Response, right? We've
10 given you so many pages of the Patent Owner Response to make your
11 argument. You proposed the claim construction. That claim construction is
12 in the expert declaration, not in your Patent Owner Response, what you're
13 quoting, right? On page 7 of your slide.

14 MR. DROLET: Of the slide.

15 JUDGE REPKO: Right. So if we were to adopt that, would that
16 be fair to Petitioner when they didn't have the opportunity to respond to it
17 because it wasn't in your Patent Owner Response?

18 MR. DROLET: So what would be fair is that Petitioner did not
19 respond to any of our characterizations or what we proposed for these key
20 terms are in our Patent Owner Response. They were silent with respect to
21 our characterization. So if you're asking me -

22 JUDGE REPKO: That wasn't my question. I guess my question
23 specifically was what's on Slide 7 here, and if that's the construction that
24 we're going to adopt, the Petitioner didn't have an opportunity to see it

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 because it was in the expert dec, it wasn't actually in a Patent Owner

2 Response, does that raise some fairness concerns?

3 MR. DROLET: So the fairness concerns, if you read through all
4 the -- these are demonstratives, but the intent was, is that a content provider,
5 as the claim -- as the challenge claims say it out to be in the actual
6 specification, is not a satellite or intermediary passenger device. It's an
7 actual entity such as a cable or satellite operator, as stated in the content
8 provider. So that's fair. They have -- they had advanced notice of that reply,
9 but also in our Sur-reply as well. So as far as notice goes, as far as argument
10 goes, we stand by what's in our Patent Owner Response and Sur-reply as far
11 as characterization.

12 As far as the mismatch between the expert-specific quote that's in
13 the demonstrative, I only say that there was no intent of misdirection or
14 mischaracterization. It was trying to intend to be in fidelity what was
15 written in the declaration and to relate that to what we've been responding to.
16 We stand by what's in the -- in the Response and we stand by the Sur-reply.

17 JUDGE REPKO: Okay. Thank you.

18 MR. DROLET: If that answers your question.

19 JUDGE REPKO: I have no further questions on that. Thank you.

20 MR. DROLET: Okay. So again, claim construction is an option.
21 All the board (INDISCERNIBLE) have said that. With respect to -- Farber,
22 getting back to the caching unit, based on the actual construction and
23 actually specification, the caching unit is not taught by Petitioner. The claim
24 construction itself, the language in the actual specification leads us to a

1 different conclusion that a mere storage unit is not taught -- is not an actual
2 caching unit.

3 With respect to Petitioner's comments concerning their lack of
4 response for their expert, I object to any sort of weight the Board will give
5 that, because they chose not to respond. The Board earlier declined to ask
6 for specific instances in which those exchanges were made, and at this point
7 during oral argument I suggest that we not -- that that not -- that be fully
8 discounted. If the Board feels those issues are important, I'm happy to read
9 specifically how it's explicitly -- disqualifies its comments, but I had the
10 feeling that that was not important and we're arguing the merits of the case.
11 So that's what I believe about the -- about disqualification.

12 So I mentioned earlier that media stream is not taught, suggested,
13 or disclosed by any of the references. Media stream, as I described earlier, is
14 a separate claim element of the actual claim itself. So we're talking about its
15 correspondence to other functionalities. I want to make sure it's clear, and
16 we argued with it. Specifically that in our reply, when we talk about media
17 stream, it's an actual specific separate thing. Media stream is a continuous,
18 temporally ordered flow of multimedia data, transmitted for playback, rather
19 than the static file transfer. Further, playback is the process of outputting
20 stored or streamed multimedia content for user consumption, including
21 retrieving, decoding, and rendering steps. Avellan does not teach, suggest,
22 or disclose at least receiving from a content provider a request for at least
23 one media stream for playback.

24 Assembling the at least one media stream requires more than

1 transmitting or displaying individual media items. A person of ordinary skill
2 in the art would understand assembling the -- organizing, and synchronizing,
3 and packetizing media content into a continuous stream suitable for
4 playback. By contrast, Avellan merely discloses transmitting a series of
5 separate image files, in some other cases, compressed video files, without
6 any disclosure of assembling those items into a coherent media stream with
7 temporal continuity or synchronization. Assembling is simply applied in
8 hindsight to the HD protocol.

9 Avellan does not disclose providing at least one media stream,
10 because it merely stores and identifies images, files, without delivering or
11 making available a continuous media stream for playback. A person of
12 ordinary skill in the art would understand that providing requires a stream to
13 be furnished in a form suitable for playback, such as through transmission
14 over a network or supplying to a client. Transmitting static images or a
15 series of image files alone falls short of this requirement.

