

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

PANASONIC SYSTEM NETWORKS CO., LTD.  
Petitioner

v.

6115187 CANADA INC.  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR \_\_\_\_\_  
U.S. Patent No. 6,844,990  
Issue Date: January 18, 2005

Title: METHOD FOR CAPTURING AND DISPLAYING A  
VARIABLE RESOLUTION DIGITAL PANORAMIC IMAGE

---

**PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW  
OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,844,990 UNDER  
35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.100 ET SEQ.**

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD, PTAB  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

- I. MANDATORY NOTICES UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(1) ..... 1
  - A. Real Party-In-Interest Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1) ..... 1
  - B. Related Matters Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2) ..... 1
  - C. Lead And Back-Up Counsel Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3)..... 1
  - D. Service Information Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(4)..... 1
- II. PAYMENT OF FEES..... 2
- III. REQUIREMENTS FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW - 37 C.F.R. § 42.104.... 2
  - A. Grounds For Standing Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a) ..... 2
  - B. Identification Of Challenge Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)..... 2
    - 1. Claims For Which *Inter Partes* Review Is Requested Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(1)..... 2
    - 2. The Specific Art And Statutory Ground(s) On Which The Challenge Is Based Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(2) ..... 3
    - 3. How The Challenged Claims Are To Be Construed Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3)..... 5
    - 4. How The Construed Claims Are Unpatentable Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4)..... 7
    - 5. Supporting Evidence Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(5) ..... 7
    - 6. One Of Ordinary Skill In The Art At The Time Of Invention ..... 8
- IV. SUMMARY OF THE ‘990 PATENT ..... 8
  - A. Description Of The Alleged Invention Of The ‘990 Patent ..... 8

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 6,844,990

B.	Summary Of The Prosecution Of The ‘990 Patent .....	9
C.	Related European Patent No. 1386480 B1 .....	9
V.	THERE IS A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT AT LEAST ONE CLAIM OF THE ‘990 PATENT IS UNPATENTABLE.....	10
A.	Identification Of The References As Prior Art .....	10
B.	Summary Of Invalidity Arguments .....	11
VI.	DETAILED EXPLANATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b) .....	12
A.	Ground 1: Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 17, 18, 20 And 22 Are Anticipated By Nagaoka. ....	12
1.	Claims 1 And 17 .....	12
2.	Claims 2 And 18 .....	16
3.	Claims 4 And 20 .....	17
4.	Claims 6 And 22 .....	17
B.	Ground 2: Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 17, 18, 20 And 22 Are Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Over Nagaoka. ....	18
C.	Ground 3: Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 17, 18, 20 And 22 Are Anticipated By Baker.....	21
1.	Claims 1 And 17 .....	21
2.	Claims 2 And 18 .....	25
3.	Claims 4 And 20 .....	26
4.	Claims 6 And 22 .....	26
D.	Ground 4: Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 17, 18, 20 And 22 Are Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Over Baker. ....	27
E.	Ground 5: Claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 17, 18, 19, 22 And 23 Are Anticipated By Fisher .....	31

Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 6,844,990

1. Claims 1 And 17 .....	31
2. Claims 2 And 18 .....	34
3. Claims 3 And 19 .....	35
4. Claims 6 And 22 .....	35
5. Claims 7 And 23 .....	35
F. Ground 6: Claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 17, 18, 19, 22 And 23 Are Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Over Fisher .....	36
G. Ground 7: Claims 1, 2, 3, 6 And 7 Are Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Over Fisher In View Of Baker.....	39
H. Ground 8: Claim 10 Is Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Over Nagaoka In View Of Shiota .....	40
I. Ground 9: Claim 10 Is Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Over Nagaoka In View Of Matsui.....	42
J. Ground 10: Claim 11 Is Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Over Nagaoka In View Of Shiota .....	46
K. Ground 11: Claims 15 And 16 Are Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Over Nagaoka In View Of Shiota And Further In View Of Enami.....	47
1. Claim 15 .....	47
2. Claim 16 .....	52
L. Grounds 12 And 13: Claims 10 And 11 Are Obvious Over Baker In View Of Shiota And Claims 15 And 16 Are Obvious Over Baker In View Of Shiota And Further In View Of Enami.....	57
M. Ground 14: Claim 25 Is Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Over Baker In View Of Inoue .....	58
N. Ground 15: Claim 25 Is Obvious Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Over Nagaoka In View Of Inoue .....	58

...

VII. CONCLUSION .....59

# 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.