

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SONY CORPORATION,  
Petitioner,

v.

YISSUM RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT CO. OF THE HEBREW  
UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2013-00219  
Patent 7,477,284 B2<sup>1</sup>

---

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY, KARL D. EASTHOM, and  
JAMES B. ARPIN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

ARPIN, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION  
Request for Rehearing  
*37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d)*

---

<sup>1</sup> *Sony Corp. v. Yissum Research Co.*, Case IPR2013-00327 (“IPR2013-00327”) has been joined with instant Case IPR2013-00219. IPR2013-00327, Paper 15 (PTAB Sept. 24, 2013). This Rehearing Decision is entered in both cases.

## I. BACKGROUND

Patent Owner, Yissum Research Development Co. of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, in its Rehearing Request, seeks withdrawal of our conclusion that Asahi (Ex. 1010) anticipates claims 1, 3, 20, 27, 29, and 37 of U.S. Patent No. 7,477,284 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’284 Patent”) because “the Board’s conclusion that Asahi anticipates claims 1, 3, 20, 27, 29, and 37 was incorrect as being based on a misapprehension of the evidence presented.” *See* Paper 61(“Req. Reh’g”), 1–2.

The applicable standard for a request for rehearing is set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(d), which provides, in relevant part, the following:

A party dissatisfied with a decision may file a request for rehearing, without prior authorization from the Board. The burden of showing a decision should be modified lies with the party challenging the decision. The request must specifically identify all matters the party believes the Board misapprehended or overlooked, and the place where each matter was previously addressed in a motion, opposition, or a reply.

For the reasons that follow, we *deny* the requested relief.

## II. DISCUSSION

After reviewing Patent Owner’s Rehearing Request, we determine that Patent Owner has not shown that we misapprehended or overlooked any matter previously presented. *See* Req. Reh’g 2. Patent Owner contends that we

misapprehended or overlooked Dr. [Trevor] Darrell’s testimony that to generate images that provide a perception of depth there needs to be almost 99 percent overlap between the *images* from which the lines are taken and Asahi’s [Ex. 1009] express teaching that it only utilizes 60 percent overlap in creating its *images*, which was argued in Patent Owner’s Motion for Observation at ¶ 3. (Paper 43).

Req. Reh’g 3 (emphasis added).

Specifically, Patent Owner argues that independent claims 1 and 27 of the '284 Patent recite mosaic images that “provide a sense of depth of the scene.” *Id.* Further, in our Institution Decision, we determined that “the perception of depth is provided to a person and [our] Final Decision confirmed this understanding noting that ‘the sense of depth must be perceived by a person *viewing the display.*’” Paper 16 (“Inst. Dec.”), 16–17; Paper 60 (“Fin. Dec.”), 13. In addition, claim 1 recites that “at least one imager that moves relative to a scene so as *to acquire a plurality of optical images of at least portions of the scene*, each of at least two of said optical images being viewed from a different respective viewing position.” Ex. 1001, col. 13, ll. 63–65 (emphasis added); *see also id.* at col. 16, ll. 6–8 (claim 27). Based on the testimony of Petitioner’s declarant, Dr. Darrell, Patent Owner argues that, “for a sense of depth to be perceived by a person, there must be a 99% overlap in the *images where a single line is taken.*” Req. Reh’g 3 (emphasis added). Patent Owner argues, however, that “Asahi, which is directed to computer vision and not human vision, explicitly and unequivocally states that it takes *a single line from images* with only 60% overlap.” *Id.* (emphasis added). Although Asahi discloses a working example in which 60% overlap is described, we did not determine that Asahi’s disclosure was limited to that example. *See* Fin. Dec. 26–32. Moreover, on what appears to be a significant point, Dr. Darrell and Patent Owner’s counsel appear to acknowledge that they disagree about whether a line used to create images in Asahi is limited to a using “a single vertical line of an image frame.” *See* Ex. 2014, 107:7–25.