16 In Patent Owner's Sur-reply, we established that the Farber is a
17 finite state machine. Audio triggers MPEG coder, MPEG coder triggers,
18 processing the three-minute song requires system to complete one trigger
19 sequence before the next. The elements require a caching unit actually
20 receiving an external request, then responsively providing that asset. In
21 Farber, when a broadcast unit sends a request in process, the process is
22 disrupted. The MPEG multiplexer works only on MPEG transport streams
23 already in process.

24 Getting back to Wannamaker, with respect to the actual

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 communication that Wannamaker is making in the actual disclosure, it's
2 HTML, to MML or CPML. That actual control language for that set top
3 control box, there's no conversion of actual data for the actual end user. This
4 is purely instructional information, based on the HTML to construction
5 language for that set top box. So when we talk about MPEG outputs, it
6 refers to encoding and decoding, which Wannamaker does not do. It takes
7 those inputs, makes it a PRI frame, sends -- transmits those, and sends
8 instructions to the set top box. It does not do any sort of MPEG encoding.

9 JUDGE REPKO: I guess what Petitioner was saying in the district
10 court claim construction, the MPEG -- it doesn't have to be MPEG
11 parameters. As long as there's some encoding somewhere in the chain of
12 causation, I guess, it reads on the claim. How do you respond to that, under
13 the district court construction that -- or I guess it's not district -- it's a
14 position that's being taken in district court that Petitioner wants us to adopt
15 for this proceeding?

16 MR. DROLET: With respect to the actual encoding of the -- what
17 that means? Is -- I'm trying to understand the question, Your Honor.

18 JUDGE REPKO: Yeah, so they pointed us to a specific exhibit,
19 and I don't want to -- you only have about three minutes, so I don't want to
20 go too far down the rabbit hole, but I guess they're saying that, you know,
21 there is MPEG compression, but the claim doesn't require that there be
22 MPEG parameters specifically, or compression parameters specifically,
23 Claim 7.

24 MR. DROLET: Right. And I say that's inherent in actual -- the

1 actual claim language itself, that it's inherent. It requires it.

2 JUDGE REPKO: Requires some sort of MPEG parameters?

3 MR. DROLET: Yes.

4 JUDGE REPKO: Thank you.

5 MR. DROLET: So in summation, we still stand by the fact that
6 Petitioner did no proper claim construction. Key terms, media stream,
7 caching unit, they're not disclosed. Content provider, not disclosed. Media
8 stream, not disclosed. Playback cannot occur by Avellan. Farber does not
9 teach a caching unit. Farber does not do a determining step. It's not
10 inherent, it's an actual specific step in the actual claim itself. You can't just
11 go ahead and modify, or interpretation to go ahead and make a claim
12 superfluous. So for Farber, you can't take those out. The inherency for the
13 actual determining step, as shown before, can't be done. It's not applicable.
14 It's not inevitable. The inherency would require inevitability, and it's not the
15 case.

16 So with the combination of all the different sources, because
17 they're different architectures, Wannamaker, we spoke before, it's an actual
18 workaround. It's a middleware for antiquated transmission of actual web
19 services, to try to go ahead and get them in set top boxes. That's a different
20 type of infrastructure than Farber or Avellan. Totally different. A person of
21 ordinary skill in the art with software, as asked earlier, how would that make
22 a difference? If a person of ordinary skill in the art had that experience
23 based on software, would understand the difference between these different
24 references. There is no motivation to combine. There's no analogous way

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)

IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)

IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

1 of even putting them together. There's no modicum of success, no
2 expectation of success. But a person of ordinary skill in the art with
3 software, which is -- this patent is about, it's pure software, is not properly
4 addressed in someone who doesn't have that background. And I believe
5 that's what's happened across the board with a lot of Petitioner's arguments,
6 is that because they're not compatible references, they're different
7 infrastructures, they are not congruent. It would not be -- they would not be
8 analogous art and it would not be functional.

9 So with that, any other questions from the board? I'll reserve my
10 time.

11 JUDGE REPKO: Judge McMillin, do you have anything further?

12 JUDGE MCMILLIN: No, thank you.

13 MR. DROLET: Thank you.

14 JUDGE REPKO: Thank you. So thank you for appearing today
15 and answering our questions. The oral hearing is concluded, but please stay
16 and answer any questions that our court reporter has.

17 THE REPORTER: Thank you.

18 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 4:01
19 p.m.)

IPR2025-00349 (Patent 10,123,074 B2)
IPR2025-00350 (Patent 10,524,002 B2)
IPR2025-00351 (Patent 11,140,441 B2)

PETITIONER:

Masood Anjom
Joshua Wyde
Michael McBride
Steven T. Jugle
ALAVI & ANAIPAKOS PLLC
manjom@aatriallaw.com
jwyde@aatriallaw.com
sjugle@aatriallaw.com

PATENT OWNER:

Robert Drolet
RL DROLET PATENT PROSECUTION SERVICES, PLLC
rob@rldpatents.com

Daniel Ravicher
ZEISLER PLLC
dan@ravicher.com