UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,
Petitioner

v.

BRADIUM TECHNOLOGIES LLC,
Patent Owner

CASE IPR2015-01432
Patent 7,139,794

PATENT OWNER BRADIUM TECHNOLOGIES LLC'S RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §42.120

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Table of Contents

Exhibit List iv

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. A POSITA WOULD NOT HAVE MODIFIED RUTLEDGE OR LIGTENBERG IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COOPER PRIORITY QUEUE 4

A. A POSITA Would Understand that 2D Image-Based Methods Such as Rutledge and Ligtenberg Are Fundamentally Different from 3D Polygon-Based Methods Such as Described by Cooper 4

B. A POSITA would Not Combine the 3D Polygonal Object Prioritization of Cooper with the Single Composited Image Display Systems of Rutledge and Ligtenberg 7

C. The Tiles in Rutledge or Ligtenberg Would Be Incapable of Being Prioritized by the Object Assessment Function of Cooper 17

1. The Bounding Box Primitives that Are Essential for the Object Assessment Function of Cooper Are Absent in Rutledge and Ligtenberg 18

2. The Object Assessment Function of Cooper Would Not Be Employed by a POSITA to Enhance the Visual Richness of the Image Display of Rutledge or Ligtenberg 22

a. The Screen Area Value Would Be Incapable of Meaningfully Distinguishing the Tiles of Rutledge or Ligtenberg 25

b. The Distance Value Would Be Incapable of Enhancing the Appearance of the Tiles of Rutledge or Ligtenberg 25

c. The Focal Point Factor Would Be Incapable of Distinguishing the Tiles of Rutledge or Ligtenberg 26

d. The Movement Value Would Not Enhance the Appearance of the Tiles of Rutledge or Ligtenberg 28

e. The Message Value Would Be Incapable of Distinguishing the Tiles of Rutledge or Ligtenberg 29

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

f. The Frames Ignored Value Would Be Incapable of Distinguishing the Tiles of Rutledge or Ligtenberg 29

g. Since None of the Importance Value Factors Would Enhance the Visual Richness of the Tile Display of Rutledge or Ligtenberg, a POSITA Would Have No Reason to Apply the Object Prioritization of Cooper to Rutledge or Ligtenberg 30

D. The Petition Fails to Establish that a POSITA Would Have Applied the Cooper Priority Queue to Rutledge or Ligtenberg 30

III. A POSITA WOULD NOT HAVE COMBINED MIGDAL WITH RUTLEDGE OR LIGTENBERG 37

IV. A POSITA WOULD NOT HAVE COMBINED COOPER WITH MIGDAL 39

V. CLAIM 1 WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF THE COMBINATION OF COOPER WITH RUTLEDGE AND LIGTENBERG 41

A. The Combination of Cooper with Rutledge and Ligtenberg Does Not Teach or Suggest a Parcel Request Queue in Which Image Parcel Requests Are Placed According to a Priority Order 41

B. Cooper Does Not Teach or Suggest a Parcel Rendering Subsystem that Determines an Assigned Priority Based on the Predetermined Resolution of an Image Display 44

C. The Petition Fails to Address the Concept of a Parcel Request Priority Order Determined on the Basis of a Predetermined Resolution of a Display 46

VI. CLAIM 2 WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF THE COMBINATION OF COOPER WITH RUTLEDGE, LIGTENBERG, AND MIGDAL 49

A. The Combination of Cooper with Rutledge, Ligtenberg, and Migdal Does Not Teach or Suggest Requesting Image Parcels in Priority Order 49

B. The Combination of Cooper with Rutledge, Ligtenberg, and Migdal Does Not Teach or Suggest a Priority Order for Image

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Parcels that Is Determined to Provide a Progressive Regional Resolution Enhancement.....51

C. The Petition and the Michalson Declaration Erroneously Assume that the Progressive Regional Resolution Enhancement of Claim 2 is Satisfied by the 3D Polygonal Object Prioritization of Cooper.....54

D. The Combination of Cooper with Rutledge, Ligtenberg, and Migdal Does Not Teach or Suggest Limiting Selective Rendering of Image Parcels to Those Having Less Than a Resolution of a Predetermined Level.....55

VII. CONCLUSION.....58

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Exhibit List

Ex. 2001 Declaration of Dr. Chandrajit Bajaj

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.