Initially, we note that independent claims 1 and 27 recite “a *display* that receives *a plurality of the mosaics* and *displays* [the plurality of the mosaics] so as to provide a sense of depth of the scene” (emphases added). Consequently, it is the *displayed mosaics* that “provide a sense of depth of the scene.” Moreover,

Petitioner’s declarant, Dr. Darrell, testified that, “if some defects were introduced in the mosaic images recorded [without proper vertical and horizontal alignment], . . . the defects would not be so severe in every case as to preclude depth from being perceived upon viewing an appropriate display of a pair of the mosaics.” Fin. Dec. 34–35 (citing Pet. Reply 13–14 (quoting Ex. 1044 ¶ 30)); *see also* Fin. Dec. 20 (Based on testimony of Petitioner’s declarant, Dr. Darrell, and Patent Owner’s declarant, Dr. Irfan Essa, with respect to Kawakita, we were persuaded that, “although a viewer may not perceive a sense of depth of every portion of a scene *from every sight line*, the viewer still may perceive a ‘sense of depth of the scene’ despite the presence of disparities in portions of the scene.”; emphasis added).

Patent Owner relies on Asahi’s discussion of a 60% *scene-to-scene* overlap, drawn from captured images, whereas Patent Owner cross-examined Dr. Darrell concerning overlap of “99 percent from *frame to frame*.” Paper 43 ¶ 3 (emphasis added). As Patent Owner acknowledges, according to Asahi, a frame may include two fields, and each field may be a scene. Paper 43, ¶ 3; *see* Ex. 1010 ¶¶ 34–35; Paper 59 (“Tr.”), 8:16–23. As noted above, however, claim 1 only requires that the at least one imager acquires a plurality of optical images *of at least portions of the scene*, each from a different respective viewing position, e.g., sight line. *See* Ex. 1001, col. 13, ll. 63–65; *see also* Tr. 70:1 (“And by the way, just to clarify, the images are portions of the scene.”).

We neither misapprehended nor overlooked the argument and supporting evidence presented in Patent Owner’s Motion for Observation. However, Patent Owner did not provide sufficient evidence or explanation to persuade us that the frame-to-frame overlap allegedly required to provide a sense of depth of a scene is not disclosed broadly by Asahi’s scene-to-scene overlap. Asahi’s working

example describes a 60% overlap (Ex. 1010 ¶ 30; *see id.*, Fig. 5 (depicting a single example of a two scene overlap of 60%)), but we do not limit the disclosure of Asahi to that one example. Asahi more broadly discloses “at least three images that overlap in a prescribed proportion” (Ex. 1010 ¶ 9), and Asahi explicitly describes “[a] pair consisting of two images that make up a stereoscopic image” (*id.* ¶ 32). *See* Fin. Dec. 25.

Patent Owner does not identify where it cross-examined Dr. Darrell explicitly about the 60% scene-to-scene overlap that Asahi discloses with respect to the working example. Instead, Patent Owner focuses on Dr. Darrell’s cross-examination testimony regarding the 99% overlap. *See* Req. Reh’g 10–11 (citing Ex. 2014, 31, 108–109). Nevertheless, in the deposition testimony cited by Patent Owner, Dr. Darrell responds “I think so” to a question about “substantial overlap” between scenes, which in the context of the following question, implies “almost 99 percent overlap” in Asahi. *See* Ex. 2014, 108:20–24 (Patent Owner’s following question was: “Similar to what we described earlier in the Kawakita discussion about needing almost 99 percent overlap; correct?,” to which Dr. Darrell responded “Correct.”). The cited pages of Dr. Darrell’s testimony, however, do not support Patent Owner’s characterization of that testimony.

Specifically, after being questioned generally about Asahi’s disclosure and the need for overlap for “a complete depiction of that scene,” Dr. Darrell testified that “the frame rate would be high enough,” (*see* Ex. 2014, 108:1–14), and the specific colloquy (as summarized above) ensued:

Q. And the result of that [frame rate] would be that the overlap between one frame and the next would be substantial?

A. I think so.

Q. Similar to what we described earlier in the Kawakita discussion about needing almost 99 percent overlap; correct?

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.